

Positioning Tayyib at The Core of Halal Food Safety Governance in Malaysia

Shahirah Said^{1*}, Nadiyah Rus Liyana bt Rusli², Ruspita Rani Pertiwi³, Emie Sylviana Mohd Zahid⁴,
Muhammad Izanee Danial bin Mohd Rizalpalavy⁵

^{1,4}Academy of Contemporary Islamic Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pulau Pinang,
Kampus Permatang Pauh, 13500 Permatang Pauh, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia

²Centre for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Labuan
International Campus, Labuan, Malaysia

³Faculty of Economics and Islamic Business, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta
55281, Indonesia

⁵Courtyard by Marriott Penang, George Town, Penang, Malaysia

*Corresponding author:

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100900016>

Received: 27 August 2026; Accepted: 02 September 2026; Published: 29 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This article positions *tayyib* at the core of halal food safety governance through comparative document analysis. Five Malaysian instruments MS 1500:2019, MPPHM 2020, MHMS 2020, the Food Hygiene Regulations 2009, and MeSTI were coded using explicit inclusion, boundary, and coverage rules across five governance dimensions. Findings reveal strong but institutionally distributed controls for source integrity, preventive safety, organisational accountability, and traceability, while public value remains weakly formalised. The article contributes by distinguishing legal halal determination from *tayyib* governance, defining integration as coordination without collapsing mandates, identifying accountability and traceability as bridging mechanisms, and positioning public value as a developmental rather than certification criterion. The resulting Integrated *Tayyib* Governance Framework connects policy, risk assessment, operational control, verification, corrective action, management review, and transparent improvement while preserving existing regulatory and certification authority.

Keywords: *tayyib*; food safety; halal certification; governance; traceability; Malaysia

INTRODUCTION

Food safety and halal assurance are frequently administered as adjacent compliance domains. Food safety regimes concentrate on biological, chemical, physical, and allergen hazards, whereas halal assurance verifies lawful sources, processing conditions, segregation, and conformity with Shariah requirements. Although the two domains share controls relating to suppliers, hygiene, storage, transport, documentation, audit, and recall, their organisational interfaces are often left implicit. This creates a governance problem: risk ownership may be fragmented, evidence may be duplicated, and a failure that crosses departmental or regulatory boundaries may remain insufficiently visible to senior management. The central issue is therefore not whether Malaysia has relevant controls, but how those controls can be coordinated without weakening the distinct legal authority, technical expertise, and decision rules of each system.

The Qur'anic pairing of halal and *tayyib* provides the normative basis for considering these domains together. The instruction to consume what is both lawful and good appears in several passages, including al-Baqarah 2:168, al-Ma'idah 5:88, and al-Nahl 16:114. In contemporary food discourse, halal defines the boundary of permissibility, while *tayyib* is associated with wholesomeness, safety, quality, and beneficial consumption

Alzeer, Rieder, and Abou Hadeed (2018) translate this relationship into practical food safety considerations, and Demirci, Soon, and Wallace (2016) demonstrate why food safety requires clearer positioning within halal assurance. *Tayyib* is therefore relevant not only to individual consumption but also to the governance responsibilities of institutions.

Malaysia has developed a comparatively mature architecture for halal assurance and food safety. MS 1500:2019 specifies the general requirements for halal food. The Manual Prosedur Pensijilan Halal Malaysia (Domestik) 2020 (MPPHM 2020) structures domestic certification procedures, while the Malaysian Halal Management System 2020 (MHMS 2020) prescribes internal halal controls proportionate to organisational size and risk. Food safety is governed through the Food Act 1983, the Food Regulations 1985, the Food Hygiene Regulations 2009, and assurance initiatives such as Makanan Selamat Tanggungjawab Industri (MeSTI). Although these instruments provide substantial protection, their distinct regulatory purposes mean that they do not automatically operate as a unified governance system.

Malaysian scholarship has documented the national halal food control system, including its institutional strengths and constraints (Ahmad et al. 2018), as well as the relationship between halal traceability and supply-chain integrity (Ab Rashid and Bojei 2019). More recent studies show that integrated management systems can reduce duplicated audit activity, yet they also identify practical barriers involving terminology, organisational commitment, competence, documentation, and system ownership (Puspaningtyas and Sucipto 2021; Elizabeth, Suyatma, and Yuliana 2021; Puspaningtyas, Sucipto, and Santoso 2023). Research on halal traceability has likewise emphasised adoption, information visibility, and technological infrastructure (Kamarulzaman, Muhamad, and Nawi 2021; Sidarto and Hamka 2021; Munawar and Mugiono 2024). These streams are valuable but remain largely system-specific: they do not yet explain how *tayyib* can organise relationships among halal determination, food-safety control, organisational accountability, traceability, and wider public value within one governance architecture.

A prior article by Said et al. (2025) analysed selected Qur'anic uses of *tayyib* and developed four conceptual themes concerning lawful and safe food, human stewardship, compliance with modern standards, and ethical integrity. The present study takes that conceptual conclusion as a point of departure but asks a different research question: how can *tayyib* be operationalised as a governance framework across Malaysia's halal assurance and food-safety instruments? The primary corpus, coding structure, analytical matrix, findings, and proposed model in this article are new. No verse-by-verse results or tables from the earlier article are reused.

Accordingly, this article asks: how can *tayyib* be operationalised as a governance orientation that connects Malaysia's halal assurance and food-safety instruments while preserving their distinct mandates? It pursues three objectives: first, to specify theoretically grounded dimensions of *tayyib* governance relevant to food organisations; second, to map those dimensions against selected Malaysian instruments using transparent coding and coverage rules; and third, to propose an integrated framework that coordinates evidence, risk ownership, review, and improvement without transferring or diluting regulatory authority. The study addresses a conceptual and institutional gap rather than claiming to measure implementation performance.

Theoretical Foundation of Tayyib Governance

Tayyib has a semantic range that includes goodness, purity, wholesomeness, suitability, and benefit. In food governance, its usefulness lies in connecting the status of a product with the process by which it is sourced, prepared, controlled, and supplied. A food item may satisfy a narrow ingredient test yet still be exposed to contamination, misleading information, poor handling, or weak organisational controls. Conversely, a technically safe product cannot be presented as halal when its ingredients or processes violate established halal requirements. A governance interpretation therefore treats halal and *tayyib* as related but non-identical obligations.

This distinction has two implications. First, the determination of halal remains a legal and Shariah matter governed by recognised authorities, standards, fatwas, and certification procedures; a broader *tayyib* framework cannot independently redefine halal. Second, *tayyib* can guide how an organisation fulfils and, where appropriate, exceeds minimum obligations through prevention, transparency, competence, and continuous improvement. *Tayyib* is therefore neither an alternative label nor a new certificate. It is a

governance orientation for assessing whether organisational decisions consistently protect consumers and preserve food-system integrity.

The shift from product attributes to governance is supported by the concept of *khalifah*, or stewardship. Organisational responsibility extends beyond avoiding prohibited ingredients to controlling foreseeable harm, using resources responsibly, and communicating truthfully. Idris, Musa, and Sumardi (2022) connect *halal tayyiban* with wider sustainable-development concerns, indicating that human well-being and environmental responsibility can be considered without diluting the core legal requirements of *halal*. These wider concerns must nevertheless be introduced proportionately and under clearly defined institutional authority.

The proposed framework rests on three complementary theoretical anchors. The first is the Shariah boundary of permissibility, which determines whether materials, processes, and products satisfy recognised *halal* requirements. The second is preventive responsibility, consistent with the protection of life and the prevention of harm, which directs attention to foreseeable hazards and control before product release. The third is stewardship and public value, which extends organisational responsibility to trustworthy information, responsible resource use, consumer welfare, and continuous improvement. Together, these anchors form an integrated normative-governance lens: *halal* supplies the authoritative legal boundary, preventive safety supplies risk-control logic, and *tayyib* provides an orientation for coordinating performance beyond minimum conformity.

This lens also clarifies what integration means theoretically. Integrated management scholarship shows that common processes such as document control, internal audit, corrective action, and management review may be coordinated across assurance systems to improve consistency and efficiency (Puspaningtyas and Sucipto 2021; Elizabeth, Suyatma, and Yuliana 2021). Coordination, however, does not make *halal* and food safety interchangeable. The framework therefore treats integration as the alignment of processes, evidence, and review while retaining domain-specific risk categories, competence requirements, and decision authority. This distinction answers a recurring concern in *halal* governance: operational convergence can be increased without converting technical food-safety approval into a *halal* ruling or allowing certification status to substitute for statutory compliance.

Five analytical dimensions follow from this governance reading. Source integrity concerns the lawful status, identity, origin, and segregation of materials. Preventive safety concerns hygiene, hazard control, sanitation, storage, transport, and contamination prevention. Organisational accountability concerns policy, authority, competence, audit, corrective action, and management review. Traceability and transparency concern the reliable flow of information across materials, processes, records, decisions, and communications. Public value concerns verified contributions to consumer welfare, responsible resource use, ethical supply relationships, and social trust. The fifth dimension is theoretically justified by scholarship linking *halal tayyiban* to sustainable development and regional development, but it remains a developmental layer rather than an independent criterion for legal *halal* determination (Idris, Musa, and Sumardi 2022; Loekman and Perdana 2024). These dimensions are analytically distinct but operationally connected.

Governance integration does not require one regulator or one audit to absorb every function. Rather, it requires organisations to understand where controls overlap, where evidence may be cross-referenced, and where separate legal decisions must remain distinct. For example, a supplier approval record can support both *halal* material verification and food-safety assessment, but the record must still capture the evidence specific to each domain. Similarly, a recall exercise can test traceability across both systems while preserving the different reporting obligations attached to *halal* non-compliance and food-safety incidents.

Malaysia's Halal and Food Safety Architecture

MS 1500:2019 is the principal Malaysian standard for *halal* food and covers management responsibility, premises and facilities, equipment, hygiene and sanitation, processing, storage, transportation, display, sale, serving, packaging, labelling, and legal compliance. The third revision strengthened management-related expectations, including *halal* integrity and record management. Its architecture shows that *halal* assurance is already organisational rather than limited to end-product inspection.

MPPHM 2020 translates certification requirements into procedural obligations across relevant schemes and must be read with MHMS 2020, applicable Malaysian standards, fatwas, and legislation. MHMS 2020 differentiates between the Internal Halal Control System for micro and small organisations and the Halal Assurance System for medium and large organisations. Its control elements include a halal policy, trained personnel, a halal committee where required, internal audit, halal risk control, raw-material control, training, traceability, management review, laboratory analysis, cleansing procedures where applicable, and document control.

The food safety side is anchored in legislation and supported by assurance programmes. The Food Hygiene Regulations 2009 regulate food premises, proprietors, and handlers across preparation, handling, storage, packaging, and transportation. MeSTI was designed as an accessible minimum food-safety assurance scheme, particularly for smaller food manufacturers, and emphasises documented controls for premises, operations, and traceability. These requirements complement halal assurance, but the administrative pathways, technical terminology, and evidence structures are not identical.

A notable design feature in MHMS 2020 is that halal risk control is documented separately from systems such as HACCP, GMP, MeSTI, or other food-safety programmes. This separation protects the specificity of halal risk, yet it can also encourage parallel registers, audits, and corrective-action records. The governance challenge is thus to align control processes without merging legal determinations or weakening specialised expertise.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed qualitative comparative document analysis. The unit of analysis was a governance requirement or control mechanism stated in an authoritative Malaysian instrument. Documents were purposively selected when they: (i) were nationally applicable to halal certification or food-safety assurance; (ii) specified organisational, process, evidentiary, or verification requirements; and (iii) were current or operationally relevant during the analysis. The corpus comprised MS 1500:2019, MPPHM 2020, MHMS 2020, the Food Hygiene Regulations 2009 (as amended), and the Ministry of Health’s MeSTI guideline. Table 1 records each document’s regulatory or assurance function so that the analysis does not treat instruments with different legal status as equivalent.

Table 1. Primary document corpus and analytical function

Document	Regulatory or operational role	Analytical use
MS 1500:2019	General requirements for halal food	Baseline controls for materials, processing, hygiene, handling, management, and records
MPPHM 2020	Domestic halal certification procedure	Certification responsibilities, documentary obligations, schemes, and compliance relationships
MHMS 2020	Internal halal management requirements	Policy, personnel, risk control, traceability, audit, review, and corrective action
Food Hygiene Regulations 2009	Legally binding hygiene requirements	Premises, food handlers, preparation, storage, packaging, and transportation controls
MeSTI guidance	Minimum food-safety assurance scheme	Documented operational controls and traceability suited to smaller food businesses

Table S1. Coding definitions, inclusion indicators, and boundary rules

Dimension	Operational definition	Inclusion indicators	Boundary or exclusion rule
Source integrity	Controls establishing the lawful status, identity, provenance, or segregation of materials and products.	Approved materials and suppliers; halal evidence; segregation; material change control; product release.	General quality or procurement requirements without material-status evidence were excluded.
Preventive safety	Controls that prevent biological, chemical, physical, allergen, or halal-contamination risk before release.	Hygiene; sanitation; hazard analysis; control points; storage; transport; monitoring; preventive action.	Purely reactive enforcement without a preventive mechanism was not coded as direct coverage.
Organisational accountability	Assignment of authority, competence, verification, review, and corrective responsibility.	Policy; responsible officer or committee; training; audit; management review; corrective and preventive action.	An isolated instruction without a named owner or oversight mechanism was coded as partial at most.
Traceability and transparency	Capacity to link materials, processes, records, decisions, and verified communications across the chain.	Batch or lot identity; records; recall; labels; document control; supplier and product information.	Record keeping without backward or forward linkage was coded as operational rather than direct traceability.
Public value	Verified contribution beyond minimum compliance to well-being, sustainability, fairness, and public trust.	Nutrition; waste; water and energy use; responsible sourcing; labour welfare; substantiated consumer claims.	The dimension cannot determine legal halal status; aspirations without a metric or evidence were coded as not explicit.

Note: The rules in this table were applied to requirements or control mechanisms, not to whole documents. A single instrument could therefore receive different coverage classifications across dimensions.

The analysis proceeded in four stages. First, relevant control statements were extracted into a document-by-code matrix that recorded the source document, clause or page where available, responsible actor, required evidence or record, and intended governance outcome. Second, each extracted unit was deductively coded against the five *tayyib* governance dimensions. Third, recurrent operational mechanisms including supplier approval, segregation, hazard control, training, internal audit, corrective action, document control, traceability, recall, and management review were identified inductively within those dimensions. Fourth, requirements were compared across instruments to identify convergence, complementarity, boundary conditions, and gaps. The matrix was iteratively checked against the source documents so that every classification remained traceable to an explicit requirement or to a clearly documented combination of controls.

Coverage decisions followed four rules. Coverage was coded as direct when an instrument expressly required a control central to a dimension; operational when several concrete controls implemented the dimension without naming it; partial when only a limited component was addressed; and not explicit when no relevant requirement could be identified. Where one provision could fit more than one dimension, it was coded according to its primary governance function and cross-referenced to the secondary function. Negative cases were retained rather than forced into the framework. For example, generic record keeping without backward or forward linkage was not coded as direct traceability, and broad sustainability aspirations without an indicator or evidentiary requirement were not coded as direct public-value coverage. Table S1 provides the operational definitions, inclusion indicators, and exclusion boundaries used in coding.

The analysis focused on document design rather than organisational performance. It did not evaluate certified premises, interview regulators, or test whether firms comply in practice. No inter-coder reliability statistic is reported because the study did not employ independent parallel coders. Methodological credibility instead rests on a bounded national corpus, explicit coding definitions and decision rules, retention of negative cases, and traceability from each interpretation to the source instrument. The proposed framework is therefore conceptual and implementation-oriented; its empirical validity requires subsequent testing with regulators, auditors, and food organisations.

Research integrity was addressed by maintaining a clear boundary from the authors' earlier publication. Said et al. (2025) is used only as a cited conceptual precursor. The present study examines a different primary corpus, applies a new comparative coding matrix, produces new findings, and proposes an original governance framework. This disclosure should accompany any submission so that editors can evaluate the relationship between the two works transparently.

FINDINGS

Comparative Coverage of *Tayyib* Governance Dimensions

The instruments collectively cover much of the operational content that a *tayyib*-based governance approach would require, but the coverage is distributed across different systems. Table 2 presents comparative mapping. The matrix should be read horizontally: no single document is expected to perform every legal or governance function. Its value lies in identifying where organisations can align processes and where supplementary policy development may be needed.

Three cross-instrument patterns are analytically significant. First, legal functions are asymmetric: halal instruments determine permissibility and certification conformity, whereas food-safety instruments regulate hazards, premises, and public-health controls. Second, procedural convergence is substantial because both domains depend on supplier evidence, documented procedures, competence, verification, corrective action, and recall. Third, normative extension is uneven: the instruments protect safety and integrity more clearly than they formalise nutrition, sustainability, or wider social value. These patterns indicate that the governance challenge is not to merge instruments, but to design reliable interfaces among distinct mandates, shared processes, and under-specified developmental outcomes.

Table 2. Comparative mapping of instruments against *tayyib* governance dimensions

Instrument	Source integrity	Preventive safety	Organisational accountability	Traceability and transparency	Public value
MS 1500:2019	Direct	Direct	Operational	Operational	Partial

MPPHM 2020	Direct	Operational through standards and law	Direct	Operational	Not explicit
MHMS 2020	Direct	Partial; halal risk is separately controlled	Direct	Direct	Not explicit
Food Hygiene Regulations 2009	Partial	Direct	Operational	Partial	Not explicit
MeSTI guidance	Partial	Direct	Operational	Operational	Not explicit

Source Integrity Is the Distinctive Strength of Halal Assurance

Source integrity is most explicit in MS 1500:2019, MPPHM 2020, and MHMS 2020. Together, these instruments require organisations to establish the status of raw materials, ingredients, processing aids, suppliers, storage conditions, equipment, and process flows. MHMS 2020 is particularly important because it converts product-level requirements into an internal management system. A current raw-material master list, supporting certificates, manufacturer and supplier information, and controls for changes in materials make source integrity auditable rather than dependent on informal knowledge.

The food-safety instruments also address materials, but their principal concern is safety and hygiene rather than religious permissibility. This is a complementary rather than competing role. Supplier information, specifications, acceptance records, batch identity, and controlled changes may serve both systems, but the evidentiary threshold and decision owner remain domain-specific. Recent traceability research supports the value of shared identifiers and verifiable information flows for strengthening halal integrity and consumer confidence (Kamarulzaman, Muhamad, and Nawi 2021; Sidarto and Hamka 2021; Munawar and Mugiono 2024). The analytical implication is that evidence may be interoperable even when approval authority is not: a common data trail can support both reviews, but only the competent authority can make the relevant halal or statutory decision.

Preventive Safety Is Strong but Institutionally Distributed

Preventive safety is directly addressed by MS 1500:2019 and the food-safety instruments. Hygiene, sanitation, premises, equipment, handling, storage, transport, packaging, and contamination controls form a substantial common area. The Food Hygiene Regulations 2009 provide the legal floor, while MeSTI offers a documented assurance pathway that is accessible to smaller manufacturers. MS 1500:2019 embeds food safety within halal food requirements, confirming that halal assurance cannot be credible when a product is unsafe or contaminated.

Nevertheless, the analytical vocabularies and control logics differ. Food-safety systems classify biological, chemical, physical, and allergen hazards, whereas MHMS 2020 centres halal risks and Halal Control Points. The requirement to document halal risk control separately from HACCP, GMP, MeSTI, or related systems preserves conceptual precision, yet it can create parallel records and fragmented review. Studies of integrated assurance systems show both the efficiency potential of common audits and the organisational barriers created

by inconsistent terminology, ownership, competence, and documentation (Elizabeth, Suyatma, and Yuliana 2021; Puspaningtyas and Sucipto 2021; Puspaningtyas, Sucipto, and Santoso 2023). The appropriate solution is therefore coordinated verification with domain-specific judgements, not a single undifferentiated risk register.

Accountability and Traceability Form the Integration Backbone

Organisational accountability is strongly expressed in MHMS 2020 through policy, leadership responsibilities, the Halal Executive, internal structures, training, internal audit, management review, and documented corrective action. MS 1500:2019 reinforces management responsibility, while MPPHM 2020 connects internal compliance to certification. Food-safety instruments assign duties to proprietors, handlers, and operators. These requirements establish a shared governance principle: compliance must have an owner, evidence, and a review process.

Traceability provides the most practical bridge between the systems. MHMS 2020 requires written traceability procedures and supports withdrawal or recall, including mock-recall expectations for organisations operating a full Halal Assurance System. Food-safety controls likewise depend on batch records, supplier data, distribution information, and recall readiness. The convergence is not merely administrative: traceability converts separate controls into an information architecture through which a material, decision, deviation, and corrective response can be followed across functions. Digital approaches may strengthen visibility, integrity, and transparency, but the literature also shows that technology must be supported by verified off-chain processes, competent review, and trusted organisational ownership (Sidarto and Hamka 2021; Munawar and Mugiono 2024). Accordingly, digitalisation supports rather than replaces halal and food-safety authority.

The convergence around audit, records, and corrective action suggests that integration should occur at the governance process level. One audit calendar may coordinate halal and food-safety activities while using discipline-specific checklists and competent auditors. One corrective-action register may record the source, legal category, responsible owner, due date, verification method, and closure evidence for each finding. Such alignment preserves specialised decisions but gives management one view of systemic risk.

Public Value Remains the Principal Developmental Gap

The widest gap concerns public value. Current instruments necessarily prioritise their statutory or certification purposes, and they do not consistently require nutritional quality, sustainable sourcing, waste reduction, labour conditions, or broader social outcomes. This absence should not be interpreted as regulatory failure because those outcomes lie partly outside the instruments' mandates. It is, however, a governance gap when organisations invoke *tayyib* as a broad ethical claim without specifying accountable indicators. Scholarship connecting halal *tayyiban* with the Sustainable Development Goals and regional development supports the relevance of well-being, responsible production, and stewardship to a wider *tayyib* orientation (Idris, Musa, and Sumardi 2022; Loekman and Perdana 2024). Public value is therefore justified as a distinct developmental dimension, but not as an alternative route to halal certification.

A *tayyib* governance framework can make these concerns visible through voluntary, proportionate, and verifiable indicators. Organisations may monitor nutrition reformulation, food waste, responsible water and energy use, supplier ethics, labour welfare, and truthful consumer communication. To avoid ethical overclaiming, each indicator should identify an owner, baseline, target, evidence source, review interval, and disclosure boundary. This makes public value auditable as organisational performance while keeping it legally separate from halal determination. The distinction clarifies the dimension's conceptual status: public value is not inferred from certification instruments; it is theoretically derived from stewardship and sustainable-development scholarship and then positioned as a transparent improvement layer beyond minimum compliance.

An Integrated Tayyib Governance Framework

The findings support an Integrated *Tayyib* Governance Framework consisting of five governance layers linked through a continuous management cycle. The layers correspond to the analytical dimensions, while the cycle

connects policy, risk assessment, operational control, verification, corrective action, and management review. Table 3 translates the framework into organisational practices, evidence, and illustrative indicators.

Table 3. Integrated Tayyib Governance Framework

Governance layer	Core organisational question	Aligned practices and evidence	Illustrative indicator
1. Source integrity	Are materials, suppliers, equipment, and process flows verified for their applicable halal and safety requirements?	Approved supplier process; raw-material master list; specifications; certificates; receiving checks; segregation and change control	% current material files; unresolved supplier changes; segregation deviations
2. Preventive safety	Are halal risks and food-safety hazards identified early and controlled at the correct process points?	Linked process map; separate technical risk assessments; cross-referenced control points; sanitation, storage, transport, and allergen controls	Control-point verification rate; hygiene deviations; repeat incidents
3. Organisational accountability	Who owns each duty, and does management provide competence, resources, and oversight?	Policy; role matrix; Halal Executive and committee; food-safety team; joint training calendar; management review	Training completion; overdue actions; attendance and decisions at review
4. Traceability and transparency	Can the organisation reconstruct product history, communicate accurately, and act quickly?	Common batch identity; cross-referenced records; complaint handling; withdrawal and recall; audit trail; verified corrective action	Trace time; mock-recall completion; record accuracy; closure effectiveness
5. Public value	How does the organisation improve wholesomeness and wider social benefit beyond minimum compliance?	Nutrition and reformulation goals; food-waste controls; responsible sourcing; ethical communication; proportional sustainability targets	Waste intensity; nutrition targets; substantiated claims; supplier improvement

The Governance Cycle

The first stage is policy commitment. Senior management should issue a policy that recognises halal integrity, food safety, and consumer protection as connected responsibilities while identifying the legal authority of each requirement. The policy should be translated into a responsibility matrix so that the Halal Executive, internal halal committee, food-safety team, procurement, production, quality assurance, warehousing, marketing, and senior management know where responsibilities intersect.

The second stage uses cross-referenced risk registers. This does not mean collapsing distinct risks into a single undifferentiated score. Organisations should retain the technical categories required by halal and food safety

systems while locating them on a shared process map and product taxonomy. Each entry should identify the risk or hazard, applicable requirement, control owner, control point, monitoring record, corrective action, and escalation route. Cross-referencing reduces duplication while preserving the rationale specific to each domain.

The third stage is operational control. Supplier approval, receiving, storage, sanitation, production scheduling, segregation, packaging, labelling, transport, and product release should use aligned identifiers and controlled documents. Where one record serves two systems, its fields must be sufficient for both. Where legal or technical needs differ, separate records should be linked through a common batch or case number rather than forced into a single form.

The fourth stage is verification. Internal audits, inspections, laboratory analysis where required, record review, supplier monitoring, and mock recalls should be scheduled within one assurance calendar. The scope, competence requirements, and conclusions of each activity must remain explicit. Joint timing is efficient, but a food-safety auditor should not make a Shariah determination without authority, and halal verification should not substitute for specialised hazard expertise.

The fifth stage is corrective action and management review. Deviations should enter a common action register that identifies their domain, severity, owner, root cause, immediate correction, preventive action, due date, and evidence of effectiveness. Management review should examine recurring causes across both systems. Repeated supplier-document failures, for example, may indicate not only a halal documentation problem but also weak supplier governance that affects food safety and business continuity.

The final stage is transparent improvement. Organisations should communicate verified product information, maintain readiness for regulatory or certification inquiries, and adopt proportional public-value goals. Improvement claims must be evidence based and must not imply official endorsement beyond the scope of the relevant certificate. The cycle then returns to policy and risk assessment as products, suppliers, laws, technology, and consumer expectations change.

Implementation By Organisation Size

Implementation should be proportionate. A micro or small enterprise operating an Internal Halal Control System and MeSTI may use a concise process map, one controlled supplier-and-material register, a simple training matrix, and one corrective-action log with clearly labelled halal and food-safety fields. The aim is not to create a complex additional manual but to make existing obligations visible and linked.

A medium or large organisation operating a Halal Assurance System, HACCP, GMP, ISO 22000, or related schemes may establish a governance dashboard that draws from existing systems. The dashboard should focus on leading indicators such as supplier-change completion, control-point verification, overdue corrective actions, mock-recall performance, and recurring audit findings. Public value indicators may be added as voluntary strategic metrics, clearly separated from certification status.

Regulators and certification bodies could support alignment through cross-referenced guidance, shared terminology where appropriate, and examples of records that satisfy multiple evidentiary needs. Any formal integration of audit or certification decisions would require institutional approval and should not be inferred from this conceptual framework. The immediate opportunity lies within organisations: coordinated calendars, common identifiers, interoperable records, and management review across functions.

DISCUSSION

Theoretical Contributions

First, the study advances a boundary-specification contribution. It distinguishes halal as an authoritative legal and certification determination from *tayyib* as a wider governance orientation. This resolves a conceptual ambiguity in which *tayyib* is sometimes treated either as a synonym for halal or as an unlimited ethical category. In the proposed model, *tayyib* cannot override recognised halal decisions; instead, it organises how

lawful sourcing, preventive safety, accountability, traceability, and improvement are connected within organisational governance.

Second, the study contributes a cross-system governance architecture. Existing work demonstrates the operational value of integrating halal assurance with quality and food-safety management systems, while also documenting practical barriers to integration (Puspaningtyas and Sucipto 2021; Elizabeth, Suyatma, and Yuliana 2021; Puspaningtyas, Sucipto, and Santoso 2023). The present framework extends that literature by specifying the unit of integration: not legal mandates or final decisions, but shared processes, interoperable evidence, coordinated assurance calendars, and management review. This explains how organisations may reduce duplication without creating regulatory substitution.

Third, the study identifies accountability and traceability as bridging mechanisms rather than merely technical controls. Traceability studies often emphasise adoption intention, visibility, blockchain, or data integrity (Kamarulzaman, Muhamad, and Nawi 2021; Sidarto and Hamka 2021; Munawar and Mugiono 2024). The framework adds that traceability becomes governance only when records are connected to responsible actors, decision rights, escalation, corrective action, and review. This actor-evidence-decision linkage explains why technology alone cannot guarantee integrity and why a shared data trail must preserve domain-specific validation.

Fourth, the study theorises public value as a conditional developmental layer. Halal-tayyiban scholarship connects ethical consumption with sustainability, well-being, and development (Idris, Musa, and Sumardi 2022; Loekman and Perdana 2024), while food-safety governance research increasingly treats safety as a multi-actor problem involving public health, consumer confidence, institutional capacity, and accountability (Shen, Wei, and Sheng 2021; Rodrigues, Saraiva, and García-Díez 2025). The framework integrates these concerns but imposes a boundary: public-value indicators must be voluntary where not legally required, evidence-based, proportionate, and never represented as substitutes for halal certification or food-law compliance.

Engagement with Recent Literature

Read against recent literature, the findings show both convergence and departure. They converge with integrated-management studies in locating efficiency gains in common documentation, audit, and corrective processes; with traceability studies in recognising reliable information flow as central to halal integrity; and with food-safety governance studies in treating coordination and stakeholder accountability as system-level concerns. They depart from technology-centred or single-system approaches by locating the primary problem at the interface among authority, evidence, and organisational review. The Integrated Tayyib Governance Framework therefore offers a meso-level explanation: it connects normative principles to organisational mechanisms while remaining anchored in the actual distribution of Malaysian regulatory and certification functions.

For small firms, integration should simplify rather than enlarge the compliance burden. MeSTI and the Internal Halal Control System provide a foundation for concise documentation. Templates should use plain language, minimise repeated data entry, and identify the evidence needed for each obligation. Digital systems can help, but technology is not a substitute for verified suppliers, trained personnel, clear responsibilities, and effective corrective action.

For large firms, the governance opportunity is strategic. Separate halal, quality, safety, sustainability, and procurement systems can produce blind spots even when each unit performs well. Senior management review should therefore consider cross-system signals. A supplier change, for example, may simultaneously affect halal status, allergen exposure, label accuracy, production scheduling, and customer trust. Integrated escalation makes these combined consequences visible.

The study has limitations. Document analysis cannot establish how regulators, auditors, or companies interpret the requirements in practice. The mapping reflects selected national instruments and does not cover every sector-specific standard, state-level practice, imported-food requirement, or private assurance scheme. Because coding was conducted as a traceable interpretive analysis rather than independent parallel coding,

future studies should test the categories through expert validation, case studies, and inter-coder assessment. These limitations define the next empirical stage rather than invalidate the present conceptual contribution.

CONCLUSION

Malaysia's halal assurance and food-safety instruments already provide strong controls for lawful sourcing, preventive safety, organisational accountability, and traceability. Their principal governance weakness is not an absence of rules but the limited articulation of interfaces among systems with different mandates. A *tayyib* governance orientation addresses this problem by coordinating shared processes and evidence while preserving the authority of halal certification, food law, and technical assurance.

The Integrated Tayyib Governance Framework connects five layers—source integrity, preventive safety, organisational accountability, traceability and transparency, and public value through a continuous cycle of policy, risk assessment, operational control, verification, corrective action, management review, and transparent improvement. Its theoretical contribution lies in specifying governance boundaries, defining integration at the process-and-evidence level, identifying accountability and traceability as bridging mechanisms, and treating public value as a conditional developmental layer rather than a certification criterion.

The framework should now be empirically tested. Engagement with JAKIM, the Ministry of Health, standards bodies, auditors, industry associations, large manufacturers, and small enterprises would determine which alignments are feasible and which must remain institutionally separate. Such validation can help translate *tayyib* from an ethical aspiration into disciplined governance that strengthens consumer protection, halal integrity, and confidence in Malaysia's food system.

REFERENCES

1. Ab Rashid, Norasekin, and Jamil Bojei. 2019. "The Relationship between Halal Traceability System Adoption and Environmental Factors on Halal Food Supply Chain Integrity in Malaysia." *Journal of Islamic Marketing* 11 (1): 117–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-01-2018-0016>.
2. Ahmad, Anis Najiha, Ungku Fatimah Ungku Zainal Abidin, Mohhidin Othman, and Russly Abdul Rahman. 2018. "Overview of the Halal Food Control System in Malaysia." *Food Control* 90: 352–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2018.02.035>.
3. Alzeer, Jawad, Ulrike Rieder, and Khaled Abou Hadeed. 2018. "Rational and Practical Aspects of Halal and *Tayyib* in the Context of Food Safety." *Trends in Food Science & Technology* 71: 264–267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2017.10.020>.
4. Demirci, Marin Neio, Jan Mei Soon, and Carol A. Wallace. 2016. "Positioning Food Safety in Halal Assurance." *Food Control* 70: 257–270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2016.05.059>.
5. Department of Islamic Development Malaysia (JAKIM). 2020a. *Manual Prosedur Pensijilan Halal Malaysia (Domestik) 2020*. Putrajaya: JAKIM.
6. Department of Islamic Development Malaysia (JAKIM). 2020b. *Sistem Pengurusan Halal Malaysia 2020*. Putrajaya: JAKIM.
7. Department of Standards Malaysia. 2019. *MS 1500:2019 Halal Food—General Requirements (Third Revision)*. Cyberjaya: Department of Standards Malaysia. Confirmed 2024.
8. Elizabeth, Irma Rosiana, Nugraha Edhi Suyatma, and Nancy Dewy Yuliana. 2021. "Integration of ISO 22000 (2018) and HAS 23000 through Management System Audit: Case Study in Corned Beef Producer." *Indonesian Journal of Halal Research* 3 (2): 43–55. <https://doi.org/10.15575/ijhar.v3i2.13515>.
9. Halim, N. R. A., Sahilah Abd. Mutalib, and Maaruf Abd. Ghani. 2024. "Food Safety Regulations Implementation and Their Impact on Food Security Level in Malaysia: A Review." *International Food Research Journal* 31 (1): 20–31. <https://doi.org/10.47836/ifrj.31.1.02>.
10. Idris, Pg Siti Rozaidah Pg Hj, Siti Fatimahwati Pehin Dato Musa, and Wardah Hakimah Hj Sumardi. 2022. "Halal-*Tayyiban* and Sustainable Development Goals: A SWOT Analysis." *International Journal of Asian Business and Information Management* 13 (2): 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJABIM.20220701.0a9>.

11. Kamarulzaman, Nitty Hirawaty, Nur Aminin Muhamad, and Nolila Mohd Nawi. 2021. "An Investigation of Adoption Intention of Halal Traceability System among Food SMEs." *Journal of Islamic Marketing* 13 (9): 1872–1900. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-11-2020-0349>.
12. Loekman, Agus Suyitno, and Firdaus Fanny Putera Perdana. 2024. "Interpreting the Elements of Halal Tayyiban into Regional Development: The Case of the Siak Regency." *International Journal of Business Studies* 8 (1): 68–84. <https://doi.org/10.32924/ijbs.v8i1.322>.
13. Malaysia. 2009. Food Hygiene Regulations 2009, P.U. (A) 95/2009, as amended. Putrajaya: Attorney General's Chambers of Malaysia.
14. Ministry of Health Malaysia. 2016. Garis Panduan Skim Pensijilan Makanan Selamat Tanggungjawab Industri (MeSTI). Putrajaya: Food Safety and Quality Division, Ministry of Health Malaysia.
15. Munawar, Munawar, and Arif Mugiono. 2024. "Framework for Smart Contract Blockchain in Halal Traceability, Integrity, and Transparency." *International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering* 14 (3): 2875–2884. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijece.v14i3.pp2875-2884>.
16. Puspaningtyas, Shinta Diah, and Sucipto Sucipto. 2021. "Integration of Halal Assurance System (HAS) in the Integrated Management System (IMS) to Support Food Industry Performance: A Review." *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 733 (1): 012045. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/733/1/012045>.
17. Puspaningtyas, Shinta Diah, Sucipto Sucipto, and Imam Santoso. 2023. "Barriers of Integration Halal Assurance System and Quality Management System." *Global Journal Al-Thaqafah SI* (1): 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.7187/GJATSI072027-3>.
18. Rodrigues, Júlia Martins, Cristina Saraiva, and Juan García-Díez. 2025. "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Food Safety Policies in Portugal: A Stakeholder-Based Analysis of Challenges and Opportunities for Food Safety Governance." *Foods* 14 (9): 1534. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods14091534>.
19. Said, Shahirah, Emie Sylviana Mohd Zahid, Habibah Ayob, Azizon Salleh, and Ameer Bukhorie Ali. 2025. "Keselamatan Makanan dalam Perspektif Islam: Analisis Berdasarkan Istilah *Tayyiba* dalam al-Qur'an." *Journal of Islamic, Social, Economics and Development* 10 (76): 1059–1074. <https://doi.org/10.55573/JISED.107680>.
20. Shen, Cong, Mingxia Wei, and Yilong Sheng. 2021. "A Bibliometric Analysis of Food Safety Governance Research from 1999 to 2019." *Food Science & Nutrition* 9 (4): 2316–2334. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fsn3.2220>.
21. Sidarto, Larissa P., and Aditya Hamka. 2021. "Improving Halal Traceability Process in the Poultry Industry Utilizing Blockchain Technology: Use Case in Indonesia." *Frontiers in Blockchain* 4: 612898. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fbloc.2021.612898>.
22. Susilowati, Indah, Aini Nur Furoida, and Cici Musliha. 2024. "Effectiveness of Food Safety for Halal Industry in Indonesia." *International Food Research Journal* 31 (2): 320–330. <https://doi.org/10.47836/ifrj.31.2.04>.
23. Wahyuni, Hana Catur, Ilyas Masudin, and Titis Wulandari. 2024. "Analysis of Interplay between Food Safety Systems and Halal Standards in Indonesia." *International Food Research Journal* 31 (2): 306–319. <https://doi.org/10.47836/ifrj.31.2.03>.