

SESSION 4

Interactive Assessment of Indonesia's Food Regulatory System

SWOT Analysis – From Regulatory Robustness to Innovation Readiness and the Jakarta Recommendations

Purpose of the Session

This session moves the workshop from principles and international experience toward a structured **SWOT assessment** of Indonesia's food regulatory system and the identification of practical recommendations for modernization. The discussion builds on the foundations of a robust regulatory regime, the Singapore experience, and the conditions that enable responsible food innovation. Food additives was used as a practical regulatory example, opening the discussion toward novel foods, innovative ingredients and emerging production processes.

Two Dimensions of Food Regulatory Innovation

REGULATING INNOVATION

Defining appropriate regulatory pathways for innovative food ingredients, products, technologies and processes — including how safety, intended uses and claims are assessed and how products gain access to the market.

INNOVATING REGULATION

Adapting regulatory approaches themselves to become more proportionate, collaborative, efficient and responsive to innovation while maintaining consumer protection — including an appropriate mix of pre-market and post-market oversight.

Questions for the SWOT Discussion

1 Strengths and weaknesses – where does Indonesia stand today?

Considering the foundations of a robust regulatory regime discussed during the workshop, what are the principal strengths of Indonesia's current food regulatory system, and where are the most important weaknesses or gaps? Consider in particular scientific and risk-assessment capacity, international benchmarking, inter-agency collaboration, stakeholder engagement, predictability and timeliness of regulatory decisions.

2 Opportunities and threats – is the system ready for the next generation of food innovation?

Using food additives and novel foods as practical examples, what opportunities exist for Indonesia to become more innovation-ready, and what regulatory, scientific, institutional or market factors could stand in the way? Which lessons from the Singapore experience could be adapted to Indonesia rather than simply replicated?

3 Where could the regulatory model itself be modernized?

Could requirements for innovative ingredients or products be proportionate to their novelty and risk profile, with the appropriate level of oversight? Propose/recommend Innovative approaches to regulate novel ingredients and processes (beyond what is currently applied)

4 What should become Jakarta Recommendations?

Based on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats identified, what **two or three practical enhancements** should Indonesia prioritize?

Examples:

Consider clearer regulatory pathways for innovative foods; stronger regulatory-science capacity; greater use of international assessments; defined timelines; and more structured collaboration among regulators, academia and industry — including collaborative approaches to generating and assessing safety evidence and substantiating claims, while preserving the independence of regulatory decision-making.

Illustrative Directions for Recommendations

- **Risk-tiered oversight:** Consider a differentiated mix of pre-market assessment and post-market oversight, calibrated to novelty and risk, rather than a single level of pre-market control for all innovative products.
- **Collaborative evidence generation:** Create structured mechanisms through which regulators, academia and industry can contribute to safety assessments and claims substantiation, while preserving regulatory independence.
- **Predictable pathways:** Strengthen early dialogue, clarity of evidentiary requirements, use of international assessments, and defined review timelines for innovative foods and ingredients.

Outcome: A concise set of actionable Jakarta Recommendations for consideration in the WNPX XII process.