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- 35 items on views of the policy impact and of the policy importance in reducing the harm done by alcohol reduced to three factors with factor analysis
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![Bar chart showing the extent of implementation for different stakeholders in two policy areas. The x-axis represents 'Policy' categories: EAAP and EC Rec. The y-axis represents the 'Extent of implementation'. The chart uses different colored bars for NGO, GO, and AI, indicating varying levels of implementation for each category.](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>GO</th>
<th>AI</th>
<th>Anova</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Effective mechanisms to ensure that producers do not produce alcoholic beverages specifically targeted at children and adolescents</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Effective mechanisms to ensure that alcoholic beverages are not designed or promoted to appeal to children and adolescents</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Delivery of specific training for servers and sales persons with regard to the protection of children and adolescents</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Commitment of representative producer and trade organisations of alcoholic beverages to observe the principles described in points 11 to 13 above</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Advances and barriers

- The strongest theme among GOs and NGOs was the importance of coordination – this was what they cited most often as a recent advance, and was also often cited as an advance (or change to get the advance) needed to implement new policies to reduce alcohol-related harm.
The strongest theme among Al's was *stakeholder involvement*, i.e. their own participation in the policy process.

In contrast, GOs and particularly NGOs saw *industry lobbying* as a major barrier to effective policy to reduce alcohol-related harm, due to both the prioritisation of economic over health interests and attempts to direct policy towards particular policy measures.
AI’s frequently mentioned the approach to policymaking as a problem, in particular the difference between reducing “use and misuse” as a goal for policy. This often referred to the ‘total consumption theory’ or ‘Scandinavian countries’, and commented that these had failed to solve the ‘real problem’ of ‘patterns of harmful drinking’, especially among young people.
Equally common from AI’s was a comment that policies should be *culturally sensitive*, which was often combined with comments on learning from best practice elsewhere (referring to southern Europe), which should be fitted to each culture’s situation.
This was linked to the principle of subsidiarity, with AIs saying that “the diversity of economies, societies, cultures, traditions and beverages across the enlarged Europe” make European-level legislation inappropriate (and possibly illegal).
Finally, only AI s mentioned the need to account for the *health benefits* of alcohol in formulating policy.