IFCS

IN-FLIGHT CATERING SOFTWARE

INDUSTRY WHITE PAPER • 2026 EDITION

The Compliance Imperative

Global Aviation Catering Regulatory Mapping

Traceability, cold-chain controls, and the 24-hour recall — an exhaustive analysis of the statutory frameworks reshaping flight kitchens worldwide.

PUBLISHED BY

IFCS — In-Flight Catering Software

Research & Compliance Practice • May 2026

ABOUT THIS PAPER

The Compliance Imperative

Global Aviation Catering Regulatory Mapping — Traceability, Cold-Chain Controls, and Compliance Frameworks

AUDIENCE

This paper is written for VPs of Catering, Heads of Quality and Food Safety, Chief Compliance Officers, and senior operations leaders at airlines and flight catering companies operating across multiple jurisdictions. It will also be useful for technology buyers evaluating digital traceability and cold-chain platforms, and for legal and regulatory affairs teams advising on cross-border catering operations.

HOW TO USE IT

Each regional section is self-contained: read the Executive Summary first, then jump to the jurisdictions relevant to your operation. The Master Comparison Matrix on page 24 distils the entire paper into a single reference table. The Industry Response section translates the regulatory landscape into a practical architecture for compliance.

A NOTE ON SOURCING

Every claim in this paper is anchored to a primary regulatory source — statute, regulator guidance, or peer-reviewed industry standard. Numbered citations correspond to the References on page 28. Where regulators have published guidance in multiple formats, we have privileged the most recent official version available as of May 2026.

CONTENTS

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Why this matters now

The commercial aviation catering supply chain is one of the most operationally complex, high-risk, and heavily regulated food-service environments in the global economy. A single contamination event aboard an international flight can trigger cascading public-health alerts across multiple sovereign borders within hours.

In response, regulators on every continent are abandoning reactive, end-product testing models in favour of proactive, data-driven traceability frameworks. The shift is no longer theoretical. Between 2023 and 2026, four of the world's largest aviation hubs — the United States, Singapore, the United Arab Emirates, and Australia — have either enacted or activated mandatory digital traceability rules requiring lot-level data, continuous cold-chain monitoring, and recall responses inside 24 hours.

This paper provides a structured, source-anchored mapping of the statutory frameworks now governing aviation catering, cold-chain integrity, and pathogen-recall traceability across nine priority jurisdictions. We identify the precise data, retention, and timing obligations imposed on flight kitchens, ramp transport, and onboard food stowage. We then synthesise the three macro shifts redefining the industry, and outline what a compliant operating architecture looks like in 2026.

> *A manual temperature log on a clipboard is no longer sufficient — it must be digitally tethered to a Traceability Lot Code that travels with the food from the farm to the galley.*
>
> — Synthesis Section, this paper

The conclusion is unambiguous: compliance has crossed the threshold from a localised hygiene discipline to an enterprise-grade data-management problem. Operators that cannot deliver sortable, electronic, lot-level traceability records to a regulator within 24 hours — across every kitchen, every cart, and every flight — are no longer compliant. They are exposed.

AT A GLANCE

Key Findings

24h	9	5 yr
MAX. RECALL RESPONSE WINDOW (FDA, SFA)	MAJOR JURISDICTIONS MAPPED	LONGEST RETENTION (ABU DHABI INCIDENTS)

5°C	75°C	72h
RECEIVING CEILING FOR TCS FOOD (AU, SG)	MIN. CORE HOT-HOLD TEMPERATURE (WFSG)	MAX. TRANSACTION RECORDING (HK)

THE FIVE TAKEAWAYS

- **1. Digital traceability is now the regulatory baseline.** FSMA 204, Singapore's Food Safety and Security Act 2025, and Dubai's Food Code 2.0 all require electronic, lot-level records linked to Critical Tracking Events. Paper logs alone no longer meet the standard.
- **2. The 24-hour recall window is becoming universal.** The FDA and Singapore's SFA explicitly mandate 24-hour electronic data delivery; the UK, EU, and UAE require records "on demand." Operational latency must be measured in hours, not days.
- **3. Cold-chain monitoring has shifted from spot-check to continuous.** Australia's Standard 3.2.2A requires data-logger evidence for every prescribed activity; Singapore mandates continuous loggers in transport vehicles; Dubai-licensed catering vehicles are subject to Municipality inspection.
- **4. Retention obligations vary fivefold across jurisdictions.** From Australia's 3-month minimum to Abu Dhabi's 5-year incident-records minimum. Multinational caterers must build to the strictest denominator.
- **5. Liability has moved upstream to the Food Business Operator.** EU 178/2002, the UK's retained version, and the SFCR all place primary responsibility on the caterer — including the presumption that an entire batch is unsafe unless the caterer can scientifically prove otherwise.

INTRODUCTION: THE STAKES AT 35,000 FEET

Unlike terrestrial restaurants or institutional caterers, flight kitchens operate under the constant friction of multi-jurisdictional oversight, extreme logistical constraints, and the unique physiological and environmental challenges of serving food at altitude.

A single pathogenic outbreak — Salmonella, Listeria monocytogenes, or E. coli — aboard an international flight can trigger cascading geopolitical health alerts, necessitating immediate, surgically precise product recalls across multiple sovereign borders. The logistical reality of provisioning wide-body aircraft involves preparing tens of thousands of meals daily in central commissaries, transporting them in specialised high-loader vehicles across sun-baked tarmacs, and storing them in aircraft galleys where power disruptions or delays can rapidly compromise the cold chain.

To mitigate these risks, regulatory bodies worldwide are abandoning reactive food-safety models — which historically relied on end-product testing and randomised inspections — in favour of proactive, data-driven traceability frameworks. This paradigm shift requires the rigorous implementation of Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP), continuous cold-chain temperature logging, and the meticulous tracking of Key Data Elements (KDEs) across Critical Tracking Events (CTEs) to ensure lot-level traceability.

The pages that follow provide an exhaustive, expert-level regulatory mapping of the statutory frameworks governing aviation catering across nine priority global aviation hubs. The analysis isolates regulations that explicitly impact commercial aviation catering, flight kitchens, ramp transport, and onboard food stowage. We have deliberately preserved the technical specificity that compliance, quality, and operations leaders need — temperature thresholds, retention periods, recall windows, batch-tracking obligations — while distilling each jurisdiction into a coherent operational picture.

SECTION 1

THE GLOBAL BASELINE

Because an aircraft may be provisioned in London, serve meals over the Atlantic, and offload catering waste in New York, international operators rely on consolidated guidelines that satisfy the strictest denominators of global law. Before dissecting sovereign regulations, the international baseline frameworks are the place to begin.

GOVERNING BODIES	International Flight Services Association (IFSA), Airline Catering Association (ACA), International Air Transport Association (IATA), World Health Organization (WHO).
STANDARD	World Food Safety Guidelines for Airline Catering (WFSG) — 5th Edition, 2022, alongside the WHO Guide to Hygiene and Sanitation in Aviation.
APPLICABILITY	Definitive global operational blueprint for airline caterers, ramp transport operations, and onboard food stowage worldwide.

The World Food Safety Guidelines (WFSG) evolved from a historic collaboration between the airline catering industry and US federal regulatory agencies — the USDA, CDC, FDA, and FAA. The WFSG integrates elements from globally recognised Global Food Safety Initiative (GFSI) schemes, specifically ISO 22000:2018 and FSSC 22000 Version 5.1, and tailors them exclusively to the flight kitchen and aircraft provisioning environment. The WHO's companion manual, the Guide to Hygiene and Sanitation in Aviation, further establishes quality specifications for water, cleaning, and disinfection of facilities applicable to international air transport.

Traceability and cold-chain requirements

The WFSG mandates a robust Traceability System (Section 8.3) requiring organisations to track raw materials from the point of receipt through transformation and final aircraft loading. Caterers must utilise a First Expiry First Out (FEFO) system. At the point of receipt, materials must be verified against expiration dates and packaging integrity. Portion identification systems must indicate preparation dates, due dates, and the identification of the portions to manage shelf-life limits.

Cold-chain monitoring is institutionalised through specific Operational Prerequisite Programs (OPRP) and Prerequisite Programs (PRP). OPRP 2 governs Cold Chain Interruption during Food Production. Time/temperature-controlled-for-safety (TCS) foods must undergo strict final chilling in holding refrigerators prior to ramp transport, ensuring core temperatures are stabilised before exposure to ambient tarmac conditions. Critical tracking occurs at specific nodes: CCP 1 for cooking and CCP 2 for chilling.

WFSG Control	Specification	Operational Implication
PRP 18 — Reheating	Push product through 5–63 °C danger zone	Continuous probe / data-logger evidence

WFSG Control	Specification	Operational Implication
	rapidly; achieve 75 °C core within 1 hour of removal from refrigeration	required at every reheating event
CCP 2 — Chilling	Strict final chilling in holding refrigerators prior to ramp transport	Pre-departure thermal stabilisation must be verifiable per cart, per flight
PRP 21 — Aircraft Delays	Communication procedures between airline and caterer to track time-temperature obligations during idle aircraft holds	Airline–caterer integration on real-time delay events is now a compliance, not a logistics, problem
Section 8.3 — Traceability	Track raw materials from receipt through transformation and aircraft loading; FEFO mandatory	Lot-level identifiers must persist through every transformation event in the kitchen

Figure *Selected WFSG controls of operational consequence to flight catering.*

The return-catering challenge

The Airline Catering Association has expanded its focus on return catering — also known as back-catering — where an aircraft carries meals for both the outbound and return sectors. Historically, return catering relied on robust, shelf-stable products such as hard cheeses or smoked meats. Today, the ACA partners with analytical firms such as Mérieux NutriSciences to apply predictive microbiology models, simulating variable storage conditions to evaluate the precise time-temperature intersections that lead to unacceptable pathogen proliferation aboard aircraft. This scientific modelling now directly informs the compliance strategies caterers use to satisfy the national regulations detailed in the sections that follow.

While the WFSG explicitly requires "Documented Information" detailing supplier approvals, environmental monitoring trends (such as swabbing for Listeria spp. or Listeria monocytogenes), and temperature storage conditions, it defers to local sovereign legislation for exact temporal retention minimums. Those sovereign rules are what we examine next.

SECTION 2

NORTH AMERICA

The North American regulatory environment is characterised by sophisticated, technologically demanding federal oversight. The focus has shifted from facility sanitation toward the granular, digital traceability of the food supply chain itself, creating significant operational mandates for aviation caterers.

United States

The United States operates a bifurcated approach to aviation catering. One set of legacy regulations governs the physical sanitation and operation of aircraft and catering facilities, enforced via the FDA's Interstate Travel Program. A newly implemented framework — FSMA Section 204 — governs the digital traceability of the food ingredients themselves. Operators must comply with both.

21 CFR 1250 / 1240 — Interstate conveyance sanitation

GOVERNING BODY	United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Interstate Travel Program (ITP).
REGULATION	21 CFR Part 1250 (Interstate Conveyance Sanitation) and 21 CFR Part 1240 (Control of Communicable Diseases).
APPLICABILITY	Provides primary, direct enforcement authority over airline caterers, flight kitchens, commissaries, and aircraft servicing areas within the United States.

These traditional regulations mandate the hygienic construction of airline commissary facilities, the safe handling of food and potable water, and the sanitation of galley components utilised onboard aircraft. The FDA conducts inspections of passenger-carrying conveyances during their construction and operation, as well as the support facilities for those conveyances — which includes caterers and commissaries.

Under 21 CFR 1250.25, conveyance operators must, on request, immediately identify the vendors, distributors, and sources of their food supply. Flight kitchens functioning as commissaries or caterers must adhere strictly to 21 CFR Part 117 (Current Good Manufacturing Practice, Hazard Analysis, and Risk-Based Preventive Controls for Human Food), which requires comprehensive temperature monitoring of TCS foods during preparation and storage.

FSMA Section 204 — The 24-hour traceability rule

> *FSMA 204 is the single most consequential regulatory shift of the decade for aviation catering. It rewires the data infrastructure of every flight kitchen serving the United States.*
>
> — Compliance & Regulatory Affairs

GOVERNING BODY	United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA).
REGULATION	FDA Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) Section 204(d) — Food Traceability Final Rule.
APPLICABILITY	Any entity manufacturing, processing, packing, or holding foods on the Food Traceability List (FTL) — directly impacting flight kitchens provisioning domestic and international flights.

FSMA Rule 204 fundamentally shifts traceability from a reactive to a highly proactive model. It applies to any entity that handles foods included on the Food Traceability List (FTL), which includes common aviation catering ingredients such as fresh leafy greens, cheeses, shell eggs, finfish, crustaceans, and ready-to-eat deli salads. Airline caterers producing meals for US consumption — including foreign firms provisioning flights inbound to the US — are subject to these requirements.

Flight kitchens must maintain records containing Key Data Elements (KDEs) associated with Critical Tracking Events (CTEs). For a flight kitchen, the primary CTEs include Receiving (inbound FTL ingredients), Transformation (assembling an airline meal, which creates a new finished-product identity), and Shipping (transporting the carts to the aircraft). KDEs are specific pieces of information associated with these events: product descriptions, quantities, units of measure, location descriptions, and dates. Entities must assign and maintain a Traceability Lot Code (TLC) for FTL foods and link all KDEs to that lot code across the entire farm-to-table continuum.

CTE (Critical Tracking Event)	What it captures in a flight kitchen	Required KDEs
Receiving	Inbound FTL ingredients arriving at the commissary	TLC, product description, quantity, UoM, supplier, date received, location
Transformation	Assembly of an airline meal — creates a new finished-product identity	Input TLCs, output TLC, transformation date, location, reference document
Shipping	Transporting carts from commissary to aircraft	TLC, quantity, ship-to location (airline, flight, aircraft tail), ship date

Figure *FSMA 204 Critical Tracking Events as they apply to a flight catering operation.*

> *Flight caterers must be capable of providing sortable, electronic traceability records to the FDA within exactly 24 hours of an official request.*
>
> — FSMA 204 Final Rule

The most demanding constraint of FSMA Rule 204 for the aviation catering industry is the recall response time. Flight caterers must be capable of providing sortable, electronic traceability records to the FDA within exactly 24 hours of an official request — or within a reasonable time agreed upon — to facilitate the rapid removal of contaminated food from the market. The industry is currently in a transitional phase: the FDA has extended the compliance and enforcement dates toward 20 January 2026 and 20 July 2028, requiring catering IT systems to undergo significant technological upgrades to support electronic, event-based tracking.

Canada

The Canadian regulatory landscape shares philosophical similarities with the United States but organises its compliance structures around federal border and interprovincial transport controls.

GOVERNING BODY	Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA).
REGULATION	Safe Food for Canadians Regulations (SFCR) — Part 5 (Traceability).
APPLICABILITY	Food businesses that manufacture, process, store, or package food sent across provincial / territorial boundaries or exported — capturing flight kitchens provisioning domestic and international flights.

The SFCR applies comprehensively to food businesses that track the movement of their food in the supply chain. The overarching rationale is to significantly reduce the time required to isolate unsafe food from the market and minimise the scope of recalls. Under the SFCR, flight kitchens are subject to rigorous one-step-forward, one-step-back traceability paradigms. Establishments must maintain documents that track the movement of food forward to the immediate customer — which in the context of aviation catering is the specific airline and flight manifest — and back to the immediate raw material supplier, including the dates on which the food was provided.

Documentation standards are strictly enforced. Under Subsection 90(1) for businesses other than retail, traceability documents must explicitly identify the common name of the food, the lot code or another unique identifier, and the name and principal place of business of the person by whom the food was manufactured or prepared. Furthermore, Part 5 of the SFCR mandates specific labelling requirements — including lot-code labelling and explicit date marking for perishable products. Such labelling is vital during ramp transport and aircraft loading, allowing both caterers and CFIA inspectors to physically audit the cold chain and traceability profile of galley carts before they are stowed aboard the aircraft. The CFIA provides an interactive tool to assist businesses in determining their specific compliance paths, ensuring that flight kitchens align with international standards.

SECTION 3

EUROPEAN UNION

The European Union operates on a foundation of absolute accountability, in which the primary responsibility for food safety rests squarely on the Food Business Operator (FBO). The EU's approach to aviation catering is deeply integrated with its general food laws, prioritising continuous HACCP implementation from the point of primary production to the passenger tray table.

GOVERNING BODY	European Commission / European Food Safety Authority (EFSA).
REGULATION	Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 (General Food Law) and Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 (Hygiene of Foodstuffs).
APPLICABILITY	Classifies flight caterers as Food Business Operators (FBOs) requiring full HACCP implementation and strict control of transport conveyances.

Continuous HACCP from farm to tray table

Regulation (EC) 852/2004 applies to all stages of production, processing, and distribution of food intended for human consumption. Flight caterers must implement procedures based entirely on HACCP principles. Crucially for aviation, the regulation extends beyond the commissary walls: conveyances and containers used for transporting foodstuffs — catering high-loaders, galley carts, and aircraft holding compartments — must be kept clean, maintained in good repair, and designed to protect foodstuffs from contamination.

Article 18 — The bedrock of EU traceability

Article 18 of Regulation (EC) 178/2002 establishes the legal bedrock for EU traceability. FBOs must have systems in place to identify any person or business from whom they have been supplied food, and the businesses to which their products have been supplied. A critical nuance of EU law is the presumption of contamination: the regulation inherently considers an entire batch, lot, or consignment of food unsafe if one component is compromised, unless the caterer can provide a detailed scientific assessment proving that the rest of the batch is safe. This mandates that flight kitchens maintain highly granular batch separation to avoid catastrophic, system-wide recalls.

> *An entire batch, lot, or consignment is presumed unsafe if one component is compromised — unless the caterer can scientifically prove otherwise.*
>
> — Regulation (EC) 178/2002, Article 14

Cold chain and transport

Temperature monitoring and cold-chain preservation are explicitly detailed in Annex II, Chapter IX of Regulation 852/2004. Raw materials, ingredients, intermediate products, and finished products likely to support pathogenic reproduction or toxin formation must not be kept at temperatures that might result in a risk to health. Flight caterers must maintain the cold chain during transport, and conveyances must be capable of maintaining suitable temperature conditions and allowing those temperatures to be continuously monitored.

Withdrawals, recalls, and retention

In the event of a food-safety incident, the EU distinguishes between withdrawals (removing food before it reaches the consumer) and recalls (removing food already in the consumer's possession). Food manufacturers and distributors must immediately notify the appropriate competent authority when they have placed a product on the market that may be injurious to human health, detailing the consumer-risk-prevention steps taken.

Regarding record retention, the EU provides a degree of flexibility compared to rigid statutory limits. The retention period should be "appropriate for the nature and product life span of the food." The established industry best practice under these rules — frequently used by major European catering conglomerates — is to retain traceability records for pre-packed foods for the shelf life of the food plus an additional 12 months.

SECTION 4

UNITED KINGDOM

Following its exit from the European Union, the United Kingdom retained much of the EU's foundational food-safety law, transposing it into domestic legislation overseen by national agencies. The UK regime places a heavy, practical emphasis on the operational readiness of flight caterers to execute rapid product withdrawals — and on the physical inspection of aircraft capabilities.

GOVERNING BODY	Food Standards Agency (FSA) / Food Standards Scotland (FSS).
REGULATION	Retained Regulation (EC) No. 178/2002 and the UK Food Law Practice Guidance.
APPLICABILITY	Directs local authorities to conduct official controls on airlines and caterers, assessing high-risk food handling, potable water, and crew training.

How regulators inspect

The UK's Food Law Practice Guidance provides specific instructions to Competent Authorities for conducting official controls on aircraft and airlines. Authorities are directed to obtain specific operational intelligence, including the named contact for food safety within the airline, aircraft registration numbers, the flight caterers utilised, specifications for the supply of high-risk foods, details on potable water supplies (including the use of bowsers and tank disinfection frequencies), and food-temperature-control monitoring systems used by cabin crew on board. Inspectors will assess crew knowledge regarding cross-contamination, pest awareness, and personal hygiene.

Production logs and batch linkage

Traceability requirements mirror the retained EU law, requiring systems to identify suppliers and business customers (one step back, one step forward). Caterers assembling airline meals must maintain exhaustive production logs. This includes the recording of batch codes of all ingredients used, production start and end times, saleable product sizes, and linking the final product batch code to all raw materials used in its production.

Recall communication and on-demand records

The UK emphasises rapid notification during food incidents. When an aviation caterer initiates a recall due to safety issues, they must communicate this "as soon as possible" to be effective. The caterer must immediately notify their enforcement authorities, the FSA / FSS, their suppliers, and affected business customers (the airlines). If unsafe food has potentially reached consumers — passengers mid-flight or post-flight — the FSA Incidents Team must be notified to potentially issue a public recall notice.

Similar to the EU, the FSA mandates that traceability records be made available "on demand" to enforcement authorities. As a minimum best practice, UK caterers must keep traceability records for pre-packed foods for the shelf life of the food plus 12 months. For foods served as meals — which constitutes the vast majority of airline tray service — traceability requirements are established on a case-by-case basis in direct consultation with local enforcement authorities.

SECTION 5

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

The UAE represents one of the most critical and high-volume aviation nodes on the planet, serving as the connective tissue between East and West. Operating in a desert environment where ambient summer temperatures routinely exceed 45 °C (113 °F) on the tarmac, the regulatory focus on cold-chain integrity during ramp transport is unparalleled. Minor delays in loading catering carts onto aircraft can result in catastrophic thermal abuse of the product.

> *Tarmac temperatures above 45 °C convert routine ramp delays into compliance events. The UAE's regulators have written this physical reality into law.*
>
> — Regional Regulatory Note

Dubai

GOVERNING BODY	Dubai Municipality — Food Safety Department.
REGULATION	Dubai Food Code 2.0 (Version 12, July 2023).
APPLICABILITY	All catering services and specialised cold-chain delivery logistics — demanding digitised FSMS and extreme transport temperature controls.

The Dubai Food Code 2.0 establishes comprehensive requirements for food establishments, explicitly including catering operations that supply airlines, cruise ships, and desert camps. Due to the extreme climate, specialised HACCP-compliant cold-chain transport is heavily enforced. Food must be transported in temperature-controlled vehicles that are routinely inspected and approved by Dubai Municipality. Whether delivering hot entrées or chilled desserts, items must be stored and delivered within safe time-and-temperature parameters to ensure the cold chain is never broken.

Caterers must monitor food temperatures rigorously during receiving, storage, cooking, cooling, and hot-holding. Specific monitoring is required for heat-treated non-ready-to-eat products, and strict controls govern sous-vide processing and slow heat treatments. Where temperature cannot be maintained, caterers must utilise "Time as a Safety Control," requiring strict monitoring of the exact duration food is out of temperature control during aircraft loading.

Digital traceability is a cornerstone of the Dubai framework. All food items imported, sold, or delivered in Dubai must be registered with the Food Safety Department. Establishments must possess documented systems to identify any supplier, and manufacturers must trace product lots — including all raw materials, packaging, and processing aids — through all stages of processing. Where mandated by the authority, catering establishments are required to utilise technologies to digitalise their Food Safety Management Systems

(FSMS) and use the captured data for predictive trend analysis. Establishments must also maintain documented emergency-preparedness procedures for scenarios such as supply-chain disruptions or power failures, alongside a robust customer-complaint handling system for investigating alleged foodborne illnesses.

Abu Dhabi

GOVERNING BODY	Abu Dhabi Agriculture and Food Safety Authority (ADAFSA).
REGULATION	ADAFSA Occupational Terms and Food Safety Legislation.
APPLICABILITY	Mandates structured HACCP principles and enforces highly specific, multi-year record retention schedules for flight kitchens and food transporters.

ADAFSA provides comprehensive oversight of the food chain, including airline catering operations originating from Abu Dhabi's international hubs. The authority mandates strict adherence to structured HACCP principles and demands accountability across all levels of an organisation. Abu Dhabi is notable for implementing exceptionally precise, multi-year data retention minimums that exceed many global baselines.

Record Type	Minimum Retention	Operational Note
Temperature monitoring records	2 years	Continuous logger output is the practical only viable evidence base
Training and certification records	Duration of employment + 2 years	HR and food-safety systems must integrate
Incident and corrective-action reports	5 years	Longest retention obligation in this paper — a clear de facto regional benchmark
Supplier and customer documentation	Duration of relationship + 3 years	Procurement and CRM systems carry compliance load
Calibration and equipment maintenance	Life of equipment + 2 years	Asset registers must persist beyond decommissioning
Transport documentation	As specified per shipment	Required to verify cold chain remained unbroken from kitchen to aircraft

Figure *ADAFSA-mandated retention minimums for aviation catering operations in Abu Dhabi.*

SECTION 6

AUSTRALIA

Australia operates under a highly unified, evidence-based food-safety framework. Recognising the inherent risks in large-scale food-service operations, the regulatory environment was significantly tightened with the introduction of new mandatory food-safety management tools aimed specifically at high-risk sectors.

GOVERNING BODY	Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) / state authorities.
REGULATION	Food Safety Standard 3.2.2A — Food Safety Management Tools (enforceable December 2023).
APPLICABILITY	Classifies airline caterers as "Category One" (higher-risk) businesses, mandating substantiation of critical food-safety controls via verifiable daily evidence.

The substantiation principle

Standard 3.2.2A applies directly to Australian businesses in the food-service and catering sectors that handle unpackaged, potentially hazardous food that is ready-to-eat. Airline caterers operate as Category One businesses under this standard, meaning they must implement the most rigorous tier of compliance tools. In addition to federal and state regulations, dominant domestic carriers such as the Qantas Group impose supplementary Work Health and Safety (WHS) and Food Safety Standards on their suppliers, extending compliance requirements into contractual obligations regarding equipment sanitisation and personnel safety on Qantas premises.

The core of Standard 3.2.2A for aviation caterers is the substantiation of critical food-safety controls — also known as the Evidence Tool. Caterers cannot simply state they are following rules; they must generate daily documentary evidence proving they have managed specific prescribed activities. Prescribed activities involve the safe receiving, storing, processing, displaying, and transporting of potentially hazardous food.

> *Caterers cannot simply state they are following the rules. They must generate daily documentary evidence — data-logger graphs, time-stamped photos, continuous temperature logs.*
>
> — Standard 3.2.2A — Evidence Tool

Evidence in practice

Businesses must generate validated evidence — such as data-logger graphs, verified notes on invoices, time-stamped photos, or continuous temperature logs — demonstrating that potentially hazardous foods are

received at temperatures at or below 5 °C, or at or above 60 °C. Monitoring must comprehensively cover storage, display, and transport to the aircraft.

Under Standard 3.2.2A, records validating these critical controls must be kept for a minimum of 3 months. This federal standard operates alongside pre-existing state legislation; caterers must adhere to whichever retention period is longer, ensuring continuous auditing capability. Category One catering businesses are also required to appoint at least one certified Food Safety Supervisor who must be available to oversee food handlers, and whose certification must be renewed every five years.

SECTION 7

ASIA-PACIFIC HUBS

The Asian regulatory landscape features highly advanced, technologically integrated food-safety frameworks designed to protect dense urban populations and facilitate the immense volumes of international transit flowing through Singapore, Tokyo, and Hong Kong.

Singapore

Singapore imports more than 90 percent of its food, creating unique vulnerabilities. To protect food security and public health, the island nation relies on hyper-efficient logistics and unforgiving regulatory standards.

GOVERNING BODY	Singapore Food Agency (SFA).
REGULATION	Food Safety and Security Act 2025.
APPLICABILITY	Updates the regime for licensed food businesses. Airline caterers fall under Category 1 under the SAFE framework, subject to strict accountability and rapid recall capabilities.

The Food Safety and Security Act 2025 consolidates and modernises previous legislation, introducing mandatory Food Control Plans. These plans grant operators flexibility in design but demand strict accountability to meet specific food-safety outcomes. Airline caterers and central kitchens fall under Category 1 Food Establishments — high risk, significant processing — under the Safety Assurance for Food Establishments (SAFE) framework, subjecting them to the highest tiers of scrutiny.

The SFA dictates precise temperature limits to prevent the rapid growth of bacteria during transport. Chilled food must be maintained at 4 °C or below, with a core temperature not exceeding 7 °C. Frozen products must be maintained at -18 °C or below, with a core temperature not exceeding -12 °C. Vehicles must use temperature gauges and automated data loggers to continuously monitor the cold chain.

> *In cases of recalls initiated due to safety concerns, the SFA must be informed as soon as possible — or within 24 hours — after the decision to recall is made.*
>
> — Food Safety and Security Act 2025, Singapore

A critical feature of the 2025 Act is the accelerated timeline for recall responses. When a food-industry operator initiates a recall due to safety concerns, the SFA must be informed as soon as possible — or within 24 hours — after the decision to recall is made. To facilitate this, the SFA provides a streamlined digital food-business portal enabling seamless information exchange during recall processes. During a recall, the SFA issues directions to businesses to remove affected products from all points of distribution and conducts physical checks to verify compliance. To support this rapid-response capability, SFA regulations stipulate that product

traceability records — including supplier details, storage conditions, batch numbers, and transport logs — must be maintained for at least 12 months.

Japan

Japan's food-safety culture is historically robust, but its regulatory framework recently underwent a substantial modernisation effort to align with global standards. This evolution marked a definitive shift from end-product testing to comprehensive, preventative process management.

GOVERNING BODY	Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW).
REGULATION	Food Sanitation Act (Amended 2020 / 2021).
APPLICABILITY	Institutionalises mandatory HACCP hygiene management for all food operators including large-scale flight caterers, and introduces a Positive List for packaging materials.

The amended Food Sanitation Act, in full effect since June 2021, mandates that all food-business operators in Japan conduct hygiene control compliant with HACCP. Operators must analyse risk factors — such as contamination with food-poisoning microorganisms — and manage key processes at every stage, from procurement of raw ingredients to product shipment. The Act also introduced the Positive List system for food utensils, containers, and packaging. This is highly relevant for aviation catering, which relies heavily on synthetic resins for airline meal trays, rotable equipment, and heat-resistant containers. Operators must adhere to Good Manufacturing Practice and save manufacturing records to confirm conformance to the Positive List based on temperature classifications (for example, resins capable of withstanding temperatures above 100 °C).

Traceability is supported by the mandatory recording of the entire process. Operators must log raw-material acceptance, confirmation of mixing ratios, temperature controls during heat treatment (Critical Control Points), cooling-water quality, and shipment tracking. Information regarding consumer health hazards related to processed products must be promptly reported to health centres to trigger the product-recall mechanism.

Unlike jurisdictions that prescribe a blanket number of years for record retention, the Japanese framework under the Ordinance for Enforcement of the Food Sanitation Act is more dynamic. The retention period "shall be reasonably set based on the period until the food or additives handled are used or consumed," aligning the retention burden with the practical shelf life of the product. The MHLW strongly encourages the integration of advanced technology — describing the use of IoT as indispensable for comprehensively managing food safety in distribution. Data such as temperature and humidity changes in storage, worker tracking, and food movement should be linked to cloud systems, allowing facility managers to determine exactly when, where, and how an abnormality occurred.

Hong Kong

Hong Kong acts as a vital conduit between mainland Asia and the rest of the world. Its dense urban environment and heavy reliance on imported food necessitate a highly systematic approach to tracking food movements at the border and wholesale levels.

GOVERNING BODY	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) / Centre for Food Safety (CFS).
REGULATION	Food Safety Ordinance (Cap. 612).
APPLICABILITY	Captures flight caterers importing raw ingredients or supplying meals wholesale under strict registration and tracking requirements.

The Food Safety Ordinance establishes a mandatory registration scheme for all food importers and distributors. Any flight caterer importing raw ingredients from overseas, or supplying finished meals wholesale to airlines, falls under these tracking requirements. The Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene possesses the statutory power to make food-safety orders prohibiting the import and supply of problem food and ordering its immediate recall. Caterers are heavily encouraged to develop their food-safety plans on the HACCP system to ensure rapid compliance with these orders.

A distinctive operational feature of Hong Kong law is the tight timeframe for documentation execution. Persons acquiring or supplying food wholesale must record the transaction details — including the date, the name and contact details of the supplier, the total quantity, and a description of the food — within 72 hours after the supply took place.

Food Category	Minimum Retention	Operational Implication
Shelf life of 3 months or less	3 months after acquisition or supply	Most ready-to-eat catering ingredients fall here — short, but must be reliable
Live aquatic products	3 months after acquisition	Specific provisioning category for premium-cabin seafood service
Shelf life greater than 3 months	24 months after acquisition or supply	Ambient and frozen stores carry extended audit-trail obligations

Figure *Hong Kong CFS retention schedule, tiered by perishability of the food in question.*

SYNTHESIS

THREE MACRO SHIFTS RESHAPING THE INDUSTRY

The global survey reveals a definitive, irreversible shift toward data-centric, preventative food-safety models. Historical reliance on random facility sampling and end-product testing is increasingly viewed as obsolete. Today, regulators demand deep, uninterrupted supply-chain visibility, mandating that flight caterers maintain digital, lot-level traceability that can be audited instantly. Three themes dominate the contemporary regulatory landscape.

Shift 1 — The convergence of HACCP and digital traceability

Across every priority region — from Japan's amended Food Sanitation Act emphasising IoT integration to the FDA's FSMA Rule 204 — governments are demanding that operational Critical Control Points be inextricably linked to Key Data Elements. A manual temperature log written on a clipboard is no longer sufficient in isolation; it must be digitally tethered to a Traceability Lot Code that travels with the food from the agricultural source, through the commissary transformation process, and onto the aircraft galley.

Shift 2 — The compression of recall timelines

The acceptable response time for identifying and containing a pathogenic threat is shrinking rapidly. Jurisdictions are no longer tolerant of delayed investigations. Singapore's Food Safety and Security Act 2025 and the FDA's FSMA 204 explicitly mandate a 24-hour turnaround for delivering actionable traceability data to authorities. This temporal compression requires flight kitchens to abandon legacy paper-based logs in favour of integrated, cloud-based ERP and automated continuous temperature monitoring systems.

Shift 3 — The amplification of cold-chain vulnerabilities

Aviation catering introduces extreme environmental variables, particularly during the ramp transport phase where carts are exposed to the elements. Jurisdictions operating in extreme climates, such as the UAE, have responded with ultra-strict transport mandates and extended record retention requirements — including Abu Dhabi's 2-year temperature-log mandate. The complex logistics of return catering are forcing the industry to use predictive microbiology to mathematically prove to regulators that foods will remain safe during extended, highly variable storage conditions aboard the aircraft.

> *For the international caterer, compliance is no longer a localised operational task focused on kitchen hygiene. It is a complex, global data-management challenge.*
>
> — Closing argument, this paper

For the international aviation caterer, meeting the strictest denominators of international law requires a technological architecture capable of seamlessly tracking ingredients, monitoring thermal limits in real time, and executing surgical product recalls across the globe within a 24-hour window.

CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL VIEW

MASTER COMPARISON MATRIX

The matrix on this page distils every jurisdiction in this paper into a single comparable view. It is intended as the most useful single page for compliance leaders building a multi-region operating model: it surfaces the strictest denominator on each compliance dimension at a glance.

Jurisdiction	Primary Regulation	Recall / Notification Window	Min. Record Retention	Digital Traceability
United States	FSMA Section 204(d) — Food Traceability Final Rule	24 hours (electronic, sortable records)	2 years (per Final Rule)	Mandatory KDE/CTE-based — Jan 2026 / Jul 2028
Canada	Safe Food for Canadians Regulations, Part 5	Records on demand	Per perishability; lot codes mandatory	Lot-code labelling required for transport
European Union	Reg. (EC) 178/2002 & 852/2004	Immediate competent-authority notification	Shelf life + 12 months (industry practice)	FBO must be able to identify suppliers and customers
United Kingdom	Retained 178/2002; FSA Practice Guidance	"As soon as possible"; records on demand	Shelf life + 12 months for pre-packed	Production-log batch linkage required
Dubai (UAE)	Dubai Food Code 2.0 (v12, 2023)	Immediate; product registration mandatory	Per category; FSMS digitisation required	Digitised FSMS where mandated by authority
Abu Dhabi (UAE)	ADAFSA Occupational Terms & Food Safety	Immediate; transport docs verify cold chain	Up to 5 years (incident records)	Continuous logger evidence is operational reality
Australia	Standard 3.2.2A — Food Safety Mgmt Tools	Records on demand; daily evidence	3 months federal; longer state rules apply	Evidence Tool requires substantiation per activity
Singapore	Food Safety and Security Act 2025	24 hours (after recall decision)	12 months minimum	Digital food-business portal; mandatory loggers in transport
Japan	Food Sanitation Act (amended 2020/21)	Prompt notification to health centres	Aligned to product shelf life	MHLW formally encourages IoT-based cloud integration
Hong Kong	Food Safety Ordinance (Cap. 612)	Statutory food-safety orders by Director	3 months / 24 months tiered by shelf life	Wholesale records within 72 hours of supply

Figure *Master Comparison Matrix: ten regulatory regimes governing aviation catering, mapped on five operational dimensions. The strictest denominator on each axis defines the compliance ceiling for multinational operators.*

INDUSTRY RESPONSE

BUILDING A COMPLIANT ARCHITECTURE

If compliance is now a global data-management problem, what does a compliant operating architecture actually look like in 2026? Across our work with airline caterers and flight kitchens, we observe a consistent pattern. Operators that comfortably meet the strictest denominator share five architectural traits.

1. A single source of truth for the meal lifecycle

Compliant operators consolidate menu, recipe, production, equipment, and shipping data into one operational platform. Fragmented spreadsheets, separate kitchen and procurement systems, and offline production logs make it structurally impossible to assemble a sortable, electronic recall response inside 24 hours. The first investment is consolidation.

2. Lot codes that survive every transformation

Inputs are received with supplier lot codes; transformations (assembly of an airline meal) emit a new finished-product lot code that maintains a bidirectional link to every input lot. This is the digital expression of FSMA 204's CTE chain — and it is also what the EU's Article 18 actually requires in practice. Without it, batch separation is theoretical.

3. Continuous, automated cold-chain telemetry

Manual probe-and-record cycles cannot satisfy Australia's Standard 3.2.2A, Singapore's transport rules, or Dubai's Food Code. Continuous data loggers — at receiving, storage, transformation, holding, ramp transport, and on-board if required — write directly into the same record store as the lot codes. Excursions raise alerts; alerts trigger documented corrective action; corrective action is itself a record.

4. Recall response as an engineered workflow

A 24-hour recall window is not a goal; it is a service-level objective. It needs to be tested. Compliant operators run mock-recall drills against their own data, measuring time-to-first-record, time-to-impact-list, and time-to-customer-notification. Singapore's digital food-business portal and the FDA's electronic-records expectation make the format of the response as important as the speed.

5. Retention by jurisdiction, audit by demand

Retention obligations vary fivefold across the regimes mapped in this paper. Architectures that hard-code a single retention period — even a generous one — risk over- or under-retaining in specific jurisdictions. Storage classes and per-record retention metadata, anchored to the originating jurisdiction, are the practical answer.

> *The 24-hour recall window is not a goal. It is a service-level objective that needs to be drilled, measured, and proven against the operator's own data.*
>
> — Industry Response Section

WHERE IFCS FITS

Why we wrote this paper

IFCS — In-Flight Catering Software — has spent more than two decades building the operational systems that flight kitchens and airlines use to plan, produce, and prove the safety of in-flight meal service. We wrote this paper because the conversations we have with VPs of Catering and Heads of Quality have changed materially over the past two years. The question is no longer "are we doing the right thing in our kitchens?" The question is "can we prove it electronically, in 24 hours, in every jurisdiction we serve?"

Our flagship platform, Galley Xai, was built around the architectural principles set out above: a single source of truth for the meal lifecycle, lot codes that survive every transformation, continuous cold-chain telemetry, recall response as an engineered workflow, and per-jurisdiction retention as a first-class concept rather than an afterthought. It is the practical answer to the regulatory landscape this paper has just mapped.

GALLEY Xai

The operational platform for compliant flight catering

If anything in this paper has prompted a question about your own readiness — for FSMA 204, for Standard 3.2.2A, for the Dubai Food Code, or for a regulator you have not yet been audited by — we would value the conversation. Our team works directly with airline caterers and flight kitchens on compliance roadmaps and platform implementations, and we are happy to share what we are seeing across the industry on a confidential, non-commercial basis.

READY TO MAP YOUR OWN COMPLIANCE EXPOSURE?

We work with airline caterers and flight kitchens on compliance roadmaps, platform implementations, and 24-hour recall readiness drills.

Contact: contact@ifcs.aero • Web: ifcs.aero

SOURCES

REFERENCES

Citations are listed in order of first appearance in the paper. Where the regulator has published official guidance in multiple formats, we have privileged the most recent official version available as of May 2026. URLs were verified at the time of publication.

1. IFSA, World Food Safety Guidelines for Airline Catering, 5th Edition (2022) https://ifsa.aero/files/2022/10/IFSA-World-Food-Safety-Guidelines-2022-Final.pdf
2. IFSA World Food Safety Guidelines 2022 — Document Repository https://www.scribd.com/document/756501009/IFSA-World-Food-Safety-Guidelines-2022-Final-V5
3. World Food Safety Guidelines for Airline Catering — Reference Edition https://www.motleyrice.com/sites/default/files/documents/Aviation/aviation-food-safety.pdf
4. Airline Catering Association (ACA), Return Catering Guidance https://www.aca.catering/layout/uploads/2022/03/Back-Catering-Guidance-Document.pdf
5. 21 CFR Part 1250 Subpart B — Food Service Sanitation on Land and Air Conveyances, eCFR https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-L/part-1250/subpart-B
6. FDA, Interstate Carriers and Support Facilities Guidelines https://www.fda.gov/interstate-carriers-and-support-facilities-guidelines
7. FDA, Interstate Travel Program Overview https://www.fda.gov/food/inspections-protect-food-supply/interstate-travel-program
8. NASA, FDA's Interstate Travel Program: Regulation of Airplanes, Vessels, Trains, and Buses https://www.nasa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/fdas-interstate-travel-program-regulation-of-airplanes-vessels-trains-and-buses.pdf
9. FDA, FSMA Final Rule on Requirements for Additional Traceability Records for Certain Foods https://www.fda.gov/food/food-safety-modernization-act-fsma/fsma-final-rule-requirements-additional-traceability-records-certain-foods
10. NC State Extension, FDA FSMA 204 Food Traceability Rule https://foodbusiness.ces.ncsu.edu/news/fda-fsma-204-food-traceability-rule/
11. DNV, FDA FSMA 204 — What it Means for You https://www.dnv.us/life-sciences/fsma/FSMA_24Q2_about/
12. TrueCommerce, FSMA 204 KDEs & CTEs Explained https://www.truecommerce.com/blog/fsma-204-kdes-ctes-guide/
13. FDA, Food Traceability Rule — Critical Tracking Events and Key Data Elements https://www.fda.gov/files/food/published/FSMA%20Rule%20for%20Food%20Traceability%20-%202024-0520-CTEs-KDEs.pdf
14. GS1 US, Fresh Foods Management Solution — CTEs and KDEs
15. Registrar Corp, FSMA Rule 204 — Strengthening Food Traceability for Safer Supply Chains https://www.registrarcorp.com/blog/food-beverage/fsma/food-traceability/
16. Caddy, CFIA Food Traceability — Ensuring Safety and Compliance in Canada https://www.joincaddy.com/blog/cfia-food-traceability-compliance
17. Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Traceability for Food https://inspection.canada.ca/en/food-safety-industry/traceability
18. Canada.ca, New Traceability Requirements under the Safe Food for Canadians Regulations https://inspection.canada.ca/en/inspect-and-protect/food-safety/new-traceability-requirements
19. CFIA, Fact Sheet — Traceability https://inspection.canada.ca/en/food-safety-industry/toolkit-food-businesses/traceability
20. Canada.ca, Regulatory Requirements — Traceability for Food https://inspection.canada.ca/en/food-safety-industry/traceability/traceability
21. European Commission, Food Safety — Legislation https://food.ec.europa.eu/food-safety/biological-safety/food-hygiene/legislation_en
22. CeIRSA, Guidance Document — Implementation of Provisions of Regulation (EC) 852/2004 https://www.ceirsa.org/fd.php?path=linee_guida_852_04.pdf
23. Legislation.gov.uk, Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 on the Hygiene of Foodstuffs https://www.legislation.gov.uk/eur/2004/852
24. PMC, Responsibilities of a Commercial Intermediation Company under EU Food Law https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12606525/
25. Food Standards Scotland, Guidance on Food Traceability, Withdrawals and Recalls https://www.foodstandards.gov.scot/sites/default/files/migration/downloads/Guidance_on_Food_Recalls_ACCESSIBLE-MASTER-LN.pdf
26. EconStor, Food Safety and ICT Traceability Systems — Lessons from Japan https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/53743/1/604642695.pdf
27. Sidley Austin LLP, Best Recall Practices Guidelines — Food Products https://www.sidley.com/en/insights/publications/2021/04/best-recall-practices-guidelines-part-2-food-products
28. Food Standards Scotland, Guidance on Temperature Control Legislation in the UK https://www.foodstandards.gov.scot/sites/default/files/migration/downloads/Guidance_on_temperature_control_legislation.pdf

29. UK Food Standards Agency, Draft Food Law Practice Guidance (Northern Ireland) https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/Draft%20Food%20Law%20Practice%20Guidance%20%28Northern%20Ireland%29.pdf

30. FreshLawBlog, Food Labelling Issues and Trends in Europe https://www.freshlawblog.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2018/08/ABA-Food-Labelling-and-REcall-Article.pdf

31. UK Food Standards Agency, Guidance on Food Traceability, Withdrawals and Recalls (Draft) https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/draft-guidance-on-food-traceability-withdrawals-and-recalls-consultation.pdf

32. UK Food Standards Agency, Guidance on Food Traceability, Withdrawals and Recalls (Final) https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/food-traceability-withdrawals-and-recalls-guidance.pdf

33. UK FSA, Food Incidents, Product Withdrawals and Recalls https://www.food.gov.uk/business-guidance/food-incidents-product-withdrawals-and-recalls

34. Dubai Municipality, Food Code 2.0 (Version 12, July 2023) https://assets-eu-01.kc-usercontent.com/75502796-0ea4-01e1-d006-9e077eede920/9ba7459e-99b3-400e-a6a5-99e38a2dd60a/FOOD%20CODE%202.0%20Version%2012%20July%202023.pdf

35. Catering Service Dubai, Food Hygiene for Catering in Dubai — Standards https://cateringservicedubai.com/blog/food-hygiene-for-catering-in-dubai-standards-we-follow-at-every-event/

36. InLex Partners, Dubai Cold Storage Delivery — Temperature Control & Operations Guide https://inlex-partners.com/blog/cold-chain-delivery-for-fb/

37. IFSA, Airline Catering Food Safety Guidelines (HACCP) https://www.scribd.com/document/542232540/IFSA-Food-Safety-Aviation

38. QCC Abu Dhabi, ADOT-107 — Food Handlers Occupational Terms https://www.qcc.gov.ae/-/media/Project/QCC/QCC/Documents/Quality-Infrastructure-Documents/Abu-Dhabi-Specification/Abu-Dhabi-Occupational-Terms/ADOT-107---FOOD-HANDLERS.pdf

39. DriveCool Transport, UAE Food Safety & Transport Compliance Manual https://drivecooltransport.com/blogs/uae-food-safety-compliance

40. FSANZ, Standard 3.2.2A — Food Safety Management Tools https://www.foodstandards.gov.au/business/food-safety/overview-food-safety-management-tools

41. AIFS Help Centre, What is Food Standard 3.2.2A? https://help.foodsafety.com.au/en/articles/7231889-what-is-food-standard-3-2-2a

42. FSANZ, Standard 3.2.2 — Food Safety Practices and General Requirements https://www.foodstandards.gov.au/sites/default/files/publications/SiteAssets/Pages/safefoodaustralia3rd16/Standard%203.2.2%20Food%20Safety%20Practices%20and%20General%20Requirements.pdf

43. NSW Food Authority, Showing Food is Safe — Standard 3.2.2A https://www.foodauthority.nsw.gov.au/retail/standard-322a-food-safety-management-tools/showing-food-safe

44. FSANZ, Standard 3.2.2A — Evidence Tool https://www.foodstandards.gov.au/business/food-safety/evidence-tool

45. Qantas Group, Supplier Requirements (March 2025) https://www.qantas.com/content/dam/qantas/pdfs/about-us/departments/procurement/supplier-requirements-version-31mar25.pdf

46. Food Safety Australia, Decoding Record-Keeping in Food Safety Standard 3.2.2A https://www.foodsafety.org.au/info/decoding-record-keeping-in-food-safety-standard-3.2.2a

47. FSANZ, Standard 3.2.2A — Overview https://www.foodstandards.gov.au/sites/default/files/2023-10/Std%20322A%20-%20overview%20Final.pdf

48. FSANZ, Standard 3.2.2A — Evidence Tool (PDF) https://www.foodstandards.gov.au/sites/default/files/2023-10/Std%20322A%20-%20Evidence%20tool%20Final.pdf

49. Complete Hospitality Training, Record-Keeping Duration in the Food Industry https://cht.edu.au/news/how-long-do-i-need-to-keep-records-for/

50. Singapore Statutes Online, Food Safety and Security Act 2025 https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/FSSA2025

51. Food Safety News, Singapore Passes New Food Safety Law https://www.foodsafetynews.com/2025/01/singapore-passes-new-food-safety-law/

52. Singapore Food Agency, Understanding the SAFE Framework https://www.sfa.gov.sg/regulatory-standards-frameworks-guidelines/understanding-the-safety-assurance-for-food-establishments-framework

53. Singapore Food Agency, Transport Frozen & Chilled Food https://www.sfa.gov.sg/docs/default-source/educational-materials/transport-frozen-and-chilled-food.pdf

54. Singapore Food Agency, Accreditation Criteria for Overseas Establishments https://www.sfa.gov.sg/docs/default-source/food-import-and-export/accreditation_criteria_establishment.pdf

55. Singapore Food Agency, Circular — Food Businesses Portal (2025) https://www.sfa.gov.sg/news-publications/circulars-and-notices/circulars/2025/circular---food-business-portal

56. Singapore Ministry of Sustainability and the Environment, Parliamentary Reply on Product Recall & Traceability https://www.mse.gov.sg/latest-news/written-reply-to-parliamentary-question-on-product-recall---traceability-/

57. Kiat Lay, How to Ensure Cold Chain Compliance in Food Logistics (Singapore) https://www.kiatlay.com.sg/food-logistics-cold-chain-compliance/

58. MHLW Japan, Overview of Amendments to the Food Sanitation Act https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/11130500/000537821.pdf

59. Murata Manufacturing, HACCP Changing Food Distribution and the Use of IoT https://article.murata.com/en-global/article/iot-utilization-in-food-distribution

60. MHLW Japan, HACCP Information Portal https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/kenkou_iryou/shokuhin/haccp/index.html

61. SGS USA, Japan Revises Specifications and Standards for Food Contact Materials https://www.sgs.com/en-us/news/2025/08/safeguards-11425-japan-revises-specifications-and-standards-for-food-contact-materials

62. Japanese Law Translation, Regulations for Enforcement of the Food Sanitation Act https://www.japaneselawtranslation.go.jp/en/laws/view/3991/en

63. JFSM, JFS-B Standard Guideline (V2.0) https://www.jfsm.or.jp/eng/scheme/docs/JFS-B%20standard%20%28guideline%29%20Ver.%202.0.pdf

64. JFSM, JFS-A Standard Guideline (V3.0 / Edition 1.0) https://www.jfsm.or.jp/eng/scheme/docs/ENG_JFS-A%20Guideline%20Version3_0_Edition1_0.pdf

65. Centre for Food Safety Hong Kong, Food Legislation and Guidelines https://www.cfs.gov.hk/english/food_leg/food_leg.html

66. Centre for Food Safety Hong Kong, Food Safety Ordinance https://www.cfs.gov.hk/english/whatsnew/whatsnew_fstr/files/Food_Safety_Ordinance_e.pdf

67. Hong Kong FEHD, Annual Report Chapter II — Food Safety https://www.fehd.gov.hk/english/publications/annualrpt/2023/2.html

68. Hong Kong FEHD, Press Release on Catering Services for Tour Groups https://www.fehd.gov.hk/english/news/details/20240913_11150.html

69. Centre for Food Safety Hong Kong, Record-Keeping Requirement Relating to Food https://www.cfs.gov.hk/english/foodsafetyordinance/FSO_record.html

70. Centre for Food Safety Hong Kong, Code of Practice on Keeping Records (Cap. 612) https://www.cfs.gov.hk/english/whatsnew/whatsnew_fstr/files/FSO_COP_Record_Keeping_e.pdf

71. Hong Kong Government, Code of Practice on Keeping Records — Consultation https://www.gov.hk/en/theme/bf/consultation/pdf/10010_en_cop.pdf

ABOUT THE PUBLISHER

About IFCS

IFCS — In-Flight Catering Software — has spent more than two decades building the operational systems that flight kitchens, airline caterers, and airlines use to plan, produce, and prove the safety of in-flight meal service. Our customers operate across more than thirty jurisdictions, with the regulatory exposure that implies.

Our flagship platform, Galley Xai, is purpose-built for the operational and regulatory realities of aviation catering. It consolidates menu, recipe, production, equipment, and shipping data into a single source of truth; carries lot-level identifiers through every transformation event; integrates with continuous cold-chain telemetry; and treats per-jurisdiction retention and 24-hour recall response as first-class architectural concerns.

If you are scoping a compliance roadmap, evaluating digital traceability platforms, or running internal recall-readiness drills, we would value the conversation.

EMAIL	WEB	LINKEDIN
contact@ifcs.aero	ifcs.aero	linkedin.com/company/ifcs

IFCS
IN-FLIGHT CATERING SOFTWARE

IN-FLIGHT CATERING SOFTWARE