



Singapore Haze 2026 - Risk Intelligence Report

GENERATED

23 October 2026

Singapore Haze 2026 - Risk Intelligence Report

TLP:CLEAR · Risk Intelligence / Social Media Intelligence

Executive Summary

This report examines how the 2026 haze affecting Singapore has developed from an environmental and public-health disruption into a wider debate about corporate accountability, government enforcement and cross-border responsibility. It brings together reported business impacts, official responses and selected online discussions to assess the legal, reputational, socio-political and geopolitical implications for Singapore businesses and organizations. Particular attention is given to Singapore–Indonesia relations and businesses with Indonesian operations or supply-chain links, while distinguishing established facts, disputed claims and potential longer-term effects.

Key judgment: MEDIUM confidence: The 2026 haze has produced reported business and health disruption in Singapore while becoming a wider debate about corporate accountability, government effectiveness and cross-border responsibility. Its commercial and reputational implications may persist after local air quality improves.

- **Disruption is evident, but uneven.** Reported examples include reduced F&B business, outdoor-worker irritation, 16 Seletar flight diversions during 5–11 October and slower construction progress with contract-dependent relief. These are indicative accounts, not sector-wide losses or population health statistics. [31] [37] [33]
- **Scrutiny extends from concessions to corporate relationships.** NEA identified ten Indonesian concession-holding companies for preventive notices, while Minister Shanmugam outlined wider legal, regulatory and economic avenues. Businesses with Indonesian assets or supply chains face location- and control-specific exposure; commercial links and notices do not themselves establish liability. APP-related certification restrictions illustrate consequences outside criminal prosecution. [5] [6] [7]

- **The online debate centres on whether action will deliver results.** Reviewed discussions include demands for prosecution and transparency, support for available measures, and concern about enforcement constraints. The PM.Haze/SG Climate Rally petition translates those concerns into demands for stronger enforcement and more accessible civil claims. Selected audience samples are not representative national opinion. [\[34\]](#)
- **Lutfi's commentary broadens the reputational stakes.** His allegations connect environmental harm to Singapore's corporate and financial role. GIC and Temasek rejected his separate MSCI allegations; former Indonesian deputy foreign minister Dino Patti Djalal also challenged that framing. Disputed claims may spill into perceptions of institutional integrity, but neither acceptance of misinformation nor a sustained change in public trust is demonstrated. [\[26\]](#) [\[40\]](#)
- **Cooperation and friction coexist.** Indonesia's prevention and assistance announcements sit alongside contentious rhetoric; Singapore's stated determination does not establish completed sanctions. The evidence supports scrutiny of implementation and accountability, not a forecast of broad bilateral commercial retaliation. [\[6\]](#)

Overall implication: Physical exposure, legal liability and reputational responsibility should be assessed separately. This season's debate may shape expectations of future responses, but stronger public sentiment than in 2015, organization-specific losses and future enforcement outcomes remain unestablished.

How to read confidence levels

- **HIGH:** Strong, directly relevant evidence from reliable sources supports the finding, with corroboration where needed and few material gaps or unresolved contradictions. Confidence in a reported statement or measurement does not establish that every underlying allegation is true.
- **MEDIUM:** Relevant evidence supports a reasonable assessment, but coverage gaps, limited corroboration or plausible alternative explanations constrain certainty. Further evidence could materially refine the finding.
- **LOW:** Evidence is sparse, indirect, weakly corroborated or materially conflicting. The assessment is tentative and should not be used alone for consequential decisions. An unverified allegation is not treated as established fact merely by assigning it low confidence.

Confidence labels are not numerical probabilities or guarantees. Where evidence is insufficient to support a conclusion, the report states that the question remains unresolved.

Situation Overview and Haze Timeline

1. **Smoke sources and climate conditions:** Fires in Sumatra and Kalimantan, Indonesia, have generated regional haze. NEA identified concessions held by ten companies as potential sources of smoke reaching Singapore:
 - **Sumatra: named 16 October:** PT Bumi Andalas Permai; PT Bumi Mekar Hijau; PT Paramitra Mulia Langgeng; PT Sumatera Alam Anugerah; PT SBA Wood Industries; PT Hutan Lestari Raya; PT Bangkanesia. [30]
 - **Kalimantan: added 19 October:** PT Buana Megatama Jaya; PT Mananjung Hayak; PT Baratama Putra Perkasa. [5]

El Niño has intensified dry conditions and complicated fire containment. Parts of Sumatra and Kalimantan have recorded Unhealthy to Hazardous air quality, with smoke spreading across borders. [10] [11]
2. **4 September: daily advisories begin:** Central Singapore's PSI entered the Unhealthy range; NEA began publishing daily haze advisories that evening. [2]
3. **October reporting: business and health disruption:**
 - F&B operators reported fewer customers and cancellations; one Boat Quay restaurant cited a **60% decline since the haze began**. A delivery rider reported throat and eye irritation but continued working to avoid lost income. [31]
 - **16 flights were diverted from Seletar during 5–11 October** because of reduced visibility, according to CAAS and Changi Airport Group. [37]
 - Construction reporting on **21 October** described slower progress since early September. Time extensions depended on contractual conditions and did not automatically permit recovery of additional costs. [33]
4. **16–19 October: preventive notices under THPA:** At her **16 October press conference**, Minister Grace Fu outlined protective measures, warned of fluctuating air quality and described assistance offered to Indonesia. NEA sent preventive notices to seven companies that day and announced three more on **19 October**, requiring fire suppression, cessation of burning and response plans. [4] [5]
5. **19 October: wider accountability measures:** Minister Shanmugam described legal, regulatory and economic avenues for pursuing corporate groups, including financing, investor standing and possible legislative changes. He criticized the "oxygen" remarks while welcoming Prabowo's measures. [6] [22]

Indonesia's response: Authorities warned of permit revocations in August. On **10 October**, communications-agency head Syahganda Nainggolan responded to regional criticism with “oxygen” remarks and described fires as natural. By **19 October**, reporting documented Prabowo’s approval of foreign assistance and prevention directives. [\[21\]](#) [\[6\]](#)

Who Can Influence the Fires, and Through Which Mechanisms?

Companies should assess the haze through the stakeholders who can change their exposure, obligations and operating environment. Land managers and suppliers influence prevention and response; authorities shape protective guidance and enforcement; financiers, buyers and civil society can affect commercial confidence and accountability expectations. Managing this changing situation requires clear engagement responsibilities, verified information and regular reassessment, while keeping immediate continuity decisions separate from unresolved questions of liability.

Actor	Mechanism	Constraint / evidence	Business relevance
Indonesia: national and local authorities	Permit enforcement, land-management oversight, prevention and firefighting; acceptance of assistance.	Warnings and directives are reported, but effectiveness depends on implementation and capacity. Mongabay’s historical reporting identifies difficulty recovering court-ordered penalties. [6] [13]	Check site-level compliance and actual response, not policy headlines alone.
Singapore: NEA and domestic agencies	Air-quality guidance, employer/public-health protection, THPA investigation and PMNs.	Foreign conduct can fall within statutory reach, while overseas records, control and evidence remain practical constraints. [5] [12] [14]	Immediate health controls and preservation of records are distinct from prosecution risk.
Singapore corporate/financial institutions	Announced consideration of wider corporate, financial, listing and incentive levers; certification assurance.	Not all announced levers have been implemented. Certification restriction is a reported current action, not a conviction. [6] [7]	Commercial confidence and disclosures may be scrutinized before legal proceedings finish.
Companies and land managers	Fire prevention, suppression, operational oversight and reporting plans.	Which entity controls relevant land/operations must be established. PMN requests specify actions, not proof of deliberate ignition. [5]	Know control and escalation responsibilities; obtain credible response evidence from affected suppliers.

Buyers, communities and civil society	Procurement choices, transparency demands, public pressure and litigation.	Advocacy can change expectations, but its company-level allegations need verification. [18]	Be prepared to explain traceability, checks and remediation without overclaiming.
---------------------------------------	--	---	---

Socio-political risk: MEDIUM confidence: When institutions announce strong action, the gap between public expectations and demonstrable outcomes becomes reputationally important. Explaining procedural and legal limits is necessary, but is less credible if it is not paired with visible preventive and protective action.

Social media makes this gap more visible: official statements, personal experiences and allegations can circulate rapidly and attract scrutiny beyond the immediately affected communities. The reviewed haze discussion includes demands for stronger action and corporate accountability, alongside disagreement over what governments can realistically enforce. For companies, this means operational and compliance responses also need a credible public explanation, one that distinguishes verified actions, unresolved questions and results still to be delivered.

Geopolitical risk: MEDIUM confidence: The current evidence shows friction over blame alongside cooperation. Shanmugam criticized the oxygen remarks but welcomed Prabowo's measures and foreign-assistance approval. That supports monitoring of diplomatic rhetoric, not an assumption of broad bilateral commercial retaliation. Malaysia/ASEAN matter chiefly as regional haze and cooperation context in this report. [\[6\]](#) [\[11\]](#)

Beyond official exchanges, commentary by public figures has introduced further points of contention. Claims about corporate privilege, unequal enforcement and Singapore's role as a financial centre can turn a debate about fire prevention into one about national responsibility and institutional integrity. The following section examines these claims, the responses they generated and their potential reputational and diplomatic implications.

Priority Actors, Public Discourse and Audience Evidence

Source audit: 23 October 2026 (SGT). Collection windows retained from the 22 October check: 1 September–22 October; 8–22 October; 15–22 October. Physical-situation findings retain their 21 October cutoff; the later source audit does not refresh air-quality measurements.

1. Since September: concern, disruption and demands for accountability

The reviewed online discussion is predominantly critical of the haze and concerned with its health, everyday-life and governance consequences. It is not a representative measure of general public opinion. The two completed haze audience analyses linked below (covering 4,100 and 4,332 comments on selected posts across platforms and countries) describe frustration over smoke, health risks, constrained outdoor activity and recurring fires, alongside demands for action and corporate accountability. This is evident in publisher posts, videos and netizen comments; the publishers' framing and the audiences' reactions are considered separately.

Two completed, broader audience analyses support the negative/accountability reading, but cannot be treated as a continuous September-to-today sentiment series. One contains 4,100 comments and the other 4,332, covering selected posts across platforms and countries. They overlap and are not added together. The three-video Lutfi sample has a nearly balanced positive and negative split: 336 positive, 322 negative and 148 neutral comments. These generic categories describe reactions within that selected audience; they do not measure agreement with every allegation or a change in general attitudes toward haze.

Held analysis / coverage	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Interpretation and limits
Broader haze sample: 4,100 comments; 16 source entries.	498	2,450	1,152	Selected mixed-platform/country audience. Analysis [35]
Broader haze sample: 4,332 comments; 20 source entries.	461	2,674	1,197	Overlaps the first sample; not pooled. Analysis [36]
Lutfi three-video sample: 806 classified comments.	336	322	148	Selected Instagram audience; generic sentiment, not government approval. Analysis

2. Past two weeks: reactions to ministerial statements focus on credibility and enforcement

Recent ministerial statements have brought corporate accountability and enforcement into sharper focus in the online haze debate. Minister Grace Fu outlined protective measures and announced preventive notices on 16 October. On 19

October, Minister Shanmugam described wider avenues for pursuing corporate groups, including legal investigations, possible legislative changes, regulatory scrutiny and economic pressure through financing, investor standing and incentives. Responses in the reviewed Singapore-focused discussions question whether these measures will produce meaningful outcomes, while others support using the available tools or emphasize practical enforcement constraints. The statements describe intended action, not completed sanctions; the evidence does not establish a measurable shift in public sentiment. [6] [22]

Sentiment Themes:

- **Demand for more than notices:** commentary questions whether letters and preventive notices are sufficient, asks who controls concessions, and calls for meaningful accountability.
- **Support for trying available measures:** @ka.cang541 responds to Lutfi: “Change has to start somewhere” and rejects the implication that Singapore should do nothing. This is an individual pro-action response, not a measured Singaporean majority. [29]
- **Practical-enforcement counterargument:** the previously collected r/singapore comment by @chemicalboom questions whether Singapore lacks the ability, not the desire, to prosecute. This counters a simple narrative of government unwillingness. [24]

Petition for concrete action: A Change.org petition co-organised by PM.Haze and SG Climate Rally displayed **2,187 verified signatures** when checked on 23 October 2026 (SGT). It calls on the Singapore Government to investigate and prosecute companies causing the haze, provide updates on previous and ongoing investigations, and strengthen enforcement of the Transboundary Haze Pollution Act. It also proposes reforms to make civil claims more accessible, including explicit provision for group claims. Supporters are also encouraged to write to their MPs and ministers using campaign templates to request action. These are the petition’s demands, not a finding that the Act currently excludes civil claims; signatures indicate participation in this campaign, not representative public opinion. [34]

Assessment: MEDIUM confidence: the reputational challenge is the gap between announced determination and visible outcomes. Businesses can face parallel demands to demonstrate control, traceability and action rather than offer reassurance alone. These are reactions in Singapore-focused spaces and relevant post threads;

commenter nationality has not been verified, so they should not be labeled collectively as “Singaporean netizens.”

3. Past week: Lutfi’s commentary, corporate accountability and reputational spillover

The past week has seen additional public figures enter the online haze debate. Former Indonesian trade minister **Muhammad Lutfi** posted Instagram videos addressing Singapore’s public and leaders, challenging them to prosecute corporations linked to the concessions identified by NEA rather than rely on preventive notices.

Lutfi frames the haze as a question of **who benefits economically and who bears the environmental costs**. He alleges that Indonesian corporate groups benefit from Singapore-based headquarters, holding structures and tax incentives while harmful activities take place in Indonesia. He also questions whether Singapore’s administration applies the law equally, contrasting its treatment of ordinary citizens with that of wealthy corporate owners and family offices.

These allegations extend the discussion beyond environmental enforcement into the credibility of Singapore’s institutions and its role as a regional financial centre. His confrontational language and direct appeals to Singaporeans make the content attention-grabbing. His former ministerial position may lend perceived authority to his statements, **but does not substantiate the allegations or establish that his purpose was to gain followers or social influence**. [\[15\]](#)

Audience responses: support, national responsibility and disagreement

The currently retrieved analysis of the three-video sample contains **806 classified comments: 336 positive, 322 negative and 148 neutral**. Its leading selected Volume themes include:

Platform-assigned theme	Comments
Support for Lutfi as a clearer and more patriotic public voice	255
Indonesia bears primary legal and regulatory responsibility	84
Nationalist resistance to Singapore and foreign economic influence	70
Blame-shifting criticism of the Indonesian government	52

The responses therefore include support for Lutfi alongside disagreement over responsibility and his framing of the issue. They suggest that audiences are interpreting the haze through questions of national accountability and political credibility, not only air quality.

These are generic sentiment labels and selected themes from a particular Instagram audience. They do not measure agreement with every allegation, trust in Singapore's government, or representative Singaporean or Indonesian opinion. [19]

The MSCI allegations broaden the dispute

Lutfi also alleged that **GIC and Temasek pressured MSCI over Indonesia's market classification**, suggesting that Singapore's state investors could benefit from lower Indonesian asset prices. This is a separate financial-market allegation, not evidence of responsibility for the haze.

MSCI's own announcement confirms that it was consulting on **proposed reclassification from emerging to standalone market status**, not announcing a completed downgrade. CNA and Bloomberg reported on **21 October** that GIC and Temasek rejected Lutfi's allegations; Temasek described them as "**patently untrue**." The denials are attributed through that reporting rather than independently retrieved fund-issued statements. [38] [26] [39]

Responses beyond Lutfi's own audience

Respondent	Response	Significance
Bertha Henson, Facebook	Her post, " <i>When you live in a glass house, you shouldn't throw stones</i> ," directly challenges Lutfi's haze commentary. She acknowledges Singapore-linked corporate interests and supports financial leverage, while arguing that Indonesian authorities retain responsibility for land, permits, enforcement and fire response.	Criticism of Lutfi coexists with calls for Singapore to act. Her factual allegations remain attributed claims, not independently verified findings. [25]
GIC and Temasek	Rejected allegations that they pressured MSCI over Indonesia's market classification.	The controversy reaches Singapore's financial reputation, beyond the haze dispute itself. [26]
@singapoor.reports, TikTok	Described Lutfi's commentary as "cheap social media drama" and contrasted it with families' exposure in Sumatra and Kalimantan.	Documents critical commentary outside his Instagram threads, but does not establish its prevalence or reach. [28]

Dino Patti Djalal, via CNA Instagram	Indonesia's former deputy foreign minister rejects Lutfi's allegations that Singapore influenced MSCI to destabilise Indonesia's market. He points to bilateral cooperation and Singapore's interest in Indonesian stability.	Documents Indonesian counter-commentary to the separate MSCI dispute, not a direct rebuttal of haze accusations. The reel identifies him as former deputy foreign minister, not foreign minister. [40]
---	---	--

Audience response to the CNA rebuttal reel

The completed analysis contains **482 classified comments: 56 positive, 344 negative and 82 neutral**. Generic negative sentiment does not mean opposition to Djalal: the leading Volume themes criticise perceived scapegoating of Singapore (88 comments), portray Lutfi and Prabowo as incompetent or politically motivated (81), attribute market risk to Indonesian governance/market weaknesses (36), reject Singapore market-sabotage allegations on economic-interest grounds (36), and describe Djalal as a voice of reason (34). These are audience characterisations, not verified political or legal findings. [\[40\]](#)

The source reports 488 comments, with six spam/promotional items excluded from classification; analysis coverage is 99.8%, with no failed batches. This selected Instagram audience is not representative public opinion, nationality is unverified, and its counts are not pooled with earlier samples. The retrieved transcript has rendering errors, so the minister's remarks are paraphrased rather than quoted as verified original-language speech.

Implications for public trust and businesses

Misinformation and reputational risk: MEDIUM confidence: Repeated allegations about corporate privilege, unequal enforcement and cross-border profiteering may leave reputational impressions even after rebuttals. Audiences could conflate disputed claims with established haze facts, interpreting the crisis through broader concerns about fairness and whose interests institutions protect. This is a potential risk, not evidence that audiences accepted the allegations or that Lutfi intended to mislead them.

At the same time, **official denials of particular allegations do not resolve every legitimate question about ownership, prevention, enforcement or corporate accountability**. Criticism of Lutfi can coexist with dissatisfaction over Singapore's enforcement record. For governments and affected businesses, explanations of verified exposure, operational control, actions taken and results remain important to credibility.

A longer-term contribution to social discontent is plausible, but **not demonstrated by the current evidence**. Establishing that connection would require evidence showing how haze-related grievances interact with wider economic and political concerns over time. The reviewed material does not support attributing a quantified follower increase to these videos or concluding that they produced a sustained change in public opinion.

Section coverage: purposive corpus searches and selected complete reports, not an exhaustive public-opinion survey. The two recent lexical samples returned 100 of 638 and 100 of 705 matching rows; September returned two and early October 11. Selected responses were checked with targeted follow-ups. Reports overlap and are not pooled. Source and attribution qualifications are consolidated under Information Gaps & Limitations.

Historical Comparison: What Has, and Has Not, Changed

Supported comparison: The 2015 precedent already included retailer withdrawals of APP-linked products and a procurement campaign, according to CNA. Therefore commercial leverage is not wholly new in 2026. What is newly prominent in current announcements is the explicit emphasis on corporate groups, ultimate controllers and multiple legal/regulatory/economic levers. Whether that produces materially different outcomes remains open. [7]

Future expectations: MEDIUM confidence: The current debate may shape expectations for how governments and companies respond to future haze episodes, particularly around meaningful action and corporate accountability. This is a forward-looking assessment, not evidence that public opinion has already changed relative to 2015.

Assessment

The haze has affected citizens' lives and businesses, while also becoming a trigger for wider socio-political and geopolitical discourse. Debate over corporate responsibility, enforcement and national accountability can persist beyond the immediate pollution episode. Notices, supplier scrutiny, certification and public expectations may remain unresolved after local air quality improves.

Exposure / impact	Severity and likelihood: qualitative assessment	Trajectory / confidence
-------------------	---	-------------------------

Singapore workforce and outdoor continuity	Material for prolonged/strenuous outdoor work and vulnerable people; near-term smoke exposure is established, but actual business disruption depends on activities and controls.	Variable over hours/days. HIGH confidence in the hazard; MEDIUM in generic business implications.
Indonesian asset and supply interruption	Potentially high near active fires or critical concentrated suppliers; likelihood cannot be assigned without locations and dependency data.	Can remain elevated after Singapore improves. MEDIUM on geographic screening; organization-specific exposure unresolved.
Legal and compliance scrutiny	Consequences can be material for relevant entities. Exposure is case-specific; prosecution probability is not estimated.	Announced scrutiny is expanding, but legal outcomes remain unknown. HIGH on announcements; MEDIUM on interpretation.
Commercial/ESG and reputation	Certification and stakeholder pressure are credible channels; APP-related certification restrictions are reported. Wider financial loss is unquantified.	May outlast the episode; depends on response quality and verification. MEDIUM confidence.
Bilateral commercial disruption	No broad retaliatory trade/investment measure is established by reviewed evidence. Rhetoric alone does not justify a high-impact forecast.	Watch cooperation and concrete measures separately. MEDIUM confidence in this bounded assessment.

Economic impact should be described through exposure pathways, not an invented national loss estimate: reduced outdoor productivity, activity reconfiguration, protective equipment and facilities expenditure, potential supplier interruption and certification/procurement consequences. These are assessed channels, not measured 2026 losses. Health effects and unequal ability to avoid exposure make workforce and public-facing decisions socially consequential as well as operational.

Information Gaps & Limitations

- **Coverage:** the chronology is milestone-based; it is not a complete daily exposure or fire series. The selected online samples are mixed-platform/country, overlap, and are not representative public-opinion surveys. Sparse September evidence cannot establish a continuous trend or stronger reaction than in 2015. Commenter nationality is unverified; Reddit comment engagement is not measured.
- **Attribution:** notices identify concession-related potential smoke sources, not guilt. Corporate control, causal responsibility and organization-specific asset/supplier exposure were not independently audited. Advocacy, political statements and Bertha Henson's factual allegations remain attributed claims.

- **Legal scope and outcomes:** THPA jurisdiction and civil-claim provisions were checked; this is not a complete case-law or Indonesian-law review and not legal advice. No national 2026 loss estimate, future enforcement outcome or proven misinformation effect is established yet.

Sources

1. [NEA: Haze Situation Update, 21 October 2026](#). Primary; current readings and next-day forecast.
2. [CNA: Daily haze advisories begin, 4 September 2026](#). Reporting; earlier Singapore milestone. Dynamic live air-quality widget is not the article's publication-time measurement.
4. [MSE: Grace Fu haze press conference, 16 October 2026](#). Primary; outlook, health response, assistance and notices.
5. [NEA: Additional THPA notices, 19 October 2026](#). Primary; additional companies and notice requirements.
6. [CNA: Shanmugam response and Indonesian measures, 19 October; updated 20 October](#). Attributed reporting; diplomatic and policy framing.
7. [CNA: APP green-certification restrictions, 19 October 2026](#). Reporting; current commercial action and 2015 precedent.
10. [NOAA CPC: ENSO diagnostic dated 8 October 2026](#). Primary climate assessment; live page can change.
11. [ASMC: Regional haze situation, 21 October 2026 and seasonal outlook](#). Primary regional observations/forecast.
12. [Singapore Statutes Online: Transboundary Haze Pollution Act 2014](#). Primary statute; jurisdiction/control and sections 6–7 on civil liability/defences checked. THPA already provides civil claims; petition proposals seek stronger enforcement and easier group claims.
13. [Mongabay: Collection of Indonesian fire penalties, 19 August 2025](#). Investigative

context, not a current official ledger.

14. [MOM: Protecting employees from haze, updated 20 October 2026](#). Official workplace guidance.
15. [@m.lutfi: Initial video 1, 19 October 2026](#). Collected caption/transcript; allegations require verification. [Account](#).
16. [@m.lutfi: Initial video 2, 19 October 2026](#). Collected caption/transcript.
17. [@m.lutfi: Initial video 3, 19 October 2026](#). Collected caption and completed report media appendix.
18. [Greenpeace Indonesia: Banks and courts must act, 21 October 2026](#). Advocacy statement; contains links to its fact sheet, financing research and litigation claims. Those underlying datasets/judgments were not audited here.
19. [Completed platform analysis: initial three Lutfi Instagram videos](#). Volume-ranked themes and media appendix; current retrieval: 806 classified comments (336 positive / 322 negative / 148 neutral). Both benchmark and Volume variants agree; source table has a separate 807-comment count and the report identifies one excluded spam item. Generic sentiment, not a government-efficacy codebook.
21. [CNA: Indonesia permit-revocation warnings, 26 August 2026](#). Reporting; warning versus implementation distinction.
22. [@kshanmugam_: 19 October policy-response reel](#). Collected caption; [account](#).
23. [@gracefu.hy: 19 October haze post](#). Collected caption; [account](#).
24. [Reddit: chemicalboom comment, 19 October 2026](#). Illustrative opposing view; [account](#); engagement not measured.
25. [Bertha Henson: When you live in a glass house, you shouldn't throw stones, Facebook](#). User-supplied screenshots dated 22 October 2026 provide the expanded post and selected reader comments. Exact publication time and individual comment links are unavailable; the comments are illustrative, not representative. Factual allegations remain attributed claims.

26. [CNA: GIC and Temasek reject Lutfi's MSCI allegations, 21 October 2026](#). Attributed institutional responses; separate market dispute.
28. [@singapoor.reports: response to Lutfi, TikTok](#). Collected publisher commentary.
29. [@ka.cang541: pro-action response, Instagram](#). Individual comment; nationality unverified.
30. [NEA: Notices under THPA, 16 October 2026](#). Primary; seven named concession holders and preventive requirements. Retrieved in this revision.
31. [CNA: Businesses and outdoor workers affected by haze, 14 October 2026](#). Attributed F&B impact and delivery-rider symptom/income accounts.
32. [CNBC: Singapore haze and enterprise responses, 16 October 2026](#). Reports 16 Seletar diversions, citing Changi Airport Group/CAAS; occurrence dates unspecified.
33. [The Straits Times: Builders protect workers as haze delays projects](#). Published 21 October 2026, 1pm SGT; updated 5:13pm. Original reporting checked; Yahoo version is syndication. Contract-dependent extensions and separate cost-recovery conditions.
34. [Change.org: Investigate and prosecute companies causing haze](#). Campaign co-organised by PM.Haze and SG Climate Rally. Page displayed 2,187 verified signatures when checked on 23 October 2026 (SGT); count may change. Primary evidence of campaign demands and displayed participation, not proof of underlying legal or corporate allegations.
35. [Broader haze audience analysis: 4,100 comments](#). Volume view; 498 positive, 2,450 negative, 1,152 neutral; 16 source entries; 98.4% platform analysis coverage. Overlaps the other broader sample.
36. [Broader haze audience analysis: 4,332 comments](#). Volume view; 461 positive, 2,674 negative, 1,197 neutral; 20 source entries; 98.8% platform analysis coverage. Not a representative survey.
37. [CNA: 16 Seletar diversions during 5–11 October](#). Reports CAAS/CAG joint response on 13 October 2026; precise period replaces earlier undated CNBC summary.

38. [MSCI: Consultation on Indonesia reclassification](#). Primary announcement 15 October 2026, 8:40pm GMT (16 October, 4:40am SGT). Feedback to 30 April 2027; decision by 30 June 2027.
39. [Bloomberg: Temasek and GIC deny instigating Indonesian stock rout](#). 21 October 2026; corroborates attributed institutional denials.
40. [CNA Instagram: Dino Patti Djalal response to Lutfi's MSCI allegations](#). Video and comments retrieved in completed analysis. Former deputy foreign minister; exact publication date not supplied. 482 classified comments; source count 488 with six excluded spam items. [Completed analysis](#).

Physical-situation sources collected 21 October 2026; audience-section evidence supplemented 22 October and source audit completed 23 October 2026. Report prepared for analyst review. This report supersedes the research-pack presentation at this path; supporting memos are not alternative final reports.