

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

The following interview is in English. I am Alexander Plateau from A+ Quality and I am your host for today. If you want to listen or watch in your own language, please know that this interview is fully subtitled on YouTube.

My guest of today has a degree in law and has been partner with various law firms. Today she is partner and food lawyer with Food Law Science and Partners based in Brussels, where she assists clients throughout the food chain with issues ranging from food labelling, health and nutrition claims to innovation. She also helps clients in the food and feed area obtaining European authorisation for new additives, enzymes and novel foods.

For that she regularly works with institutions, European and national professional bodies and commercial organisations. Not only that, she is a frequent speaker at international conferences and is one of only four Chambers and Partners ranked attorneys in the EU-wide agro-food regulatory category. She is also recognised by the Legal 500 in both Belgium and France as a leading individual in the EU regulatory category.

Wow! With such a curriculum, I hope to never have her as an opponent in court. Can't wait to start this interview.

Welcome, Katia Merten-Lentz.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Thank you, Alexander. With such an introduction, I can leave. Everything has been said now.

Thank you.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Anyway, I still have questions.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

It's very flattering.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Katia, let's go back to your start. What attracted you specifically in food and in food safety?

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Coincidence and life. It all started 31 years ago. My background at university was based on European law, which at the time was something highly specific.

And my first job in a law firm in Brussels was to join a former agent from the European Commission who, after retiring, decided to create and develop a department dedicated to agri- and agro-law, which was so new, so innovative. So I cannot say that we created literally this area of expertise, but not far.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

More or less.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

We really were a pioneer and we really pushed and were at the top. I just followed because when I started, we were in the middle of the cow crisis, the mad cow crisis. And so food safety was in the centre of the attention of everybody, everyone in Europe.

And so very, I would say, naturally, I followed the adoption of all the rules which now make the food law primal.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

That's the beginning of my story. Okay. So today in Belgium, we have the federal authorities, the FAVV, who has its mission of protecting the consumer against any health issue caused by the consumption of food.

But let's say a consumer is confronted with an unsafe food. We have now the Nestlé story in the news. What can he or she do legally?

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Okay. I'm not in the best place to answer your question because we are just between you and me. I can tell you everything.

I'm usually on the side of the company. But of course, I can provide you with a legal answer, an official answer. Yeah, definitely.

AFSCA, FAVV are at the disposal of the consumers, consumer associations to gather, to receive any kind of complaints, to investigate, to open an investigation, to sue the companies, to ask for some analysis or for anything, everything. So any kind of unsafe, even unfit products which are already on the Belgium market can be sent to the AFSCA, FAVV to be withdrawn or recalled. Yeah.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

But imagine I am a consumer and then I say, okay, my baby became ill after eating this product. I can bring a company to court.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

I can sue a company. Of course. All this is based, regardless of the fact that we face a food safety case, it's very straightforward on a legal basis.

We are back to the principle of there is a fault, there is a damage and you need to prove the causality.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Yeah.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Okay. So once you have the justification and a robust demonstration of these three facts, if a consumer feels strong enough to sue himself a company, fair enough, go. But usually it's better to ask an association or to go to the, I think, I don't think, I'm sure, FAVV and AFSCA has a centre point for any kind of complaints.

But again, please, another question. Okay.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

So from the other side, let's take the example of placing a product contaminated with salmonella on the market, resulting in mortality and sickness. Who is responsible? So I know there is personal liability for people on the organisational chart of the company being the source of the problem.

But how does this work in practise? I mean, can multiple actors in the food chain be held responsible? Is the food safety manager in a company also liable?

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Okay. Here you ask me one question, one sub-question into one question, I would say. If you just give me two more minutes.

First of all, for a consumer, I mean, facially primarily, they can sue and they have to sue the food operator and whose name the product was placed on the market. Exactly.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Who is on the label.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

I would say Danone, I don't say Messier, the name, the brand, the brand plus the name. And that's it for the consumers.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Okay.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Now, I mean, in the back office, along the food chain, and we know since the whole skate scandal, you remember, it was like a discovery of all the trading chain along the food chain. Yes, definitely. It's not just Danone plus a farmer and plus, no, suppliers.

There are so many suppliers ingredients, transformers and suppliers and suppliers until a product, a final product is placed on the market. But again, the consumer will sue the brands, the industrial who has placed on the market the product. Then if this industrial is not liable, is not accountable, is not the responsible of the, how can I say, the compliance of the product.

It's up to this company, this food operator to sue his turn, his suppliers and the supplier of his suppliers, the one who is responsible of the contamination of the wrong delivery of information. Everything I should have maybe started with this reminder, along the food chain, it's the most important principle is solidarity. From post harvest, the very first raw material until the placement on the shelves of a retailer.

We could have thousands of traders and everything. We don't care. The thing is, is each step, each operator along the food chain plays his role fully with conscious and seriousness.

Normally the zero risk, the famous one should be guaranteed at the end. Okay. So it's a question of solidarity, of transparency, of full delivery of full information and accurate and compliant product until the end of the food chain.

So back to your question. Now Nestlé or another company, they have, they turn to sue there, but on a contractual basis, basic basis. Okay.

So this is one part of your question. The second is now internally. And I think you mentioned it's a question of a chart, internal chart, the structure, the organisation, the internal organisation of each company.

It depends. More generally, when it comes to something very serious, it goes up to the CEO. The top.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
Yeah.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
Because the other people involved usually have just, I mean, have just done their job. Okay. But the one at the end who has to be responsible.

And I do not say that this one didn't do his job, but at the end, one has to be responsible and it must be on the job.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
But he has personal liability. I mean, he can be sent in person.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
He can be. Normally, no, normally, first of all, he's liable and accountable because he, on behalf of his company, his or her company. But if there is something, a negligence and something we can blame him of, then he could be personally liable.

And when it comes to jail, to criminal sanctions, it could be on behalf of his company, but the company cannot go to jail. So somebody has to go to jail.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
So they will pick him.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
Say, please, who would like to?

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
Yeah. But then on the other hand, I'm just thinking worst case now. This CEO says, yeah, okay, but I asked my food safety manager to do this and that.

She didn't do it. So can then the food safety manager be held liable?

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
Theoretically, yes, but it's on a case by case basis. And based on my experience, generally, it's really difficult to demonstrate a very serious negligence or fault behind.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
If it would be falsification, fraud, then you could say, okay, it's you.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

If it's just a quality manager who thought he followed the rules, but he missed something, it's still human. So it's not something strong enough to sue him on a personal basis. And look at some other precedents and case law.

So often, CEO was dismissed after a scandal.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Or in the West, Stuart Parnell, who was sentenced for 27 years.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

We always need to cut one head.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

That will be the top head. Now, we were starting from the principle that the consumer sues a company. It can also be the AFSCA who sues the company, of course.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Generally, it's AFSCA. I know very well AFSCA.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

I imagine.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

We exchange on a very regular basis.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

I would imagine. What are the possibilities if a food processor doesn't agree with the findings made by the AFSCA? The AFSCA says, I'm taking you to court.

The food company says, oh, pardon me, but the mistake is not mine. It's a Chinese supplier.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Alexander, is it a real question? You don't have the answer? They come to me immediately, helpdesk, 9-1-1.

To myself or to my company or to somebody else. But I mean, it's their full right to contest, to challenge an AFSCA, FRVV decision. OK, and I'm used to challenging FRVV position because it happens more and more often now that FRVV consider that they are better in the assessment of the situation than the business operator themselves.

And that when AFSCA says something, it's better than the assessment or the scope of a recall. For instance, AFSCA say, no, no, you have decided to recall, I don't know, 5,000 products. OK, well, well noted.

But we consider after a very quick analysis that you should recall 10 times or 20 times this product. So it's sometimes very violent. OK, and generally it is built on a threefold approach.

First of all, you absolutely need to assure and reassure AFSCA, FRVV that you have identified the origin of the crisis. OK, it seems logical, but it's OK. But yes, something, hello, AFSCA, FRVV, something has just happened.

We have immediately investigated. Yes, we are on it. We know precisely what happened and what happened and why.

OK, first. Second point is to say, based on what and why, we immediately stop. Yes, we block the goods.

Yes, we put like when you roll on the wheel of your bike, I don't know, the rustine in French. But never forget the third fold is to say to AFSCA and AFSCA, FRVV, and it will not happen again in the future. And if my understanding of your background is correct, it's something related with HACCP, with all the food safety, but on the technical and scientific side.

Is to say it is now, this is now.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

We have taken preventive measures and.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Critical, critical control point, highly critical control point. And we take very precise and definitive measures. OK, and normally if you follow, I know there is no normal situation, but fingers crossed so far, it works pretty well.

And when you are strong enough. Based on this structure of challenging the FRVV decisions, plus a very detailed scientific risk assessment, they will leave you manage the situation.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Yeah, touch wood. One other topic that a lot of my clients struggle with is the jungle in the EU legislation. Jungle?

And the link or let's say the absence of it with national legislation. I give you an example. A Belgian food producer has to comply with, of course, the EU and Belgian legislation.

Now he wants to sell his product also in the Netherlands. But in the Netherlands, since the 1st of January, you have now the PAL, the precautionary allergen labelling law. And so, yeah, I mean, I am producing here in Belgium, so I don't have to deal with the Netherlands legislation.

Now I want to export to the Netherlands. But yeah, there is the principle in Europe of the, how do you call it? Mutual recognition.

Mutual recognition. Explain to our listeners in such a situation how a company has to deal with that.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

It is a very interesting question. I need, I should need more time, but in a nutshell, the principle of mutual recognition is a very important one. It is, its purpose is to guarantee the

good trading and the circulation of goods all over Europe and to harmonise and to make sure that everything is OK within the market.

But on top of this, to make sure that one member state respects the other member states. There is normally no hierarchy among the member states. You can say French rules are better than Italian ones or Dutch or Belgian ones.

This is a principle. But when there is a principle, there is quite often, not to say generally and always, an exception. And the exception to the basis, it means the principle of mutual recognition means that a product which has been lawfully and properly placed on another market, the open market, this product is legal, is compliant.

Automatically.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
Automatically.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
There is a presumption of legality, of compliance. Of compliance. So based on this presumption, it is supposed to be legally placed as well on any other market.

It was your question. What about a fully compliant Belgian product which you would like to place, which you would like to place on the Dutch market? As I've just mentioned, the exception or the limit to this principle is safety.

One member state is always, in theory, able and allowed to deny the access to its market based on safety motives. It's a bit crazy. What do you mean?

That the Dutch people are more sensible, sensitive, fragile than the Belgian ones? For instance, in your example. And my answer would be, I'm sorry, but yes, because when it comes to safety, a member state, again, is still allowed to put in place some legal obstacles, some extra technical obstacles, which officially are supposed to protect the safety of their citizens.

Remember, a totally different example than the French one, just not to say we have something against the Dutch, our Dutch compatriots. You will remember, I'm sure, in France, when it comes to the BPA, bisphenol A, and France, out of the blue, decided that no way, stop of everything. You stop placing, you stop producing, even you stop exporting, but our Conseil d'Etat decided, you went too far, this is not possible. So, we go back.

But still, France kept a no-go on producing and placing on the French market. And the story after that is, the whole Europe followed. Yeah, in that case, yes, yeah.

And this poll is maybe a bi-final case, I mean.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
Yeah, but they will go in the same sense, I think.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
Yeah, yeah, because it makes sense. It's not so, honestly, it makes sense. It's pretty smart.

I work, I'm used to working a lot with allergens questions and umbrella claims, and there were too many issues around these umbrella claims, and so their position.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

I know, but in the meantime, we have this period of, yeah, I have to make an extra label for the Dutch market. But so, summary, Holland can say, we refuse these goods on our market because it doesn't comply with our national legislation, unfortunately.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Belgian food operators can always try, because there are many, I mean, systems and legal avenues to challenge when a member state provides a no-go, so we can try. It's too early to see the consequences and to assess the situation, but just on the spot, this is my answer.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Another case from 2020 was the ethylene oxide case, the ETO. Personally, I remember that quite well, with the sesame coming from India, and in India, they had disinfected their containers, yeah, which was...

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

With a highly prohibited pesticide, yeah.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Exactly, exactly. And then it was first sesame, and then it was guar gum, and then it was also Pakistan, and what a chaos. We were faced with huge recalls, although at that time, there were no legal grounds for it, at first.

Can you guide us through this principle of authorities forcing a product recall, even if there is no legal limit on a certain substance?

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Be careful with your legal, you said legal rationale or legal basis. I do not agree. First of all, first command, yes, of course, I remember, and I'm still working on cases.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Oh my God.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Yeah, on cases, on ETO cases. The first command, it was a chaos, yes. Why?

Simply because these sesame seeds were processed in so many products. So we were just talking about the long chain of trading and intermediaries, something like that. This is a perfect illustration.

And first, you could say, I don't care, I never eat the sesame seeds. You would be surprised, you eat a lot of sesame seeds. So the reason of this chaos is because almost all the food chain basically...

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Was implied.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Was implied. So first. Secondly, when you say no legal basis, the thing became very touchy when it comes to very processed foods.

And then, despite the fact that the food operator knew that he had bought ingredients from ingredients coming from India, because you have a full transparent chain. So they knew for sure, but they made a risk assessment and the result of the risk assessment, in other words, the result of the analysis, didn't show any traces of these residues of pesticides. So in a normal, in a more common situation, normally, back to, I don't remember your questions.

How does it work when you would like to challenge an FAVV decision? Normally, based on, I knew, I identified the crisis. I stopped, I made, I stopped or I made my risk analysis and it's okay because it's far below the level of detection or something.

And for the future, I will never, never buy again something from India. That's being said. Bye-bye.

Thank you for coming. Okay. Usually it works, but it's typically an example where it didn't work.

Why? Because it was so huge. And the most cautious among the member states, you know, the syndrome of the best student.

I'm French. So if I can criticise my country, it's objective. We are, and we suffer generally from the syndrome of the best student in the class.

And you always would like to show that, yes, we were the first and we are the most severe. Yes, we have the highest standards of safety and things like that. So among the member states, France was particularly cautious and the DGCRF decided out of the blue that from now, very day one, as soon as a business operator knew that, as I said, a supplier from a supplier, bought something from India, they were taught officially, firmly to recall, to recall, to destroy to everything.

And they didn't care about any risk assessment, despite the fact that you could provide, that you provide, there was no risk, that there was no trace, that they were diluted and so on. Belgium had took another position. It depends.

We had so many different positions. That's one of the other reasons we are still with pending cases of consequence, legal action and things like that. But at the end, not at the end, but not, I mean, not enough quickly, the European Commission reacted and decided on behalf of all the member states.

Because at the end, at the beginning and at the end, we are supposed to be one market. OK, so when we face such a situation, the European Commission should react without delay, which was not the case. And the European Commission left some time and some space to the member states.

So, unfortunately, it's not a question of legal basis or scientific, it's a question, it was more politics.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
Yeah, yeah.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
My humble...

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
With huge consequences for the food process.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
Sure, it was a disaster. You talked about chaos, that it was K.O. for some of them.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
Which evolutions in European food law keep you busy the most at this moment?

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
Food safety, of course. Honestly, because I would say since Covid, I don't think that Covid has really something to do with this, but it's, I mean, it's something on my timeline.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
Yeah, it's a mark.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
It's a mark on my timeline, yeah. More or less since Covid, more and more often, as I've just told you, AFSCA, DGC-CRF and almost everywhere in Europe, the National Authority of Control, tend to decide on behalf of my clients. Even if we, I think they did everything perfectly.

As perfect as they could regarding the circumstances. But in other circumstances, by the past, the National Authority would have said, OK, thanks for informing. You have respected the general food law.

You informed us without delay. Thank you. OK, we keep an eye on you.

Big world is watching, but it's OK. Now, they came and said, OK, OK, it's OK. Our gut is telling us that, no, no, you should remove precautionary principle to an extent you cannot imagine.

It's a big, big umbrella.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
And they don't care.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
They're not business orientated. So in our defence, we cannot say, have you any idea how much it costs? But it is an impact as well.

And when it is not justified, I mean, you kill a business just by application of the precautionary principle. And so I stand always firm on the side of my clients to change the position.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

OK, so in the EU, we have this precautionary principle. If I am correct, in the US, they start from another point of view. A food product is safe until the opposite is proven.

Am I correct there or am I wrong?

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Do you have some bodyguards? You're very brave, Alexander, but I fully share your point of view and your approach. And I don't care.

Often, even when I have a talk in the US, I mentioned that we are proud within the EU to have the highest standards of safety because of the solidarity along the food chain. And yes, you're fully correct. The approach is less radical, is more who cares until it comes to the placement on the market.

But then it's a disaster. Remember, they have the class action.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Then it's all the way.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

It's such a strong system. It could totally destroy the reputation and the company, the reputation definitely and the company, because the result of a class action means billions of dollars to pay for the company. So the approach, the US philosophy is a bit different.

But to be honest, they turn now to come closer to our system and to be more, I would say, more on control all along the food chain. Now they seem to have realised that the notion, the concept of food chain means something. So we cannot say that we have a EU approach, we have a US, which are drastically different.

No, not anymore. But it's a good point.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Yeah. Okay. I just wanted to be sure that I'm on the right track.

As a Belgian food industry, what can we expect for the future from UK legislation? They have left the EU. Will it continue to follow the EU approach or will they move towards their own system or towards the American approach?

I don't know. What's your idea?

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

I have my perception and I have my experience. Altogether, I would say that since Brexit, despite several announcements, which for me looks like wishful thinking, they said we will I mean, move away from Europe. We will be, I mean, a sort of paradise on heaven for food business.

Everything will be more flexible, more agile, more open to innovation and things like that. For me, it's just wishful thinking. Completely, where do we stand today?

They cannot tell their citizens that we totally move away from the European food safety standards, which we keep talking about, which are good. Okay. Because they put them at risk to weaken the trust of their citizens in the UK systems.

The UK citizens are okay, we're satisfied and we're used to having this protection. So it's difficult to convince the UK citizens that we will change. We are talking about safety.

So first reason.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
Okay.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
Second reason, UK cannot digest, I mean, and anglicise, I've just made up the word, the verb, but I mean, create from scratch a new system, a new own UK system. Based on what? And they have no time, not enough sources, nothing enough.

Okay. No time, no money, no sources. And for me, I'm a bit, I'm pushing.

But third reason, those are very pragmatic one. This is basically because if they drastically change their framework and their philosophy of safety, it means the end of import export with the EU. Because we will say our safety, we would like to protect our safety.

You do not follow anymore our rules. It's okay. You are like Chinese products.

So it will really mean the end of something like a fluid and a smooth trading between the UK and the EU. And despite their proximity with the US, UK, Europe, we are close. The trading is quite important.

So I think we will keep, they will keep following our line.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
That makes sense. That's my opinion.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
That makes sense.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
Yeah, yeah, yeah. Exactly. Now, food safety legislation, that's a very specific topic.

As you mentioned it a half an hour ago, do judges in court always fully understand the nature of a case?

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:
Difficult to say. Always it's always a case by case interpretation. But I would say, yes, not so badly.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:
Did you see it evolve over time?

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Yes. And how can I say, the judges, the legal basis and the reasoning, the rationale is really straightforward. As I mentioned, fault, damage, causality.

And regarding all the scientific aspects, the highly specific regulatory aspects, they can ask an expert if needed. And then back to the implementation of the rules. And it works pretty well.

They do the job seriously.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Good to hear. And if you could give one legal advice to food companies, what would that be?

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Seriously? It is so tempting. No, seriously.

One, it's the last question.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

That's my last question.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

So I need to say something very touchy. No, no, no. Something people will never forget.

No, seriously, I would say the risk zero is something consumers have in mind. They are sure that normally they deserve a zero risk food product. Okay.

So for a food operator, they are supposed, it's a parallel of this obligation, this commitment. They are supposed to have a very, very good understanding of all the food requirements. And it comes to something new, very innovative, or when they have some doubts, please, please do not place the product on the market before asking an expert, before making sure that your understanding is correct.

In case of doubt, please do not do. Because it will be so damageable, or it could be, might be so damageable once it is placed on the market. Because I noticed before court, during a hearing with FRVV or AFSCA, it's always the same reaction.

When I start with my clients to defend our position, and as I say, okay, but at the beginning, who forced you to place on the market? Okay. You pretend to be a food business operator.

So you are supposed to know everything. You pretend to place on the market something, you know the first requirement, the very first requirement of the general food law regulation. It is only a hundred percent safe food should be placed on the market.

So if you cannot guarantee this zero risk, you do not place. And that's it. And we would not be there discussing and trying to challenge our decision.

And so I never forget this approach.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Excellent. Thank you, Katia.

Katia Merten-Lentz, Food Law Science & Partners:

Thank you, Alexander. It was very, very interesting to exchange with you.

Alexander Platteeuw, A+ Quality:

Thanks for this fascinating insight in the world of law. Keep up the good work in defending our food chain operators and to keep our world a food safe place. After all, better food safe than sorry.

Yeah, sure, sure. Good. To our listeners, if you like this interview, please subscribe to my channel and like this video.

Spread the word. See you in the next episode of Better Food Safe Than Sorry. I'm Alexander Platteeuw from A+ Quality, and I'm here to help you with all of your food safety questions.