METHODOLOGY FOR CONSUMER INVOLVEMENT REVIEW IN FOOD SAFETY AND QUALITY
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I. INTRODUCTION

The rapid pace of change in science and technology, changes in legislation and the current socio-economic and socio demographic realities have all had a marked impact on the food we buy today.\(^1\) Consumer feels more concerned with food quality and safety, demanding more transparency in the food-chain and more information on the diverse qualitative characteristics of foods (e.g. nutritious value, origin, way of production, etc.). In order to be able to represent and protect rights of consumers in the area of food safety and quality, CSO’s in Montenegro need to understand the cues, criteria, reasons and sources which consumers use to evaluate food quality as well as the sources of food risk.

This methodology was prepared in order to enable civil society organizations working with consumers in Montenegro to be involved in food safety and quality review legislation.

Monitoring of markets is essential precondition for implementation of successful economic policies, civil society organizations play a vital role in this process. In order to be effectively involved in food and safety and quality review legislation consumerCSO’s in Montenegro need to have and be able to interpret and present evidence based data that would be strong and efficient prove helping to impact food safety and quality regulation in Montenegro. This methodology will focus on providing tips for CSO’s in Montenegro on collecting, interpreting and presenting evidence based tools, participating in research models that may be used for wide range of monitoring (regulatory process and performance of certain markets).

This methodology will allow to involve consumers’ in the regulatory process in the field of food safety and quality in Montenegro using such evidence based tools as sociological researches, focus groups, analysis of consumer complaints, good practices of other countries, etc. The abovementioned tools will help consumer associations to present objective arguments why legislation of food safety and quality in Montenegro should be reviewed.

This methodology present examples and suggestions for CSO’s in Montenegro to be involved in review of legislation on food safety and quality. After introduction section, ways for CSO’s to collect evidence based data in order to be able to impact legislation on food safety and quality is presented. Methodology shortly presents how to analyse legislation on food safety and quality and make suggestions for revision or adoption of new legislation, explains how to gather information from national and international databases on food risks in order to use it in discussions with government institution, awareness raising for general public in Montenegro, review of the food safety and quality legislation. Suggestions in methodology are based on international researches and data in the area of food safety and quality as well as good practice examples in other countries.

II. COLLECTING EVIDENCE BASED DATA: CONSUMERS FOOD CHOICE AND QUALITY PERCEPTION

Collecting evidence based tools will provide insights to CSO’s in Montenegro into how consumers perceive food safety and quality and why they choose the food products they do, and may thus help in understanding the complicated concept of food safety and quality as well as use this data in advocating for changes in food safety and quality regulation in Montenegro. Different factors take place when consumers evaluate food safety and food quality, both of them can be analysed in collecting evidence – based tools. Numerous tools can be used in collecting evidence – based data on food safety and quality. This methodology will mainly analyse methods of using focus groups, desk research, sociological surveys, that are the most suitable for the CSO’s and require less human resources and less funds than big researches and scientific analysis.

2.1 Measuring consumers perception of food safety and quality

In order for CSO’s to involve consumers in food safety and quality review, they perception of various target groups on the subject should be measured. The food choice process is a complex preferences function of sensorial characteristics, non-sensorial factors, including expectations and attitudes, health aspects, price, ethical considerations and inner state. Diverse methodologies have been developed to analyse consumer behaviour related to food choice. Most of them assume quality as a multidimensional concept, i.e., quality is perceived by combining a number of quality dimensions or characteristics of the product.

Methods for measuring perception of food quality. Food quality is the most important factor that influence consumer’s decision to buy one or another food product.² There have been a few attempts to integrate the different philosophies into a unified framework for analysing the food quality perception process, one of the most notable cases being the model proposed by Grunert et al. (1996), the Total Food Quality Model (TFQM). According to the Total Food Quality Model (TFQM), food quality evaluation in focus group should be distinguished into between ‘before’ and ‘after’ purchase evaluations. Many characteristics of a food product cannot be ascertained before purchase, i.e., most food products have only search characteristics to a limited degree. In order to make a choice, the consumer will develop expectations about quality – but it is only after consumption that experienced quality can be determined (and even this is limited in the case of credence characteristics). The distinction between before and after purchase thus forms the basis of the Total Food Quality Model. There are four basic dimensions of food quality in Total Food Quality Model, that could be analysed in focus groups with consumers – taste, health, convenience, process – and the price dimension.³ For most people, food is, and has always been, a matter of pleasure. The hedonic

² Eurobarometer 238 “Risk issues”, 2006
³ Consumers’ food choice and quality perception, Karen Brunso Thomas Ahle Fjord Klaus G. Grunert (The Aarhus School of Business, 2002)
characteristics of food – primarily taste, but also appearance and smell – thus constitute a central dimension of quality for consumers.

Health is a quality dimension that has become very important to many consumers, and a number of studies indicate that, today, health is as important as taste. This includes functional qualities of foods, but consumers are also concerned about safety and risk-related issues.

**Methods for measuring perception of food safety.** Food safety is an essential public health issue for all countries. Foodborne diseases not only significantly affect people's health and well-being, but they also have economic consequences for individuals, families, communities, businesses and countries. These diseases impose a substantial burden on healthcare systems and markedly reduce economic productivity. Unfortunately in EU only 8 percent of consumers name food safety as a factor in their decision to buy one or the other product. Health-related qualities are mostly credence characteristics, since the consequences for one’s health of eating a specific food is a matter of trust, and can seldom be ascertained after consumption. Usually the most common food safety practice among consumers is reading expiration dates, food poisoning is the most frequent food safety concern. A food safety knowledge survey instrument (Byrd-Bredbenner et al, 2010 and Byrd-Bredbenner et al, 2007) as well as Food safety knowledge questionnaire could be used for surveys and focus groups on food safety.

Consumers also have attached increasing importance to the way food is produced, i.e. the production process has become a dimension of quality, even when it has no immediate bearing on the taste or healthiness of the product. This quality dimension covers organic production, production that takes animal welfare into consideration, and production without the use of GMOs.

Finally, another factor of increasing importance to consumers is convenience. From a consumer point of view, convenience is much more than just eases of purchase or quick consumption. Convenience means the saving of time, physical or mental energy at one or more stages of the overall meal process: planning and shopping, storage and preparation of products, consumption, and the cleaning up and disposal of leftovers.

Given the broad nature of the Total Food Quality Model, the entire range of social science methods can be applied when using it. Focus groups have been widely used to obtain a basic understanding of dimensions of quality, relevant quality cues, purchase motives, shopping situations, eating situations and ways of preparing meals. Focus groups can be implemented selecting different consumer segments, testing consumer perception of different food products. To start with focus group food products must be selected.

**Focus group example: vulnerable groups**

Food mishandling is more acute in some consumer groups than in others. Specifically, young adults, men, and individuals with education beyond high school (Williamson and others 1992; Fein and others 1995; Klontz and others 1995; Food Safety and Inspection Service and U.S. Dept. of Agriculture 1998b; Altekruse and others 1999) are more likely to engage in risky food handling than others. Although it is not known why these groups tend to have risky food handling behaviours, researchers hypothesize it may be due to lack of food safety education.

---

4 Assuring food safety and quality: guidelines for strengthening national food control systems (FAO)
5 Eurobarometer 238 “Risk issues”
Without appropriate, valid, and reliable measures and baseline data, it is difficult to develop and implement effective education efforts (Gronlund 1998; Contento and others 2002). Attention of the adults to the subject of food safety and quality can be drawn through their children, as children related issues are usually sensitized among various group of consumer as well as public institutions. Also according to previous studies (Bruhn & Schutz, 1999; Gettings & Kiernan, 2001; Redmond & Griffith, 2003; Shiferaw, Yang, & Cieslak, 2000), food safety knowledge tends to increase with age, practice, and urbanization. Very little is known about food safety knowledge, perceptions, and practices among younger children, since most health promotion campaigns have been targeted at middle school students, secondary school students, university students, and adults. The objectives of Healthy People 2020 include reducing infections in the general population caused by key pathogens commonly transmitted through food (Campylobacter, Shiga toxin producing E. coli (STEC) O157, Listeria monocytogenes, Salmonella, Vibrio, Yersinia). Children are at higher risk than other populations related to lower body weight, less acidic stomachs, under developed immune systems, and lack of control in food preparation.

Food safety knowledge of children was tested in a research in USA in 2010 (Food Safety Knowledge: Beliefs of Middle School Children). In this research focus group with middle school students were organized. For baseline youth interviews, middle school children in varying geographic regions (that is, Maine, New Jersey, Tennessee, Georgia, New Mexico) were recruited from schools and extracurricular youth groups. Prior to recruiting youth, permission was obtained from school administrators or youth group leaders. The recruitment materials described the focus group purpose (that is, explore middle schoolers’ food safety knowledge, beliefs, interests, and practices) and length (that is, 30 to 45 min) as well as compensation (that is, each participant received $15 or a T-shirt or movie gift certificate of similar value). The form of compensation varied to comply with the wishes of school administrators or youth group leaders and/or policies of these organizations. Informed consent letters signed by each youth’s parent or guardian were obtained. In addition, each youth gave his or her oral assent prior to participating in a focus group. Middle school students received these questions like: Do you think it is possible for food to make you sick? Is it possible for you to get sick from foods that you prepared? and etc. Full questionnaire and analysis of the questions for the focus groups are included in the research.

2.2 Desk research on food safety and quality

Conducting desk research can help CSO’s quickly and inexpensively find data on food safety and quality data from a wide variety of sources to answer many of the questions that have already been asked. The most important thing in preparing desk research is locating information. Sources of information:

---

- Google search engine. Phrases of search: “food safety and quality in Montenegro”, “perception of food safety in Montenegro”, “food poisoning in Montenegro” and etc.
- Professional sites: World Health Organisation (WHO).
- Media sources: e.g. cases of food poisoning in households, perception of consumers on food safety and quality.
- Researches and reports: EU (e.g.: screening report Montenegro).

III. ANALYSIS OF CONSUMER DISPUTES ON FOOD SAFETY AND QUALITY

Consumers are generally much less tolerant about health risks from food than about risks from tobacco or cars. Consumer concerns go well beyond basic food safety. The quality of food and how it is produced, animal welfare, the use of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), hormones, the environment and ethical and cultural differences all feature highly in the public debate. Governments have understandably come under intense pressure to ensure safe food at a minimum cost to consumers and industry. The trouble is that the complexity of the issues makes the right policy response difficult to identify, especially in the awkward cases where public opinion is strong and where convincing scientific evidence is in short supply. Nevertheless, governments are responding. Canada, France and New Zealand have established new food agencies with broad mandates for health, safety and inspection responsibilities. A similar agency has been proposed in the United Kingdom. The EU has legislated for the labelling of GMO products. Furthermore, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, an organisation which brings together some 40 European countries, has recommended a framework convention on food safety, setting up food safety agencies at the national and European level, strengthening legislation, improving health checks and increasing access to information. The difficulty is that consumer attitudes to risk and government approaches to food safety and quality vary significantly from country to country.  

Analysis of legal system of dispute resolution on food safety and quality

In order to make analysis of legal system CSO’s could draw attention to:
- **Reports of state institutions** that analyse consumer disputes;
- **Reports of NGO’s** that analyse and solve disputes of consumers, e.g. The European Consumer Centers (ECC) in the 28 EU Member States, Norway and Iceland. Aims of these centres is to provide free of charge help and advice to consumers on their cross-border purchases, whether online or on the spot within these 30 countries. ECC-Net is in direct contact with some 100 000 consumers every year and handles about 40 000 consumer complaints.

---

9 “Food safety: protection or protectionism?” Evdokia Moïsé, OECD Observer
Analysis of consumer complains would help to draw recommendations for amendment of legal acts on food safety and quality.

Example of consumer complaint: ‘I bought a seafood that are glowing, is it safe to eat?’
Example of an answer: Thank you for your question. Crabmeat, cooked shrimp and simulated seafood products made from surimi are the most common seafood associated with luminescence or glowing. When seafood glows it means that luminous bacteria are present. This suggests that the seafood was held for a time at a temperature that bacteria could grow. It does not mean the seafood is unsafe or of low quality. There are no reports of illness from luminous marine bacteria growing on seafood.10

IV. ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATION ON FOOD SAFETY AND QUALITY

The European Union’s (EU’s) food safety policy aims to ensure that EU citizens enjoy safe and nutritious food produced from healthy plants and animals, whilst enabling the food industry - Europe’s largest manufacturing and employment sector — to operate in the best possible conditions. National legal frameworks are a key pillar in an effective food control system. In all countries, food is governed by a complexity of laws and regulations which set out the government’s requirements to be met by food chain operators to ensure the food is safe and of adequate quality. Although food law is used in a singular term, it is recognised that in many countries more than one law may exist which contains provisions for ensuring safe and quality food production. CSO’s must analyse legislation on food safety and quality on national and international level in order to be able to make suggestions and review legal acts regulating the issue in Montenegro. This methodology suggests several steps to collect analyse and make suggestions for food laws in Montenegro:

- Information collection. Collection of information on food laws (title, coverage of sections dealing with food, date of enactment (amendments if any), agency responsible for implementation and control of the law) (see Annex 2);
- Review and analysis. Based on an analysis of the information collected, it will be possible to describe and critically examine the existing legislative and regulatory framework for food control. During this process, additional questions will become apparent, that could be resolved during focus groups with various stakeholders. (see Annex 3).
- Stakeholder analysis. Identify all the government agencies in the country that influence food legislation, as well as the stakeholders that are affected by food legislation. Stakeholders can exist at different levels (national, provincial, local). Visualize the relationships between the different stakeholders involved. Once all the potential stakeholders have been identified, discuss the specific mandate, roles and/or interests of each of these in food legislation using the table. (see Annex 4).

V. ANALYSIS OF FOOD RISKS

---

All foods carry an inherent degree of risk, whether produced conventionally or by alternative methods. As everyone needs food to survive we are forced to take risks every time we eat. People have learnt to avoid the obvious risks. For example cooking chicken and eggs reduces the risk of salmonella and vegetables are washed to ensure their cleanliness. Nowadays society has become more concerned about food related risks than ever before.

Food risk analysis should be seen as a structured decision-making system comprised of three highly interrelated components: risk management, risk assessment and risk communication. The role of „risk managers” is generally played by governmental food safety officials, who have the ultimate responsibility for selecting and implementing the most efficient food safety control measures. As high public trust in an organisation communicating food risk is seen one of the main factors for success, therefore CSO’s can play an important role in this field and raise awareness of society members. In order to implement food risk communication CSO’s should be able to identify target group of their messages (government officials, researches and scientist, society in general, parents, and etc.), create an appropriate message (clearly identify the problem and avoid any unnecessary details), avoid mentioning specific brands (if the risk is not linked to one specific brand or company), connect with media (hold press releases and involve journalists).

In order for CSO’s to be able to implement actions for risk communication to society they need to do desk researches on food risks in their country. There are several ways to gather data, this methodology will present ways of gathering data on food risk.

5.1 Use of RASF system

The EU has one of the highest food safety standards in the world. A key tool to ensure the cross-border follow of information to swiftly react when risks to public health are detected in the food chain is RASFF – the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed. Since 1979, RASFF enables information to be shared efficiently between its members and provides a round-the-clock service to ensure that urgent notifications are sent, received and responded to collectively and efficiently. The Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF) was put in place to provide food and feed control authorities with an effective tool to exchange information about measures taken responding to serious risks detected in relation to food or feed. This exchange of information helps Member States to act more rapidly and in a coordinated manner in response to a health threat caused by food or feed. More in-depth analysis of RASFF performance is available in annual reports.

11 (World Health Organization, 2010)
According to the seriousness of the risks identified and the distribution of the product on the market, the RASFF notification is classified after verification by the Commission contact point as alert, information or border rejection notification before the Commission contact point transmits it to all network members.

Types of notifications
In order to gather information for food risk communication CSO’s may use RASF Portal.\textsuperscript{12} Analysis of information in RASF portal may lead to identification of gaps in legal acts regulating food safety and quality, also gaps in implementation of the legal acts. Use of RASF is also explained in a short video.

5.2 Use of EFSA (European Food safety authority) information (science based analysis: health and nutrition claims, etc.)

EFSA is a European agency funded by the European Union that operates independently of the European legislative and executive institutions (Commission, Council, Parliament) and EU Member States.

Food and feed safety is one of the areas in which EFSA, as the risk assessor, that produces scientific opinions and advice that form the basis for European policies and legislation. EFSA also communicate food related risks, providing appropriate, accurate and timely information on food safety issues to raise awareness and explain the implications of scientific work. Scientific results cannot always be easily converted into simple guidelines and advice that non-scientists can understand. One of EFSA’s tasks, therefore, is to communicate clearly not only to its principal partners and stakeholders but also to the public at large, to help bridge the gap between science and the consumer. CSO’s can use information already prepared by EFSA\textsuperscript{13} in food risk communication to the members of general public in Montenegro. (e.g. what salmonella is and how to communicate this food risk to general public).

5.3 Using the national data (data from hospitals and etc.)

CSO’s are recommended to analyse national data on food safety and quality. There are several sources to use in the desk analysis:
- Data provided by official governmental bodies responsible for food safety and quality in Montenegro;
- Data provided by medical professionals on foodborne diseases and outbreaks;
- Data provided by the media sources. (e.g. in Lithuania in 2016 media published article on major salmonella risk in dumplings from a company that belongs to a member of Lithuanian Parliament, as a result of a huge public debate and findings of food testing these dumplings were eliminated from major shopping centers in Lithuania. Media played major role in risk communication).

\textsuperscript{12}RASF Portal: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/rasff-window/portal/?event=SearchForm&cleanSearch=1
\textsuperscript{13}EFSA’s Communications Director explains the art of effective risk communication: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3IHGshTDMCw
VI. PLAN OF IMPLEMENTATION OF METHODOLOGY

Preferential Methodology implementation plan might, but not necessarily have to, be based on following elements, methods of data collection presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of tool/measure</th>
<th>Relevance of measure to Montenegro context, distribution</th>
<th>Responsible person</th>
<th>Date of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Questionnaire for food inspectors and other relevant government representatives</td>
<td>Questionnaire aim to obtain views and insights from representatives, food inspectors and other relevant government representatives dealing with food safety and quality on existing food law regulations and standards. With this questionnaire we want to collect information on food laws, perception on food legislation from Government representatives (strengths and weaknesses), institutional framework of agencies whom dealing with implementation of existing laws. Questionnaire will be delivered to the target group of 10 representatives via e-mail address, directly to target persons, with possibilities to have interviews with some of representatives. Results will be presented on the CEZAPs official website, possible on press conference, newsletter, etc..</td>
<td>Željka Rajković, Danilo Mosurović</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Questionnaire for representatives of the food industry</td>
<td>By this questionnaire we tend to obtain views from representatives of the food industry (small and medium – sized enterprises) on the adequacy and performance of existing food legislations. Questionnaire will be delivered to Chamber of Commerce, after they</td>
<td>Željka Rajković</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will distribute questionnaire to 10 representatives of food enterprises involved in food production or processing for the domestic market and/or export via e-mail address. Results will be presented on the CEZAPs official website, possible on press conference, newsletter, etc...

| 3 | Survey for consumers | By this survey we tend to find out knowledge level of consumers about existing food law and their rights. Survey will be made by [www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com), will be filled by citizens, and it will be posted on CEZAPs official web page and Facebook page. Results will be presented on the CEZAPs official website, Facebook page, possible on press conference, newsletter, etc... | Danilo Mosurović | April 2017 |
VII. ANNEXES

Annex 1

Consumer segments

Generally, the processes of food choice and quality perception are characterised by individual differences. In order to take account of these differences, it is useful to distinguish between different consumer segments. Consumers can be categorized according to their different ways of shopping for food, ways of preparing meals, eating situations, ways of weighting quality dimensions and purchase motives for food, i.e. their food-related lifestyle, which can be defined as the general pattern of how consumers use food to fulfil basic motives or attain life values. Food-related lifestyle can be measured by means of a questionnaires tested for cross-culturally validity, for its ability to obtain results which can be compared even though respondents come from different countries, cultures, and language areas (Scholderer, Brunsø, Bredahl & Grunert, in press).

Extensive research on consumers’ food-related lifestyle in a number of European countries has established a number of basic food consumer segments which are described below together with general demographic characteristics:

- **The uninvolved food consumer.** Food is not a central element in the lives of these consumers. Consequently, their purchase motives for food are weak, and their interest in food quality is limited mostly to the convenience aspect. They are also uninterested in most aspects of shopping, don’t use specialty shops, and don’t read product information, limiting their exposure to and processing of food quality cues. Even their interest in price is limited. They have little interest in cooking, tend not to plan their meals, and snack a great deal. Compared to the average consumer, these consumers are single, young, have part- or full-time jobs, average to low-level incomes, and tend to live in big cities.

- **The careless food consumer.** In many ways, these consumers resemble the uninvolved food consumer, in the sense that food is not very important to them, and, with the exception of convenience, their interest in food quality is correspondingly low. The main difference is that these consumers are interested in novelty; they like new products and tend to buy them spontaneously, at least as long as they don’t require a great effort in the kitchen or new cooking skills. The careless food consumer is in general, as the uninvolved food consumer, young and often live in big cities. But in contrast to the uninvolved, these consumers are more educated and they lie in the upper income brackets.

- **The conservative food consumer.** For these consumers, the security and stability achieved by following traditional meal patterns is a major purchase motive. They are very interested in the taste and health aspects of food products, but are not particularly interested in convenience, since meals are prepared in the traditional way and regarded as part of the woman’s tasks.

---

14 Brunsø & Grunert, 1998; Grunert, Brunsø & Bisp, 1997; Grunert, Brunsø & Bredahl, 1998
• **The rational food consumer.** These consumers process a lot of information when shopping; they look at product information and prices, and they use shopping lists to plan their purchases. They are interested in all aspects of food quality. Self-fulfilment, recognition and security are major purchase motives for these consumers, and their meals tend to be planned. Compared with the average food consumer, this segment has a higher proportion of women with families. The level of education and income in this segment differ from country to country, but they tend to live in medium-sized towns and a relatively large proportion of these consumers do not work.

• **The adventurous food consumer.** While these consumers have a somewhat above-average interest in most quality aspects, this segment is mainly characterised by the effort they put into the preparation of meals. They are very interested in cooking, look for new recipes and new ways of cooking, involve the whole family in the cooking process, are not interested in convenience and reject the notion that cooking is the woman’s task. They want quality, and demand good taste in food products. Self-fulfilment in food is an important purchase motive. Food and food products are important elements in these consumers’ lives. Cooking is a creative and social process for the whole family. The adventurous food consumer is in general from the younger part of the population, and household size is above average. The adventurous food consumers have the highest educational level and have high incomes. They tend to live in big cities.

The types described above are the basic segments we have found across countries. In addition to these, a particular country may have idiosyncratic segments which differ a little from the basic types described above.
ANNEX 2

Template for collection of information on food law(s)\textsuperscript{15}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of law</th>
<th>Coverage/scope of sections dealing with food</th>
<th>Date of enactment (amendments if any)</th>
<th>Responsible agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{15} Covering all stages of the food chain from farm to table (i.e. production, processing, distribution/trade, retailing/catering, etc.)
Developed and described content for the proposed measures/tools.

ANNEX 3

1. Questionnaire for food inspectors and other relevant government representatives

Proposed questions:

1. To what extend are existing food law and regulations are accessible and easy to understand to average consumer, in your opinion?
2. What are the main strengths and weaknesses of existing food legislation?
3. To what extend is food legislation adequately enforced in different part of the country?
4. To what extend is the distribution of resources (human, financial, equipment, etc.) for food inspection equitable throughout the country?
5. Is more than one agency responsible for enforcement of the same law? If so, to what extend is there consistency in enforcement, in your opinion?
6. To what extend are food producers, processors, manufacturers, traders, retailers, etc. familiar with and/or knowledgeable about existing food legislation?
7. To what extend Nacional food safety legal framework is harmonized with the EU?
8. Is there any collision in between existing laws and regulations in food sections?
9. What changes would you like to see in existing food legislation and why?

2. Questionnaire for business sector

Proposed questions:

1. To what extent is existing food legislation (laws, regulations, standards) accessible and easy to understand?
2. To what extent are you familiar with and/or knowledgeable about existing food legislation?
3. Which is the most common way of being informed about changes in existing food regulations?
4. To what extent is there consistency in the enforcement of legislation by food inspectors?
5. What are the main strengths and weaknesses of existing food legislation from your point of view?
6. To what extent does food law and regulations grant food enterprises the freedom and flexibility required to ensure food safety and quality?
7. To what extent does existing food legislation support or promote exports?
8. How could compliance with food law and regulations be improved from your point of view?
9. What changes would you like to see in food legislation and why?

3. Survey for consumers

Proposed questions:

1. Do you know, which law is regulating food safety and quality area?
2. Do you think, that laws in this area are properly implemented?
3. In your opinion, what should be improved in the area of food safety and quality?
4. What kind of problems/irregularities you have encountered so far?
5. In case of violation of your consumer rights in the area of food safety and quality, do you know which competent institution to contact?
6. Did you reported any irregularities so far, and what are your experiences?
7. In which way you get information about the situation in this area?
ANNEX 4

Template for stakeholder’s analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Current roles (what is their current role/interest in food safety and quality legislation)</th>
<th>Future needs/expectations (what amendments to food legislation is needed and why?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government agencies (regional and local)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food inspection services (independent or part of government agency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food laboratories (official, independent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>