

EVALUATION OF THE EUROPEAN WEEK 2002

OSHA/TF/2002/T1

Final Report

Submitted to

The European Agency for Safety and Health at Work

By

ECONOMISTI ASSOCIATI SRL

April 15, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	6
2.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	7
3.	THE 2002 EUROPEAN WEEK - OVERVIEW	12
3.1	SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EW	12
3.2	THE TIME FRAME OF THE CAMPAIGN.....	12
3.3	THE ROLE OF THE VARIOUS ORGANISATIONS	14
3.4	OVERVIEW OF EUROPEAN LEVEL ACTIVITIES	17
3.5	OVERVIEW OF NATIONAL ACTIVITIES	19
4.	RELEVANCE	25
4.1	BACKGROUND	25
4.2	THE SUITABILITY TO BENEFICIARIES INTERESTS AND NEEDS	26
4.3	THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE EW ORGANISATIONAL MODEL	28
4.4	RELEVANCE OF THE EW 2002 AS A EUROPEAN INITIATIVE.....	29
4.5	SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS	30
5.	OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS.....	32
5.1	AGENCY GENERAL MANAGEMENT & COORDINATION.....	32
5.2	AGENCY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	34
5.3	ROLE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SME /EW GROUP & SYNERGIES WITH THE SME GRANT SCHEME.....	36
5.4	MANAGEMENT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE GOOD PRACTICE AWARD SCHEME.....	38
5.5	ORGANISATION OF THE CLOSING EVENT	40
5.6	SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS	41
6.	THE SEED FINANCING MECHANISM.....	42
6.1	BACKGROUND	42
6.2	EFFICIENCY AND THE SUITABILITY OF THE SEED FINANCING MECHANISM	43
6.3	THE REMAINING CO-FINANCING.....	44
6.4	ELIGIBILITY ISSUES.....	46
6.5	ADDITIONALITY CONSIDERATIONS	47
6.6	SUBSIDIARITY CONSIDERATIONS.....	48
6.7	SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS	49

7.	OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT	50
7.1	EFFECTIVENESS.....	50
7.2	IMPACT	54
7.3	EUROPEAN ADDED VALUE.....	56
7.4	OVERALL FINAL ASSESSMENT	57
7.5	SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS	58
8.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	60
	ANNEX A – THE METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH.....	68
	ANNEX B – FOCAL POINT QUESTIONNAIRE.....	74
	ANNEX C – THE CAMPAIGN PARTNER QUESTIONNAIRES (FRENCH & ENGLISH)	83
	ANNEX D – LIST OF INTERVIEWEES.....	88
	ANNEX E – LIST OF DOCUMENTS	92

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Chapter 3 THE EUROPEAN WEEK 2002 – OVERVIEW

Table 3.1	EW 2002 Flow Chart of Activities
Table 3.2	EW 2002 MS Timetables
Table 3.3	Member State Focal Point Locations
Table 3.4	MS Creation of a National EW Group
Table 3.5	EW Working Group Member Status
Table 3.6	Distribution of Agency Campaign Materials to MS
Table 3.7	National Seed Financing Activities
Table 3.8	Distribution of Activities Among Member States

Chapter 4 RELEVANCE

Table 4.1	Suitability of the Stress Theme to Focal Points & Campaign Partners
Table 4.2	Media Interest in the Stress Theme According to Focal Points
Table 4.3	Campaign Visibility & Image as a EU Initiatives
Table 4.4	The Use of the EU Logo

Chapter 5 OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY

Table 5.1	Agency Campaign Management Responsiveness to Focal Point Needs
Table 5.2	Trans-national Cooperation
Table 5.3	Importance of Agency Promotional Materials
Table 5.4	Degree Agency Publicity Measures are Targeted to MS National Audiences
Table 5.5	Agency Support in Media and Communication
Table 5.6	SME Grant Scheme / EW Group
Table 5.7	Focal Point Degree of Satisfaction with the GPAS and GPAS Visibility
Table 5.8	Synergy effects with the GPAS

Chapter 6 COST EFFECTIVENESS & IMPACT OF SEED FINANCING

Table 6.1	Overall Opinions on Seed Financing
Table 6.2	Responsibilities Linked to Seed Financing
Table 6.3	Average Importance at the European Level of the Possible Other Sources of Campaign Financing
Table 6.4	Campaign Partners' Willingness to Contribute to EW Activities
Table 6.5	Total Size of Potential Financial Contributions
Table 6.6	Criteria of Eligibility for EU Financing

Table 6.7	Satisfaction with the Actual Selection of Eligible Projects
Table 6.8	Comparison of the Number of MS Activities

Chapter 7 OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS & IMPACT

Table 7.1a	Focal Point Opinions on Awareness Raising Among Target Groups
Table 7.1b	Campaign Partners' Opinion on Awareness Raising Among Target Groups
Table 7.2	Satisfaction with SME Involvement
Table 7.3	Mobilisation of SMEs
Table 7.4	Focal Points Opinions on Best Tools to Promote Best Practice
Table 7.5	Focal Point Understanding of Best Practice
Table 7.6	Trans-national Transfer of Know-how
Table 7.7	Focal Point Contact Methods
Table 7.8	Impact on the National Media
Table 7.9	Tangible Improved Practice
Table 7.10	Promotion of European & National Policy Action
Table 7.11	Campaign Partner Overall Assessment
Table 7.12	Plans for Future Participation

Chapter 8 CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Table 8.1	Achieving Focal Point Objectives
-----------	----------------------------------

LIST OF ACRONYMS

EAV	European Added Value
EC	European Commission
ERDF	European Regional Development Fund
ESF	European Social Fund
ETUC	European Trade Union Confederation
EU	European Union
EW	European Week (2000, 2001 or 2002)
GPAS	Good Practice Award Scheme
ICU	Information and Communication Unit
MS	Member State
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OSH	Operational Safety and Health
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
UNICE	Union of Industrial and Employers' Confederations of Europe

1. INTRODUCTION

The Assignment. *Economisti Associati* has been requested by to carry out an ex-post evaluation of the European Week 2002 information campaign (hereinafter EW 2002) that was run by the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (hereinafter the Agency) in collaboration with its fifteen Member State Focal Points on work-related psycho-sociological stress “*Working on Stress*”. This assignment has been awarded through a restricted call for tender procedure.

The Objective. The objective of this evaluation is to provide recommendations for improving the organisation of future similar events. More specifically, the campaign will be evaluated with a special view to its effectiveness and impact on awareness raising and to the improvement of safety and health in the workplace. Finally, a qualitative analysis will be made of the campaign’s own internal management and organizational aspects with a special reference to the expediency and efficiency of the newly introduced “seed money” financing mechanisms.

The Scope. The assignment includes the activities directly managed and implemented by the Agency at the central level together with those funded at the national level through the €700,000 Agency seed financing budget that was allocated proportionally among Member States. The study is also intended to provide an overview of all activities promoted by the campaign in the various Member States, irrespective of their financing. Due to the very nature of the EW 2002 and to the possibility of spontaneous activities, this will be possible only to the extent that Focal Points are aware of the existence of initiatives carried out at the national level. This evaluation covers EU Member States only, and not Norway that voluntarily joined the week or the Candidate Countries.

The Clients. The evaluation has been commissioned by Agency itself and is directly managed by the EW task force recently created within Agency to better manage the campaign. The main clients of this evaluation are intended to be the relevant Agency services and their Focal Point network. Moreover, the evaluation results will also concern the main actors in the field of Health and Safety at Work at the European level, including DG Employment and Social Affairs and the main social partners.

The Evaluation Team. The evaluation was carried out by a team led by Alberto Bolognini and composed of Marco Lorenzoni, Roberto Raggi, and Susannah Tillson. *Economisti Associati’s* internal quality control review was carried out by Roberto Zavatta, *Economisti Associati’s* senior partner.

Structure of This Report. This report is structured into two parts: a main text and a series of appendices. The main text is composed of eight chapters including this introduction and an executive summary. The bulk of the text begins with an overview of the EW summarizing key background information for the following sections. It continues with a chapter on relevance analysing the suitability of the EW2002 theme for stakeholders and other conceptual issues of appropriateness. Another chapter will extensively review operational effectiveness, while the seed financing mechanism – a key aspect for this evaluation exercise – will be dealt with in an ad hoc chapter. A final chapter on the campaign effectiveness and impact including European added value will lead to conclusions and recommendations on the future of the week. The appendices include: a description of the methodology and activities carried out, the text of the questionnaires sent to the Focal Points and Campaign Partners, the list of interviewees and the list of documents reviewed.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2002 the theme of the EW was “Working on Stress” or more specifically: psychosocial risks at work with a special focus on stress, an increasingly perceived OSH theme across Europe and the world. The specific objectives of the campaign are: i) to raise awareness of risks and to promote actions to prevent work-related stress and psychosocial stress across Europe; ii) to promote information and project at the workplace level to prevent work-related stress and psychosocial risks; and, iii) to support and stimulate activities in particular with regard to exchange of information on good safety and health practice on the prevention of stress and other psychosocial risks. The ultimate aim of the campaign is to contribute to cutting the human and economic toll of stress at work in Europe. The overall organizational time frame of the EW2002 was broadly similar to that of the EW2001. The main differences depended on additional elements directly related to the implementation and management of the Seed Financing Mechanism - an innovation in comparison to previous editions of the week.

Since the year 2000, the EW Campaign has been implemented in synergy with the Good Practice Award Scheme (GPAS), a European contest aimed to prize examples of best practice in the workplace. As already happened with EW 2001 the GPAS was part of the EW concept from the beginning. In 2002 the goal of the GPAS was to recognize companies or organisations across the MS that have made outstanding and innovative contributions in the field of psychosocial risk. The campaign closing event of the EW 2002 took place on November 25, 2002 in Bilbao. The event was co-sponsored by Agency and by the Danish Presidency of the EU. In 2002, the SME Funding Scheme a grant initiative that in 2001 had been managed in parallel with the EW, turned generic and no longer had a common theme with the EW.

In 2002 EW national activities were eligible for Agency seed-financing. The purpose of the mechanism was to act as a multiplier of initiatives. Agency provided the Focal Points with indications on criteria for eligibility. These included evidence of tripartite consultation “according to national rules and practice” and a maximum 50% co-financing. The support of targeted information to prevent psycho social risks in the workplace was given the priority. The typology of projects was left fairly open and included all information activities ranging from national or local workshops/seminars, the production of informational material or guidelines, as well as various forms of good practice competitions, to participation in exhibitions/events. The only limit was that catch-all conferences not directly focused on stress would not be eligible.

EW 2002 advertising campaign in the media were organised in 7 MS, i.e. two more than in 2001. These usually are costly activities largely supported by national budgets and in a few cases without Agency co-funding. Compared to 2001 there was no longer recourse to advertising campaigns on phone cards and an increasing use of TV and radio spots. Eight countries decided to complement Agency materials by publishing national materials (books, brochures, etc.) on campaign issues. This represents a notable increase on previous years. Moreover, some two thirds of Focal Points dedicated national web pages to the EW 2002 campaign. This number is roughly comparable with that of previous years but the websites were on average used much more than before. National Good Practice Awards mirroring the European Scheme were carried out in 4 countries. In 3 out of the 4 national award schemes, the MS selected winners on the national level and subsequently submitted a selection of their national winners to the EU level GPAS. Overall, the number of national GPAS represents an increase compared to previous editions of the campaign. As has become customary within the framework of the European Week the most frequently organised events in all MS are seminars and workshops at either the regional and the national

level and targeted to various audiences. Other activities include, among others, training sessions, fairs and exhibitions, open door days.

Despite the diverse situation in each MS and taking account of the organisational and budgetary limitations, the EW2002 can be considered all in all as a good success. The theme of the EW2002 was highly suitable to the interests and needs of beneficiaries, although it is very challenging and innovative from many points of view. The choice of such a theme almost inevitably had a price to be paid. The focus of the campaign was somehow switched from the promotion of best practice at the workplace level to fostering public discussion and scientific debate on the issue. This goal is not inferior to the first but the differences between the possible results must be acknowledged.

There is a generally positive or even highly positive assessment of how the EW 2002 was managed and organised by Agency. All in all the EW model can be considered as reasonably efficient and stable. The overall impression is that Agency has already largely achieved the best possible campaign organisation within the existing framework of organisational and budgetary constraints. Any attempt to introduce radical reforms would have major budgetary and organisational implications and would require a considerable political commitment. Ideally the first area deserving such radical re-consideration is campaign follow-up (for instance a second mini-campaign continuing the theme in the following year) in order to ensure better sustainability of results. However, any move towards a double campaign system appears hardly feasible and realistic in present conditions.

The process to set up national steering groups mainly on tripartite consultation keeps improving, although it still remains a bit too rigid. For instance in the case of the EW2002, there seems to be some preliminary evidence from interviewees that the involvement of NGOs such as organizations for women's rights or those dealing with violence against women could have improved campaign organization. Networking has also been improved and remains a factor of success and a good proxy for campaign effectiveness. There also was a better use of the internet which is confirmed to be an effective communication means for the campaign and an increased attention to the visibility of the campaign.

If it is true that one of the EW organisational strengths is its decentralised implementation model, this also means that the main obstacles presently hindering substantial progress are outside Agency control. The main obstacles are: the campaign organising skills of individual Focal Points that vary greatly from country to country and slowly but constantly improve through a learning mechanism, and the sheer amount of resources the different MS put at the EW disposal. Many Focal Points still are learners in campaign organisation and the majority of MS still attempt to organise the campaigns on a limited budget; these are the two main critical factors facing the EW. In a few areas it can be noted there still are fundamental disagreements between MS on value judgments attached to certain campaign aspects. These considerations more specifically relate to political consensus building between MS rather than EW operational effectiveness.

The quality and scope of the EW 2002 communication and media activities has further increased, partly as a result of additional EU financing, partly because of the learning effect, and partly because the theme was itself appealing to the media. Agency support also improved and the launching event at the EU Parliament is generally considered as a very positive innovation and an event worth repeating. The materials produced are assessed by beneficiaries as good quality and have been used in all MS. However most of the campaign partners still perceive insufficient media impact and communication support for their activities. To address this, considerable financial resources would be required at the national level to fund initiatives. Within available means it can

be attempted to further anticipate the EU launch and make it more synergic with parallel national events.

The GPAS is a good promotional tool and should remain an integral part of the week. However, its potential is underexploited and would require a wider recognition than presently in place, although some progress in this sense can be noted. The GPAS is still poorly advertised and communicated in a number of MS and this limits its multiplier effect at the workplace level. Moreover, the current timing of the award ceremony greatly reduces its usefulness in the framework of the EW. Aspects of the GPAS to be constantly monitored include transparency and real focus on pilot and innovative projects only. In the EW 2002 no synergy and co-ordination was envisaged with the SME Grant Scheme and this created some degree of confusion at the operational layer. On paper, the overall impression remains that a closer conception and supervision of the EW, the SME Grant Scheme and the GPAS could further improve their overall effectiveness as proposed by the EW 2001 evaluation as a possibility for reform. Nevertheless the concrete feasibility of such an approach faces major bureaucratic obstacles and problems with budgetary appropriations that go beyond the scope of this exercise, since they would somehow involve a biennial implementation of the campaign.

The awareness raising effect of the EW 2002 has been fairly high and higher than in previous years. There are huge variations in the different MS regarding resources available and the different target groups reached. The EW has been more limitedly effective in promoting best practice at the workplace level. The situation is again highly varied across MS, but in most countries the promotion of best practice in the workplace is not a particularly well-developed area. Few activities are implemented directly with this purpose. In the case of the EW 2002, the problem was made worse by the intrinsic difficulty and sensitiveness of the subject. We are not inclined to consider this as an indicator of limited campaign effectiveness, rather it is seemingly a result of the challenge posed by the subject matter. Exchange of information and expertise at the European level remains one of the EW's weakest areas. Focal Points operate quite independently from one another and both the EW Working Group and the GPAS have only limitedly facilitated exchange of information and sharing of best practices, that is mainly based on spontaneous contacts and informal networking. Joint trans-national projects have hardly been implemented.

Little notable improvement could be found regarding SME involvement. Despite the focus placed in EW guidelines on including SMEs in EW 2002 activities, the resulting role of SMEs was quite low. This is not only because of the intrinsic difficulties in reaching and organizing SME events, but also because of the sheer limited number of activities expressly aimed at them. In very few cases the Focal Points made specific plans and programs to address SME needs. Moreover limited attention was given to the SME target group in the awareness raising campaign.

Seed financing is a widely appreciated EU funding mechanism whose justification, however, in additionality and subsidiarity terms appears to be fairly weak. Its rationale mainly lies in assisting the few MS claiming that without European financial support there would be no EW campaign at all. In this way seed financing achieves the fundamental objective of having implemented the EW in all MS. There is conflicting evidence that seed financing was really additional to the campaign and acted as a project multiplier mechanism. Focal Points' opinions confirm this but are naturally biased. It seems it mainly had an impact on the scope and geographical coverage of certain projects and somehow facilitated networking. Where there are big campaigns the total number of national activities is mainly based on national factors and the amount of seed-financing is too limited to substantially influence the process. In some of the other cases it seems it substituted for other sources of financing. The Focal Points complaints about heavy reporting requirements do not appear as totally justified. In subsidiarity terms valid

arguments can be made that seed financing should be more specifically focused to cover areas where the current system of national incentives does not work well, so as to provide real European Added Value.

Most of the previous EW2001 recommendations have been confirmed by this evaluation exercise even if in many cases some progress was achieved, and namely.

- 1.1 There is no good reason to radically change the EW organisational model as is. Any reform should allow the campaign structure continue, with marginal improvements. This means that the balance of activities between Agency and the Focal Points is substantially correct and that the GPAS is worth continuing as a EW component.*
- 1.2 An interlinked management of the EW, the GPAS and the SME Grant Scheme would appear theoretically preferable. This kind of change would imply the solution of major administrative problems, so the present management of the EW and the SME Grant Scheme as separate initiatives appears as a reasonable second best.*
- 1.3 There would be an advantage if there were a higher rate of continuity in the choice of EW Group Members. Some progress was reached in respect to previous years. Another possible solution could be to complement the two different areas of expertise by placing two people in charge of the EW: one campaign expert that is constant from year to year and one theme expert that changes with the themes.*
- 1.4 Ensure the long term value of the Good Practice Award. To preserve the image and credibility of the Good Practice Award Scheme should remain a Agency's priority. However together with a focus on transparency, award criteria, and selection of innovative projects, greater emphasis should be given to the GPAS in order to improve its overall visibility.*
- 1.5 Improve dissemination of good practice. There is still room for improving dissemination of good practice. For instance placing the award ceremony during the week itself, i.e. during the month of October would represent a low cost improvement.*
- 1.6 Boost efficiency by creating an evaluation culture within the MS. There is certainly a big scope for promoting the EW effectiveness by making recourse to a more extensive use of campaign evaluations that are presently carried out in one country only. But before doing that substantial work has to be done on the monitoring system. Most Focal Points are not accustomed to tracking and follow up enquiries, do not set monitorable objectives for their activities and generally have a limited knowledge of what happens even one organisational layer below them.*

Recommendations to improve European Added Value include:

- 2.1 Greater investment in media attention including reinforcement of efforts at EU level. Substantial progress was achieved in this respect, but further improvement is still possible.*
- 2.2 Ensure more national and European political backing to ease the availability of funds and increase media attention. This is partly related to the recommendation above. It remains valid and progress was reached through the increasing recourse to media events aimed at Parliaments.*

- 2.3 *Make more money available for evaluations at the national level – to be compared at EU level in order to enhance the exchange of good practice. A proposal in this sense was made by the Agency and discussed with the EW Working Group, but was not then followed up. We would put the emphasis first of all on devising and implementing a common campaign monitoring system.*
- 2.4 *Involve more trans-national cooperation in the week in order to ensure a wider reach of efforts undertaken. This remains a priority where little progress was made and where action is urgently needed.*
- 2.5 *Increased commitment of social partners so that they can act as leverage on their members. A positive trend of increased social partner commitment can be generally noted across Europe, although in some MS this still remains a problem area. The seed financing mechanism has had little impact on this.*

Additional recommendations can be formulated from the findings of the current evaluation exercise and include:

- 3.1 *Anticipate the launch of the campaign earlier in the year and increase the number of parallel launch events at the national level. We can see the rationale behind using the campaign launch as a tool to raise companies' attention and would therefore favour a much earlier launch. The EU launch event could work in better synergy with parallel national launch events.*
- 3.2 *Further fine-tune the production of campaign materials. The discontinuation of certain campaign materials poorly appreciated (such as postcards) can be considered while there is an increasing request for creative gadgets. Specific materials can be better studied for specific target groups including first and foremost SMEs.*
- 3.3 *Issue guidelines for a more consistent use of the EU logo together with the campaign logo in EW-related activities.*
- 3.4 *Increase the communication effort and the visibility of the Good Practice Award Scheme. Partly related to the above, a campaign launch in May could be used as a tool to promote a call for applications for the GPAS. A certain minimum form of publicity to the initiative should become a standard.*
- 3.5 *Continue seed-financing but increase its conditionality in terms of eligible activities and eligible costs. Although the issue could be highly controversial we would be in favour of modulating EU co-financing to the kind of activities financed. It can be as high as 50% for activities directly aimed at the workplace or focused on SMEs, some 20-25% for media and communication campaigns, but no more than 5-10% or even discontinued altogether for seminars workshops and colloquia. Preferable co-financing rates should be granted to initiatives with a clear tripartite financial commitment. Caps should be introduced on the maximum share of reimbursable Focal Point personnel costs and overheads as respect total direct project expenditure.*
- 3.6 *Creation of a separate budget for trans-national projects. As already happens with the SME Grant scheme, a part of the seed-financing budget should be devoted to trans-national initiatives and not allocated on a country basis. It should be used to co-finance (with a high co-financing rate) those initiatives with a clear European, trans-national or cross-border dimension.*

3. THE 2002 EUROPEAN WEEK - OVERVIEW

Introduction. This chapter summarizes key background information for this evaluation. In order to make it better accessible to all readers, it includes a brief introduction to the essential elements of the EW 2002. The chapter begins with a description of the objectives and scope of the EW, it describes the time frame of the event and continues with a description of the campaign participants and the main campaign activities. The information presented here is mainly based on review of documents including an analysis the reports provided by Agency (see Annex E) and additional information available on the Internet. This was complemented whenever necessary, by other sources such as the case studies, the questionnaires and the interviews. A description of the methodology followed for these other sources is reported in Annex A.

3.1 Scope and Objectives of the EW

Nature and Scope. The EW is an annual information campaign that aims to improve the levels of health and safety in the European workplace. Each year the campaign is developed around a pre-defined theme that is common to all MS and attempts to address a wide range of target groups including: a) employers and employees in a wide range of sectors, b) labour inspectors, c) public authorities, d) health practitioners, e) preventative services and f) OSH experts. The EW represents a unique opportunity to involve many national and European entities in a common EU effort to promote and improve workplace safety and health in a given topic.

Campaign Organizers. Since 2000 the EW has been organised by Agency. This was the third EW Agency was responsible for after the EW 2001 “Prevention of Accidents” and the EW 2000 “Musculoskeletal Disorders”. Before 2000 the EWs were directly organised and managed by the Commission. For the implementation of the campaign at the national level Agency relies on its network of 15 Focal Points and related partners.

2002 Theme and Campaign Objectives. In 2002 the theme of the EW was “*Working on Stress*” or more specifically: psychosocial risks at work with a special focus on stress, an increasingly perceived OSH theme across Europe and the world. The specific objectives of the campaign as defined in Agency official documents are: i) to raise awareness of risks and to promote actions to prevent work-related stress and psychosocial stress across Europe; ii) to promote information and project at the workplace level to prevent work-related stress and psychosocial risks; and, iii) to support and stimulate activities in particular with regard to exchange of information on good safety and health practice on the prevention of stress and other psychosocial risks. The ultimate aim of the campaign is to contribute to cutting the human and economic toll of stress at work in Europe.

3.2 The Time Frame of the Campaign

The Campaign as a Whole. The overall organizational time frame of the EW 2002 was broadly similar to that of the EW 2001 for all major events¹. The main differences depended on additional elements directly related to the implementation and management of the Seed Financing Mechanism - which was an innovation compared to previous editions of the week - and to the newly introduced presentation press conference at the European Parliament in July. Table 3.1 below

¹ Such as the due date for GPAS applications, the selection of GPAS winners, the EW itself and the Closing Event all occurred in the same time period in 2001 and 2002.

presents the progression of events from the initial choice of the EW 2002 theme through the final closing event. The theme was announced in March 2001 and preparation activities started in autumn 2001. During the first three and a half months of 2002 Focal Points were allowed to apply for funding and propose projects for seed financing. Applications for the GPAS had to be submitted by mid-July. The EW was finally held in October and the GPAS award ceremony during the campaign closing event in Bilbao in the end of November.

Table 3.1 EW2002 Flow Chart of Activities

DATE	ACTIVITY
November, 2000	Various Topics proposed as possible EW 2001 subjects. Stress scored second.
March, 2001	“Working on Stress” chosen and announced as EW 2002 theme
October, 2001	Budget Committee of the EU Parliament met to discuss the Agency draft budget.
October 18, 2001	“EW 2002 Strategy Paper” presented and circulated at the SME/EW Assessment Meeting
October / November 2001	EU Parliament decision on Agency budget.
December 3-4, 2001	Focal Point meeting to present and discuss the seed financing mechanism.
Mid December 2001	Seed Financing Application form sent to Focal Points
February 1, 2002	1 st due date for Focal Points to inform Agency if they accept EW financing in principle (especially Austria, Germany & France).
April 15, 2002	Due date for completed Seed Financing Application form
Mid April 2002 and on	Agency project selection and approval / administrative and financial tasks in relation to seed financing contracts
Before Summer 2002	Payment of the 1 st instalment of Seed Financing
July 2, 2002	Presentation at the European Parliament
July 10, 2002	Due date for GPAS applications from Focal Points (applications not in English)
August 15, 2002	Due date for GPAS applications in English.
August 16, 2002	Due date for Agency to have all applications translated into English.
End of September 2002	Winners selected by European Jury
October 2002	European Week 2002 in MS.
November 25, 2002	EW 2002 Closing Event & GPAS Award ceremony
November 2002 – March 2003	Focal Points provide a final activity report, a financial report and submit an invoice for the remaining Seed Financing balance. Agency will then pay the balance.

Source: Agency internal planning materials.

Timing of National Activities. While the overall campaign organisation took place throughout 2002, the EW week itself took place in each MS during one week only. Following a well consolidated tradition the EW is not implemented into the very same week across Europe, but over a longer period of time spanning the whole month of October. Actually, as shown in Table 3.2 below, each MS was given the flexibility to choose the week within the month of October that best fit their national preferences. As a result, as high as nine MS decided to choose the fourth week of October, another five preferred the third week and one country only – Germany – preferred to have it done in the second week of October. However in some cases these dates must be considered as merely indicative. For instance most of the EW 2002 activities were actually carried out in Sweden in between 5-19 November. Also Portugal decided to have EW 2002 activities implemented in the Azores in late November. In other cases there were EW 2002 activities implemented much earlier during the year. These typically were campaign launching events: the UK had it in May and Italy in September. In one case Ireland started implementing sheer campaign activities in early September.

Table 3.2 EW 2002 MS Timetables

COUNTRY	2 ND WEEK OCT 07/10 – 13/10	3 RD WEEK OCT 14/10 – 20/10	4 TH WEEK OCT 21/10 – 27/10
Austria			
Belgium			
Denmark			
Finland			
France			
Germany			
Greece			
Ireland			
Italy			
Luxembourg			
Netherlands			
Portugal			
Spain			
Sweden			
United Kingdom			

3.3 The Role of the Various Organisations

Agency. Agency is a European Agency whose management includes representatives from MS governments, employer organisations and employee organisations. In the scope of the EW, Agency mainly plays a co-ordination and promotional role. It is responsible for the overall European level coordination of the EW and for stimulating decentralised activities. More specifically Agency's tasks include general management administrative duties; coordination of EU level meetings and groups; the overall management of seed financing activities; creation, production and distribution of EW materials including those on the website; organisation and implementation of the GPAS; EW launching and closing events; and the final evaluation of the EW. Agency produces materials directly related to the EW theme although the scientific content is only partly a direct responsibility of the Agency. Agency relies on consortia of national safety and health institutions – the *Topic Centres* - that research, collect and analyse relevant data to provide Agency with up-to-date facts on the EW theme.

The National Focal Points. For the actual organisation and implementation of the EW in each MS Agency relies on a network of Focal Points. Each Focal Point is responsible for proposing and promoting campaign national activities, for the coordination of its own national tripartite network and for the provision of information on Agency activities, initiatives and products. As shown in Table 3.3 below, each Focal Point is usually located within a larger governmental organisation responsible for OSH at the national level. Due to the different national traditions and OSH cultures the Focal Points do not all have the same level of expertise when it comes to the organisation of large-scale information campaigns. Some MS (like the UK) have long term experience in organising such campaigns, while other countries are mere beginners. It may even happen that a Focal Point *de facto* subcontract the bulk of EW organisation to external entities. In order to carry out the EW, Agency has designated specific tasks to the Focal Point for the organisation and promotion of the EW. These responsibilities include the management of interaction with the national tripartite social partners; decisions related to activities proposed for seed financing; promotion of the EW at the national level; translations into national languages; and, the production of reports for Agency.

Table 3.3 Member State Focal Point Locations

COUNTRY	FOCAL POINT LOCATION
Austria	Ministry of the Economy and Employment – Employment Department
Belgium	Ministry of Employment - Department for the Safety at Work.
Denmark	National Working Environment Authority
Finland	Ministry of Social Affairs and Health – Department for Occupational Safety and Health
France	Ministry of Social Affairs, Labour and Solidarity – Organisation for Health and Security at Work
Germany	Federal Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs
Greece	Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs - General Directorate of Working Conditions and Health
Ireland	Health and Safety Authority
Italy	Institute for Safety and Prevention and Work – Department of Documentation, Information and Education
Luxembourg	Ministry of Labour – Labour Inspectorate (responsible for health & safety issues)
Netherlands	Ministry for Social Affairs and Employment – Department of Working Conditions
Portugal	Institute for Development and Inspection of Working Conditions - Department responsible for Prevention of Professional risk.
Spain	National Institute of Security and Hygiene at Work
Sweden	Swedish Work Environment Authority
United Kingdom	Health and Safety Executive

The National Networks. For the implementation of the campaign the Focal Points work closely with their national networks of partners. These are networks with unique nation-specific characteristics that have been created on the basis of the various national OSH structure features. The role of the social partners in campaign organisation in the various MS varies also depending on national factors. At any rate a certain degree of institutional involvement is always ensured. In some MS, the Focal Points have established a national EW Working Group to directly manage the campaign on a tripartite basis. Tripartite consultation sometimes plays a merely supervisory role, while final decisions on the EW are left to the Focal Point, in other cases it took on the creation and organisation of some EW activities for constituents. Table 3.4 below summarizes the main consultation arrangements and working group creation in the different MS based on the information retrieved from the various EW reports. As can be seen there is a trend over time to extend the scope of social partner involvement in campaign management and to create ad hoc working groups.

Table 3.4 Member State Creation of a National EW Group

COUNTRY	2002	2001	2000	NOTES
Austria	N	N	N	No specific group set up but the EW is discussed on a regular tripartite basis.
Belgium	Y	N	N	In 2001 the role of the EW Group was filled by a tripartite bureau of the Focal Point and in 2000 Focal Point had a number of meetings with various tripartite representatives.
Denmark	Y	Y	Y	Tripartite EW Groups set up each year.
Finland	Y	n/a	Y	2001 no specific group mentioned
France	N	N	N	No specific EW Group was set up although the Focal Point did carry out regular tripartite consultations for EW organisation
Germany	N	Y	Y	NO specific group was set up but the EW was discussed on a regular basis with members of the Focal Point network.
Greece	Y	Y	N	In 2000 no specific group set up because there was already a form of tripartite cooperation.
Ireland	Y	N	N	No group set up in 2000 & 2000 but EW was discussed with the already existing large tripartite national network.
Italy	N	N	N	Tripartite consultation promoted by Government
Luxembourg	N	N	N	Ad hoc tripartite network.
Netherlands	Y	Y	N	In 2000 Focal Point and EW also worked with tripartite bureau of Focal Point but no specific EW Group.
Portugal	Y	Y	Y	EW Group is a 4 member permanent team made up of experts on information, communication, documentation and diffusion and

				the social partners.
Spain	Y	Y	Y	EW Group exists but the level of social partner involvement is not clear.
Sweden	Y	Y	N	2000 included internal Focal Point discussions while in 2001 an active tripartite EW Group was created.
United Kingdom	Y	Y	Y	Active since 1999 with social partners' involvement.

Source: Focal Point national activity reports for 2000, 2001 and 2002.

The Agency SME/EW Working Group. The main liaison between Agency and the Focal Points for campaign organisation is represented by the SME/EW Working Group. Thematic expert groups are a peculiar feature of Agency organisation and a specific Working Group including one representative designated from each Focal Point was created for EW organisation. The EW 2002 Working Group had joint responsibilities also for the SME Funding Scheme. The EW meets a couple of times during the year to prepare campaign activities and discuss results. The responsibilities of the group in terms of the EW include exchange of expertise and expert advice in campaign launch, involvement of partners, stimulating activities, facilitating exchange of expertise and measuring campaign impact. The EW 2002 WG members often play also the role of Agency counterparts in EW preparation, implementation and follow-up in their MS.

The EW-related activities of the SME/EW Working Group are hindered by two main factors: first the limited time devoted to the EW: basically only a part of its spring meeting, while the autumn one is reportedly mainly absorbed by SME Grant Scheme issues; 2) the different kind of expertise represented in the group. There is a fundamental difference between a member that is appointed on a year to year basis because of his/her expertise in the specific theme and a member that is an expert in the management and organisation of large scale campaigns, irrespective of the theme². As shown in Table 3.5 below in 6 MS, the EW GM has been the same since the first EW organized by Agency and may have been the same individual that organized the EWs previously; in 5 MS, the EW GM remained the same in 2001 and 2002; in the remaining 4 MS, the GM has changed every year.

Table 3.5 EW Working Group Member Status

COUNTRY	EW GROUP MEMBER STATUS
Austria	Same GM since 1996
Belgium	Changing GM – close involvement of Focal Point leader since 2000
Denmark	GM new every year – chosen b/c of theme expertise
Finland	Same GM since 2000 (at least)
France	Same GM in 2001 & 2002 (at least)
Germany	Same GM in 2001 & 2002
Greece	Same GM since 2000 (at least)
Ireland	GM new every year
Italy	Same GM in 2001 & 2002
Luxembourg	Same GM since 2000 (at least)
Netherlands	Same GM since 2000 (at least)
Portugal	Same GM in 2001 & 2002
Spain	GM new every year
Sweden	Same GM in 2001 & 2002
United Kingdom	Same GM since 1996

Source: Focal Point national activity reports for 2000, 2001 and 2002

² The EW GM that remain constant from year to year have an additional advantage in that they are able to build upon past experience in terms of national and international networking and in terms of the AGENCY organizational and administrative requirements.

3.4 Overview of European Level Activities

Content Production and Distribution of Campaign Materials. Agency is directly responsible for the preparation and distribution of a core set of campaign materials. These include: a) posters; b) leaflets; c) postcards; d) good practice flyers; e) press pack together with stress balls, reprint of various Agency reports on stress and the Agency stress magazine. As mentioned before most of content production is actually subcontracted to the Topic Centres; while despite some discussions with the Focal Point printing and distribution are still managed centrally because of economies of scale. In the end, the promotional materials were printed at the EU level and distributed to all MS, according to their requests as detailed in Table 3.6 below. Only when requests exceeded the foreseen threshold were Focal Points allowed to print additional materials on their own at the local level. This reportedly happened in two countries only, namely the UK and Italy. It is generally recognized that the pattern of printed materials distribution can be considered as a first good proxy of the level of development of campaign activities in the various countries.

Table 3.6 Distribution of Agency Campaign Materials to Member States

	POSTERS	LEAFLETS	FACT SHEETS	POSTCARDS	GOOD PRACTICE "FLYER"	FACTSHEET N°8	LANGUAGES
Austria	100	2,500	3,500	2,000	2,000	3,500	DE
Belgium	7,500	8,800	12,300	0	17,500	12,300	FR, NL & DE
Denmark	1,000	2,500	9,000	2000	2,000	2,000	DA
Finland	14,200	41,500	25,500	30,500	7,000	25,500	FI, SV & EN
France	5,500	20,000	20,000	3,500	3,500	20,000	FR
Germany	1,500	12,000	12,000	5,000	12,000	2,000	DE
Greece	1,000	3,000	2,000	500	5,000	3,000	EL
Ireland	10,000	18,000	20,000	5,000	1,000	1,000	EN
Italy	2,000	40,000	100,000	2,000	4,000	100,000	IT
Luxembourg	700	400	300	n.a.	1,000	300	FR & DE
Netherlands	1,500	4,000	4,000	2,000	4,000	4,000	NL
Portugal	5,000	10,000	20,000	10,000	5,000	20,000	PT
Spain	4,000	7,000	7,000	11,300	8,000	7,000	ES
Sweden	2,000	6,000	4,000	6,000	4,000	4,000	SV
UK	100,000	100,000	100,000	50,000	10,000	100,000	EN

Source: Agency internal planning materials

Website. The EW Website³ is a part of the Agency website highly appreciated and increasingly used. The EW 2002 Website was launched in May. Because of the EW 2002 the number of user sessions increased from a baseline value of 8-9000 in summer 2002 to some 13,000 in September and as high as 23,000 in October. It is interesting to note that during the peak of the campaign (September - October) the visitors that most frequently visited the Agency website came from the same MS that received high numbers of campaign materials. In fact, apart from the US that remained by far the leading country in terms of hits, the largest part of visitors came from the UK, Italy, Finland and Belgium. On top of that the Agency website provided each MS with the possibility to create a sub-site of its own dedicated to EW 2002 publicity. These websites included a combination of information in the MS national language and in English and provided both MS specific and EU level links.

³ The website provides an introduction to the theme, participants and organisers of the EW2002, a description of EU and MS activities, promotional materials and reports available for downloading and recent news. Each page offers the possibility to change to another EU language whenever necessary.

Campaign Publicity and Promotion Events. The campaign was accompanied by a number of European media and promotion events including Agency and EU institutional publications. One of the major media events organized by Agency was an EU level press conference that was held at the European Parliament in July, 2002 to formally launch the EW 2002 campaign in Europe.⁴ The conference included high level politicians including the President of the European Parliament, the European Commissioner for Employment and Social Affairs, and the Agency Director. The event was given a wide media coverage across Europe including Euronews and was accompanied by an *ad hoc* press package. Other promotional events included Agency participation to MS launch or national events (Italy, the UK, Austria, Spain, Ireland, etc) and the organisation of a final press conference for the closing event.

The Good Practice Award Scheme. Since the year 2000, the EW Campaign has been implemented in synergy with the Good Practice Award Scheme (GPAS), a European contest aimed to prize every year examples of best practice in the workplace. As already happened with EW 2001 the GPAS was part of the EW concept from the beginning. In 2002 the goal of the GPAS was to recognize companies or organisations across the MS that have made outstanding and innovative contributions in the field of psychosocial risk. The selection of candidates based on pre-defined criteria was left to the Focal Points according to national modalities and applications had to be submitted to Agency by Mid August. In 2002 out of a total 34 candidatures were received from the MS a total 20 prizes were awarded in two project categories – enterprise and innovative campaigns. More in particular a total final 11 projects were awarded the prize and an additional 9 commended. As frequently happens in the OSH field most of these initiatives are implemented by large or public organisations. The European level evaluation panel including representatives of the interest groups of the Board and Topic Centre’s representatives. The awards were given during the campaign closing event in Bilbao and cases included in an Agency publication – “Working on Stress” as examples of best practice.

Closing Event. The campaign closing event of the EW 2002 took place on November 25, 2002 in Bilbao. The event was co-sponsored by Agency and by the Danish Presidency of the EU. The purpose of the Closing Event was to promote the results of the EW, to highlight the good practice examples and to provide an arena that stimulates discussion on work-related psychosocial issues among high level European policy makers and OSH experts. In addition, the Closing Event included workshops and a colloquium as well as the Good Practice Awards Evening. The event was attended by the Agency Director, the Spanish Minister for Employment, the Danish Minister for Employment, EU Presidency as well as other members of the EC and European Parliament.

The SME Funding Scheme. To compensate for the unbalanced implementation of OSH initiatives among SMEs in Europe, in 2001 Agency created the SME Funding Scheme to co-fund innovative pilot initiatives. The SME Funding Scheme was therefore organized in a synergetic way with the same theme as the EW 2001 (accidents at work). In that year, the SME Funding Scheme had a total of €5 mn to spend while the EW 2001 received no Agency financing. In 2002, even though the SME Funding Scheme turned generic and no longer had a common theme, the SME/EW Group still met together. The actual synergies between the two were very limited. The SME Funding Scheme in 2002 was a €4 mn mechanism that awarded grants to SME-based innovative projects in the field of OSH based on a call for proposal mechanism. There are two categories for national and trans-national projects. Out of *the 41 national projects* awarded a grant in 2002, just a couple were related to psychosocial risks and stress at work. The same applies to the dozen trans-national projects, one of which is about the EW 2002 theme.

⁴ For additional public visibility, AGENCY produced the world’s biggest “stress ball” measuring 4 meters in diameter.

3.5 Overview of National Activities

Agency Seed Financed Initiatives. In 2002 EW national activities were eligible for Agency seed-financing. The purpose of the mechanism was to act as a multiplier of initiatives. Agency provided the Focal Points with indications on criteria for eligibility. These included evidence of tripartite consultation “according to national rules and practice” and a maximum 50% co-financing. The support of targeted information to prevent psycho social risks in the workplace was given the priority. The typology of projects was left fairly open and included all information activities ranging from national or local workshops/seminars, the production of informational material or guidelines, as well as various forms of good practice competitions, to participation in exhibitions/events. The only limit was that catch-all conferences not directly focused on stress would not be eligible. Table 3.8 below summarizes the national activities deemed eligible for seed financing.

Table 3.7 National Seed Financing Activities

Name of Activity	Type of Activity
AUSTRIA 14 - 20 OCTOBER 2002 STRESS LASS NACH ! BEWUSSTER UMGANG MIT STRESS	
European Week 2002 – Impuls	creation and production of a brochure, tests and training sessions
Interfaculty Stress Centre of the Karl-Franzens-University of Graz	creation of a research centre on stress.
BELGIUM 14 - 18 OCTOBER 2002 TRAVAILLER SANS STRESS ! WERKEN AAN STRESS STRESS LASS NACH ! BEWUSSTER UMGANG MIT STRESS	
Three sessions of a 4-days training on participatory risk-analysis in the Health-care sector	3 identical 4-day training sessions
Translation into Dutch and or French or English of different kind of interesting documents (magazine number 5 about Working on Stress) or leaflets concerning aspects of the European Weeks (previous or this year) for example good practices	translation and website publication
Award of the High Council of Prevention and Protection in the Workplace Theme of 2002 is Stress at work	National good practice award
Training of Time and Stress Management	training course
Preparing documents and publishing information on the Belgian site about the theme of the European Week 2002 by PREVENT vzw (national institute for occupational safety and health)	creation of Agency website for Belgium
DENMARK 21 - 27 OCTOBER 2002 TA ´ STRESSEN AF ARBEJDET	
Take the stress out of work - København, Roskilde, West Zealand and Storstrøm, Funen, Vejle, Ribe County, Ringkøbing, Århus, Viborg, Nordjylland	Numerous regional seminars and workshops across Denmark
Take the stress out of the Busdriver´s Work– Frederiksborg, Hillerød	After work meeting and production/distribution of brochure
Thrive at Work – Banish Stress	various after-work meetings, theme days or regional seminars
Occupational Psychosocial Risk Factors	various after-work meetings, theme days or regional seminars
Work Enjoyment and Enthusiasm – How does it come about?	various after-work meetings, theme days or regional seminars
Handling Stress – this is how we do it	various after-work meetings, theme days or regional seminars
Stress and Stress Prevention	various after-work meetings, theme days or regional seminars
Do Something about Stress and Health – Heart and Head at the Workplace	various after-work meetings, theme days or regional seminars
Bullying at Work – Causes and Solutions	various after-work meetings, theme days or regional seminars
From Chaos to Development	various after-work meetings, theme days or regional seminars

Stress on the Building Site	various after-work meetings, theme days or regional seminars
FINLAND 21 - 27 OCTOBER 2002 TYÖSTÄ STRESSIÄ!	
"Työstä stressiä/Working on stress" EW 2002 Opening Seminar, 21.10.2002, Helsinki	national seminar
OSH Exhibition (Tampere) and two Regional Sites (Oulu, Lappeenranta)	fairs and exhibitions to deliver general and sector oriented OSH information and materials
ALUKE II -project - development of the regional cooperation and network for the SMEs and other regional partners including occupational safety and health districts	7 regional seminars
Regional Seminars and Focused Activities in the OSH Districts	11 regional seminars
EW 2002 Co-operation in Estonia	exchange of information with Estonian partners
EW 2002 Information and Communication Activities	advertising and marketing activities
EW 2002 TV-spot/video	preparation of a TV commercial
FRANCE 21 - 25 OCTOBER 2002 TRAVAILLER SANS STRESS!	
24 October : Three seminars on Working on stress in Albi, Bordeaux and Besançon	3 regional seminars
GERMANY 7 - 11 OCTOBER 2002 STRESS LASS NACH!	
Leaving stress behind - conscious handling of stress, exchange of experience, practical examples and accompanying exhibition	regional conference
Work related stress – analysis, assessment, intervention. Curriculum for company doctors	training session
Work related stress – analysing, assessing, avoiding it	regional seminars
More successful with overcoming stress	regional workshops
GREECE 21 - 25 OCTOBER 2002 ERGON KHORIS ARGOS	
Leaflet about occupational stress	production of an informational leaflet
Two manifestations for (Athens 24/10/2002 time 9.30' a.m. – Patra21/10/2002 time 4.00 pm) dedicated on occupational stress	regional seminars
IRELAND 14 - 18 OCTOBER 2002 WORKING ON STRESS	
Stress at work - Highlight Stress Problems in the Hospital Sector, Co. Kildare	small regional lecture
Workplace Health Conference, Galway City	regional conference
SIPTU Respect & Dignity at Work: Killarney, Co. Kerry	large regional lecture
Risk Assessments for WRS, Case Studies & Coping Strategies, Dublin	regional lecture
Stress Workshops for Civil Service HR Managers & OSH Experts	multiple workshops
Risk Assessment WRS for Managers in the Health Services	risk assessment and stress management techniques
Risk Assessment & Coping Strategies	regional lecture
Work Related Stress; Case Studies and Coping Strategies, several locations	regional lecture
Work Related Stress including case studies including coping strategies	regional lecture
Psychosocial Disorders; Stress; Bullying & Violence	regional lecture
Work Related Stress; Case Studies and Coping Strategies	regional lecture
Bullying in the Workplace	regional lecture
ITALY 21 - 25 OCTOBER 2002 LAVORARE CON STRESS?	
Seminars on psycho social risk during the launch of EW 2002 in Modena (25-26Sep 2002) and during the EW 2002 (21-25 Oct 2002)	national conferences
National campaign by local radio, TV and press-office	Advertising campaign
Dissemination of information documents for employers, safety responsible and workers	production and publication of informational materials
LUXEMBOURG 21 - 27 OCTOBER 2002 TRAVAILLER SANS STRESS ! STRESS LASS NACH ! BEWUSSTER UMGANG MIT STRESS	
Semaine du Logement	participation in a week long fair in the construction sector
Workshop Future working life	national workshop
THE NETHERLANDS 14 - 19 OCTOBER 2002 WERKEN AAN STRESS	
Conference on 'Working on stress'	national conference
NL Good Practice competition	award money for national GPAS
Publicity campaign	Advertising campaign

PORTUGAL 21 - 25 OCTOBER 2002 CONTRA O STRESSE NO TRABALHO, TRABALHE CONTRA O STRESSE	
Seminar: "Working on Stress" in Setúbal	regional seminar
Seminar: "Working on Stress" in Faro	regional seminar
Seminar: "Working on Stress" in Bragança	regional seminar
Seminar: "Working on Stress" in Funchal - Madeira	regional seminar
Seminar "Stress in the teachers profession" in Aveiro	regional seminar
Seminar: "Working on Stress" in Ponta Delgada - Azores	regional seminar
Seminar: "Working on Stress" in Angra do Heroísmo - Azores	regional seminar
SPAIN 21 - 27 OCTOBER 2002 TRABAJEMOS CONTRA EL ESTRES	
Elaboration and edition of a guide for the evaluation of the stress	
Publication edition on the stress related with the work	
Technical day: Let us work against the stress	day long seminar & workshop
Technical day: El burnout	day long seminar & workshop
Technical day: The stress: Paradigm of the risk psychosocial?	day long seminar & workshop
Technical day: The labour stress: Etiologic and forms of approaching it	day long seminar & workshop
Technical day: Risks psycho socials related with the stress	day long seminar & workshop
Technical day: Working on stress (2)	day long seminar & workshop
Technical day: The stress in the workplace	day long seminar & workshop
Practical shops	5 workshops on various stress topics
Collaboration: International Prevention Week in Catalonia	week long conference and workshops
Collaboration: V Forum Foundation San Prudencio of Prevention of Labour Risks conference	regional conference
SWEDEN 21 - 25 OCTOBER 2002 ARBETA UTAN STRESS!	
Work Environment Parliament	presentation of EW results in the public and with high level politicians
Seminar Work without stress - how can it be achieved?, Halmstad	regional seminar
Seminar Work without stress - how can it be achieved?, Falun	regional seminar
Seminar Work without stress - how can it be achieved?, Sundsvall	regional seminar
UNITED KINGDOM 4 - 18 OCTOBER 2002 WORKING ON STRESS	
Launch of EW 2002 on 14 May 2002	exhibition stand at fair, combined with organisational meeting of UK network and EW Group
Promotion of Good Practice Awards	advertising campaign
UK launch of European Week on 14 October	advertising campaign
Produce targeted information	production of promotional materials
TUC: To promote involvement and participation by trade unions, full time officials and safety representatives	production of promotional materials
Regional and local media project	advertising campaign

Source: Agency website on the EW2002

Media Campaigns. EW 2002 advertising campaign in the media were organised in 7 MS, i.e. two more than in 2001. These usually are costly activities largely supported by national budgets and in a few cases without Agency co-funding. Compared to 2001 there was no longer recourse to advertising campaigns on phone cards and an increasing use of TV and radio spots. The 2002 examples include:

- Finland: In 2002 two seed money activities dealt with advertising: a general information and communication initiative to advertise and market the campaign; and, the preparation of a TV spot/video. In 2001 Finland carried out an advertising campaign to promote the GPAS in three regional daily newspapers;
- The UK: In 2002 there were 3 activities to advertise the campaign and included both advertising campaigns as well as the production and distribution of information whose ultimate goal was publicity. The activities consisted of the promotion of the GPA to encourage applications, a publicity campaign to launch the EW2002, and media packs for regional and local press. In

2001 the UK ran an advertising campaign in the OSH press and included a EW supplement in a magazine;

- Italy: as a part of seed financing Italy created a national publicity campaign through radio, TV and press to sensitise people on stress at work while in 2001 it run an advertising campaign on phone cards and in national newspapers;
- Sweden: A workers union carried out a large scale marketing campaign including informative advertisements in daily, specialized and business press.
- Belgium: One of the activities funded with seed financing activity was a publicity campaign including information publicized online and a conference with national media.
- Portugal funded a TV campaign;
- Ireland had recourse to a radio campaign.

In Denmark a media campaign also took place on the same theme of the EW 2002, but this campaign was not directly connected to the EW. On top of this almost all countries tried to obtain coverage in the media through press releases and press conferences with varying degree of success.

Other Publications and Websites. Eight countries decided to complement Agency materials by publishing national materials (books, brochures, etc.) on campaign issues. This represents a notable increase on previous years as such initiatives in 2001 had been carried out by five MS only. EW 2002 examples include:

- Austria – IMPULS project included the printing of a brochure.
- Denmark – one regional activity receiving seed funding produced a small brochure.
- Ireland – re-published a stress booklet.
- Italy – Created, published and distributed 4 separate guidelines/booklets on stress.
- Netherlands – publicized a book with the MS GPAS activities and publicity as a part of the seed financing activity. Other materials produced at the national level include invitations and booklet for the national conference.
- Portugal – produced a glossary about stress and translated two reports into national language for publication.
- Spain – a number of seed financing projects included publication of related materials including the elaboration and editing of a guide for the evaluation of stress, publication and diffusion of a manual on stress.
- UK – various seed financing activities were undertaken to produce and distribute materials. These included: the production of targeted information to raise awareness and promote participation in the eW2002; production and distribution of specific materials to promote the EW among trade unions.

Moreover, 9 out of 15 Focal Points dedicated national web pages to the EW 2002 campaign. This number is roughly comparable with that of previous years. Five of these national web pages were located within the Agency website with an Agency.eu.int address. The remaining 4 web pages were located within the website of the national OSH organisation. The national web pages were successful in publicising the EW on a MS level: the web pages of the UK for example received 248,000 hits in August and September alone. The UK also created a new web site for work related stress launched in parallel to the EW that received 13,359 visits and 15,061 requests for publication between mid October and mid November 2002.⁵

⁵ The number of national websites created is based on information provided by the AGENCY EW2002 website. Although not included in that list, 2 additional MS made comments in their activity reports referring to the success of their own national websites.

National Good Practice Awards. National Good Practice Awards mirroring the European Scheme were carried out in the UK, Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany. In Belgium and the Netherlands, the national GPAS was implemented with seed financing and there was a monetary prize for award winners. In 3 out of the 4 national award schemes, the MS selected winners on the national level and subsequently submitted a selection of their national winners to the EU level GPAS. This proved to be much more successful than the MS that ran a separate EU GPAS. The number of national applications submitted ranged from 12 in the Netherlands, 23 in Germany and the UK and 40 in Belgium. Overall, the number of national GPAS represents an increase compared to previous editions of the campaign. In 2001 Good Practice Awards Scheme had been implemented in Ireland, the UK and Belgium.

Other National Activities. As has become customary within the framework of the European Week the most frequently organised events in all Member States are seminars and workshops at both the regional and the national level and targeted to various audiences. It is difficult to have precise figures on these national events. On the one hand the Focal Point are not necessarily aware of all the initiatives put in place by their national campaign partners outside formal seed-financing for which reporting is compulsory. In fact there are few campaign monitoring system in place in most MS and as a result the available information is often patchy and confused. On the other hand there is little common terminology adopted in formal campaign reporting and inconsistencies over the years are fairly frequent. Table 3.9 below represents an, admittedly and inevitably incomplete attempt to provide a first picture of national campaign activities based on various sources including the seed-financing reports, the 2002 EW final reports and our own case studies. Based on this the following observations can be made.

- *Seminars*, be they at the national or regional levels are the typology of EW activity most consistently implemented throughout Europe. Large, national level or full day conferences, and/or regional, small lectures, seminars or workshops, were carried out in almost all countries. Some of these activities were organized on a more interactive level, directly involving participants. There might be differences in size, coverage and duration, but all in all a total more than 300 activities can be estimated in this area.
- *Training Sessions* includes a number of projects that were organized specifically to teach participants stress related prevention or reduction. These activities were often done at the workplace level and typically included a more limited number of participants per activity. They were organised in 4 MS for a total estimated 11 events. In some cases, a number of smaller interactive workshops and meetings included in the above category could have been considered training sessions.
- *Fairs and Exhibitions* were organised in 3 countries for a total of 15 events. These activities included exhibitions dedicated solely to the EW 2002 and also EW related initiatives within a larger national fair.
- *Open Door Days* were organised by 3 countries making for a total of 3 events. These activities are carried out at the work place level where companies open their working space to the public or to family and friends to share and show their EW 2002 initiatives. The number of people included in these events varies greatly depending on how big a company is.

The following table presents the distribution of activities in MS. The numbers are based on information available in the Reports on Seed Money Activities and in the Reports on national Activities. Unfortunately, many Focal Points were unable to provide a complete list of the activities implemented in their country. In many cases below, singular seed financing projects included a

number of smaller seminars occurring repeatedly in different locations. In this table, each repetition of an event is considered as a separate project.

Table 3.8 Distribution of Activities Among Member States

	National/Large Seminar Workshop		Regional Seminar Workshop		Training Sessions		Fairs Exhibitions		Open Doors Day		Other		Total	
	TOT	EU	TOT	EU	TOT	EU	TOT	EU	TOT	EU	TOT	EU	TOT	EU
AUS ⁶	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	1	1 ⁷	2	2	9	8
BEL ⁸	1	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	7
DEN	5	2	48	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	55	25
FIN ⁹	1	1	20	18	0	0	3	3	0	0	2	2	26	24
FRA	0	0	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	3
GER	0	0	6	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	0	14	7
GRE	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	3
IRE	0	0	31	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	14
ITA ¹⁰	2	2	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	2
LUX	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	2
NET ¹¹	1	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	1	17	2
POR	0	0	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	37 ¹²	0	48	7
SPA	0	0	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
SWE	0	0	39	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 ¹³	1	41	4
UK ¹⁴	5	0	62	0	5	0	11	1	0	0	46	0	129	1
EU 15	16	7	293	98	11	5	15	5	3	1	109	11	447	127

⁶ Seed money report presented an interesting project – the creation of a stress related research organisation.

⁷ This open door day was included in the Austrian national report as a seed money activity but it is not present in the seed money report.

⁸ Final report sends reader to the interim report on seed money.

⁹ Two other seed financing activities include the advertising and TV activities mentioned above.

¹⁰ Other seed financing activities include the advertising and publication activities mentioned above. During the case study the Italian Focal Point reported being aware of 34 conferences and workshops.

¹¹ One other seed financing activity is a publicity event mentioned above.

¹² Portugal report includes mention of 37 sensitising activities organised through tripartite network.

¹³ Includes a supervision campaign in which environment inspectors visited 1,550 worksites.

¹⁴ The remaining 5 seed financing activities were related to advertising and publication and therefore have already been mentioned in the relevant sections above. According to the interviews with the UK Focal Point there were approximately 1600 activities implemented, largely at the workplace level, a small minority of which were conferences with a total reported involvement of some 20,000 employers. The numbers reported here are based on lists included in the HSE and social partner websites.

4. RELEVANCE

Introduction. This chapter will address issues of relevance, i.e. of 1) coherence of the campaign objectives with identified needs and priorities and of 2) appropriateness of the overall campaign setting. In this particular case, relevance attains first of all the suitability of the EW 2002 selected theme to beneficiaries' interests and needs. Furthermore it relates to the overall conception of the campaign in terms of design and timing and to some of its key peculiarities: its being a European initiative carrying a common EU logo.

4.1 Background

The theme of the EW is chosen based on tripartite consultation and changes on a yearly basis. The EW 2002 theme was chosen in March 2001 by Agency Board without formal Focal Point consultation. When a number of possible themes for the EW 2001 were proposed in November 2000, psychosocial risk scored second after accidents at work (the theme for the EW 2001). In the subsequent discussions on the 2003 – 2006 themes, the Focal Points themselves have been formally involved in the consultation process and an agenda of themes has already been set by the Board.

As always happens, at the time of making a decision the choice of the EW 2002 theme was not without its pros and cons. The Agency Board on the one hand acknowledged that psychosocial risk was a theme concerning all sectors and there was scientific evidence of its growing importance as an OSH problem in Europe¹⁵. Moreover, it was possible to include other important issues such as bullying, mobbing and violence at work. The subject was included in the EU strategy, Commission guidelines had already been drafted and research and pilot examples of good practice were available for dissemination. However, on the other hand it was also acknowledged how it could be particularly difficult to organise activities at the workplace level, especially in the SME world, where stress is hardly yet perceived as an issue. Last but not least it was remarked there is a general lack of legal instruments (regulations, cods, etc) available across Europe to practically handle the topic and define clear benchmarks. This latter point was of particular concern to employers' organizations that highlighted the possibility of the campaign creating expectations in an area not well regulated and defined and therefore ultimately resulting in fostering conflicts and further confusion.

Since its establishment the European Week has been structured as a week long event. This is mainly due to historical reasons as the Commission has a long-established tradition of organising campaigns as "weeks". Some aspects of the campaign design have long been controversial. For instance a part of the SME/EW 2002 Working Group remarked in their works how "*the impact [of the campaign] could be increased if the main EW activities were carried out simultaneously all across Europe*". This search for synergic effects in time and space is well known to campaign professionals that often would prefer to concentrate events on the shortest period of time across the largest number of countries possible to increase media coverage. Other concerns relate to the lack of campaign reinforcement effects over time. It is usually considered best practice that campaign messages are reinforced after a certain period of time to ensure their sustainability. In the case of the EW no follow-up reinforcement campaign is presently envisaged. This is of particular concern to employees' organisations that have often expressed their preference for biennial events both to increase sustainability of results and to leave more room for campaign preparation and mobilisation of resources.

¹⁵ This view had been informally supported by 10 Focal Points that saw a need to develop additional preventive actions in the field of stress. Moreover 8 Focal Points considered stress as an emerging risk.

4.2 The Suitability to Beneficiaries Interests and Needs

General Remarks. The wide consensus on the suitability of the EW2002 theme to beneficiaries' interests and needs was largely confirmed by the results of the evaluation questionnaires, interviews and case studies. As shown in Table 4.1 below by far the vast majority of respondents, be they Focal Points, campaign partners or high level EU politicians / stakeholders maintain that stress is a significant issue currently facing EU workers today and that the EW2002 theme was highly appropriate. More in particular, as shown by the table below, in almost 90% of Focal Points the suitability of the stress theme for national interests and needs was positively rated and just two MS provided a neutral answer. This is little surprise if one considers that 10 Focal Points were favourable to the theme from the beginning. However, all in all even the results from campaign partner questionnaires and case studies show there is a general consensus of the high suitability and timeliness of the EW2002 because of the increasing importance of psychosocial risk and its economic toll. In some cases the stress theme was already a part of the national agenda so the EW came as particularly welcome. In one country, stress was such a high profile and attractive theme that some extra possible social partners asked to join the EW tripartite consultation. The only reservations were voiced by some employers' organizations that on the one hand generally tend to refrain from initiatives not aimed at a specific risk or a specific group and, on the other hand wondered whether the lack of clear legal solutions to communicate would ultimately result in campaign ineffectiveness.

Table 4.1 Suitability of the Stress Theme to Focal Points & Campaign Partners

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Suitability to the interests and needs of the MS <i>1 is not suitable and 5 is very suitable</i>	0	0	2 13%	3 20%	10 67%	4.5	5
Campaign Partner	Suitability of the EW 2002 theme to your interests and priorities. <i>1 is the least suitable and 5 is the most suitable</i>	4%	9%	10%	35%	42%	4.0	5

Ability to Attract Media Support. The particular appeal of the EW 2002 theme was also reinforced by practical campaign-related considerations. As shown by Table 4.2 below the largest majority of Focal Points (ten out of fifteen in our sample) found that the EW 2002 theme was particularly of interest to the media and easy to communicate. Only one country was fairly negative about this aspect. In some cases, it was reported that the theme was already being dealt with at a national level, both through media initiatives as well as through national OSH agendas. There was a general feeling that in the context of the media the campaign message could be more easily conveyed. Although clearly appreciated by campaign implementers who saw their task easier, this relatively high media appeal raised some concerns among some employee's representatives who saw the risk that the campaign – supported by too much media attention - could turn into an exceedingly media based exercise to the detriment of workplace focused initiatives. However these concerns, when expressed, never modified an overall largely favourable assessment on the campaign theme overall suitability and appropriateness.

Table 4.2 Media Interest in the Stress Theme According to Focal Points

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Ability to attract media attention	0	1	4	1	9	4.2	5
	<i>1 is very difficult and 5 is very easy</i>	0%	7%	27%	7%	60.0%		

Broad Versus Narrowly Defined Theme. There has been a long debate among campaign implementers and Focal Points in particular, about the various pros and cons of broadly defined themes versus more focused ones. There was a general consensus among all respondents that psychosocial risks and stress could be considered as a very broad theme, despite the attempt to make it narrower through the “special focus on stress”. In fact, various campaign stakeholders usually stretched it further towards violence and bullying or mobbing. This lack of precision and focus was generally considered as a liability by a minority of Focal Points that would have preferred a more focused theme to rally support on the campaign. On the contrary the majority of respondents considered a broadly defined theme as an asset, as it allowed a wider approach targeting a wider audience. It is difficult to find the rationale behind these two arguments that despite their being apparently so similar lead to such different conclusions. Although generalisations are not possible, it can be roughly observed that those who prefer narrow themes often have a fairly institutional approach to campaign managing and organising. They tend to seek support “from above” – i.e. from Government institutions and feel that well defined themes help them in establishing an institutional dialogue. On the contrary the others seem to have a more “bottom-up” approach to campaign management and are more familiar with raising funds and involving interest groups from below. Therefore they appreciate the room of manoeuvre a broad theme leaves to them. It comes then to little surprise that the EW 2003 campaign (as a fairly broad even if much more traditional theme) raises similar expectations.

Availability of Best Practice. As correctly anticipated at the time of the theme choice, the issue of lack of both best practice and legal benchmarks became one of the most controversial aspects of the EW 2002. In the vast field of psychosocial risk, research is still going on and best practice mechanisms are being identified in certain areas only and at any rate still lack widespread recognition, not to say legal endorsement. To partly respond to this problem Agency tried to narrow down the theme by switching the focus on stress, the area where the larger amount of research results and good practice techniques are already available. Nevertheless, some Focal Points reported that although the stress theme was completely relevant to national needs, it caused some unexpected difficulties. Since there are limited legal benchmarks and recognisable best practice methods, campaign organisers faced complications in their attempt to take action on stress. Due to this legal ambiguity in some countries it was found that social partners’ willingness to actually participate in the organisation of initiatives at the workplace level was much scarcer than in recent years. Elsewhere anecdotal cases were reported of companies that, when demanding advice on concrete actions to be taken, were left almost empty-handed. In the UK, the country that traditionally manages to establish the highest number of contacts at the workplace level, it was noticed how in previous years, organisations participating in the EW demonstrated a willingness and desire to publicise their events and to act as testimonials but this year, participants were much more sceptical. Apparently this unexpected behaviour was attributed to uncertainties about the “correctness” of the activities to be implemented and the inability to compare their experience with pre-established benchmarks.

Role in the European Policy Agenda. While Focal Point and campaign partners tended to emphasize campaign management considerations in their comments on campaign suitability and relevance the interviewees active at the European level preferred to put the emphasis on suitability to the EU policy agenda. Under this respect it was frequently observed how stress is one of the top priorities of EC action in the OSH field and therefore a perfectly suitable and EU synergic theme

for the EW. The theme also fit well within EC requirements to prepare a new instrument on stress as required by the new strategy COM 2002/118. Its political timing was therefore generally deemed highly appropriate also in the light of the parallel ETUC-UNICE decision to start negotiations on defining an EU instrument on stress.

4.3 The Appropriateness of the EW Organisational Model

A Week Long Event. In spite of the various arguments that can be formulated against the EW concept and timing as it is now and of the possible alternative solutions - including European day, month or year – and the related pros and cons, there is a strong *a priori* consensus at the Focal Point level on leaving things as they are. In fact, more than 90 % of the responding Focal Points are fully satisfied with the timeframe of the EW as it is currently arranged. They are reportedly happy with both the concept of a European Week and the flexibility provided by the choice of weeks within the month of October. In this way, MS are able to have a certain degree of freedom to choose the week that fits best with other aspects of the national agenda.

Although the overall feeling was satisfaction with the flexibility the current EW timeframe currently provides, a number of fairly drastic suggestions were made during the interviews and the case studies by a minority of respondents that would like to change the week-long structure of the week either by turning it into an initiative that lasts longer than a week – perhaps a month or longer; or, a single European Day that is common to all MS. Another less radical suggestion frequently voiced was the possibility to organise the week in the same calendar week throughout Europe in order to improve and to maximize the total EU visibility. This idea is usually resisted by the Focal Points based on arguments that in a common week available top European OSH experts would be too thinly spread across the various initiatives MS. We are not fully convinced of the soundness of this argument, as on the one hand it further stresses the assumption that “national conferences” are a key component of the campaign, and on the other hand because it estimates invitation of other EU experts as a phenomenon more widespread and important than it currently appears. At any rate discussions with Focal Points and comments included in the questionnaires easily lead to the conclusion that although there are other possibilities, all are in agreement that the current EW timeframe is the best possible compromise.

Yearly Theme and Campaign Reinforcement. In the current structure, the EW theme changes on a yearly basis. In this way, the EW does not give too much emphasis to a certain topic and is able to address various OSH themes relevant to different MS and social partner groups. Interviewees have presented both positive and negative reactions to the yearly changing theme: some find a year sufficient time to cover a single OSH topic and by the end of the EW, they and their constituents are ready to move on to another topic while others feel that they do not have enough time to fully cover a certain theme before they have to change directions and focus on another one. They feel unable to fully mobilise a sufficient amount of social partner interest or willingness to participate on a yearly basis. There is a certain consensus that problems related to planning a campaign preparation on a theme that changes yearly can be at least partly coped with through a better anticipation of foreseen themes. This is no longer an issue after the Agency the campaign themes till 2006 have been made known. Still, existing stronger reservations have been voiced on the impact the changing theme has on lack of campaign reinforcement and sustainability. At present EW follow-up is left to national initiatives and to activities left to the social partners such as for instance the seminars planned by UNICE and ETUC in 2003 and 2004.

Although the political feasibility of EU-funded reinforcement activities appears limited there is a strong request in this direction coming from the operational layer. Previous evaluation reports

already noted a tendency in some countries to include initiatives within the framework of the EW that were actually related to the previous year's theme. A few instances of the same phenomenon were found for the EW 2002, as well (although obviously outside of seed financing) and represent an indicator of a hidden need within the system. Alternative solutions proposed included: 1) the use of one theme that stays constant for two years in a row – developing and maturing through two EWs; 2) the repetition of a theme every couple of years in order to ensure the sustainability of results; and possibly a bit more realistically even if with important cost implications 3) the creation of an additional minor campaign that accompanies the major EW (whose theme changes every year) that organises events on the theme of the previous year, perhaps with EU financing, in order to ensure the sustainability of results.

4.4 Relevance of the EW 2002 as a European Initiative

Visibility and Image Considerations. In some countries the suitability of the EW2002selected theme was increased by synergies with previous national campaigns or other parallel initiatives. In 2002 there was a slight increase in the number of such synergic campaigns compared with previous years. Examples include:

- Ireland where the EW 2002 activities were linked to a national Safe Town and Good Neighbour Scheme.
- Denmark, where there was a campaign in 2000 and 2001 (and one planned for 2003) specifically dealing with psychosocial risk in the workplace through control and inspection of schools and hospitals. Moreover the OSH organisation runs two national seed money funds to improve the psychosocial environment in the workplace.
- The UK, the national OSH organisation ran a national campaign on stress during the summer of 2002 in order to launch the EW.
- In Italy the Focal Point ran a parallel national information campaign on hazard from chemical products that was inspired by new Italian legislation, but can also be seen as an introductory activity to the EW 2003 campaign.

Relevance of the Campaign as an EU Initiative. There are important divergences among MS in the assessment given to the added value the EW has in the various national contexts because of its being a European initiative. As shown in Table 4.3 below, the sheer visibility of the campaign as a European initiative is considered as a plus by the majority of respondents, but this is not universally agreed upon. Even more importantly there is even less consensus among Focal Points that EW organisation and its European dimension result in an improved image for the Focal Point itself. This has important implications for the possibility of using prestige considerations in campaign organisation as a motivational tool, which appear fairly limited.

Table 4.3 Campaign Visibility & Image as an EU Initiative

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Amount the EW2002's visibility as an EU initiative has added to the success of your week. <i>1 is no addition and 5 is greatly added</i>	0 0%	2 13 %	6 40%	4 27%	3 20%	3.5	3
Focal Point	Amount the organisation's image has improved because of role in the EW2002. <i>1 is no improvement and 5 is greatly improved</i>	3 20%	3 20%	2 13%	5 33%	2 13%	3.0	4

The Use of the EU Logo. From what is reported above, there are different propensities to identify the EW campaign as a EU initiative. As presented in Table 4.4 while the large majority of Focal Point responded positively when asked about the use of the EU logo together with the Campaign logo –that was found as consistently used during the week, others acknowledged it is hardly ever used, even when strictly mandatory (e.g., seed financing). More in general the rationale behind the use of the EU flag as a logo created a certain amount of confusion. While in some cases the EU logo was sought out and used by activity organisers that did not receive seed financing but still wanted to publicize their activity as part of the EW in others the logo was seen as more directly related to EU financing. Also in past years the use of the EU logo has not been systematic at the national level: in some cases project organizers have not used the logo in the production of materials for solely national activities.

Table 4.4 The Use of the EU Logo

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	The use of the EU logo throughout the week.	0	2	1	3	9	4.3	5
	<i>1 is never and 5 is always</i>	0%	13%	7%	20%	60%		

4.5 Summary of Main Findings

- There was overall Focal Point satisfaction with the EW as a week long event with the flexibility in choice of weeks allowing MS to have a certain degree of freedom to choose the week that fits best with other aspects of the national agenda After weighing other possible combinations, Focal Points agree that the “week” structured as it is represents the best possible solution.
- The choice of the yearly theme is a fundamental decision that has effects the overall success of the week. It is necessary to find a balance between various stakeholder, Focal Point/government, and media needs.
- Overall high satisfaction with the 2002 theme. Stress was a theme concerning all sectors and there was scientific evidence of its growing importance as an OSH problem in Europe. A drawback to the theme was that it was particularly difficult to organise activities at the workplace level, especially in the SME world, where stress is hardly perceived as an issue.
- The EWs visibility as an EU initiative has a generally positive effect on Focal Points and on the success of national EWs.
- In some MS the EW fit nicely within other OSH initiatives thereby increasing the synergies with previous national campaigns or other parallel initiatives.
- The theme was particularly attractive to the media.
- It was felt there is a general lack of legal instruments (regulations, codes, etc) available across Europe to practically handle the topic and define clear benchmarks. This point was of particular concern in that it could have possibly created expectations in an area not well regulated and therefore ultimately resulting in fostering conflicts and further confusion.
- Stress is one of the top priorities of EC action in the OSH field and therefore a perfectly suitable and EU synergic theme for the EW.

- The EW theme changes on a yearly basis. In this way, the EW does not give too much emphasis to a certain topic and is able to address various OSH themes relevant to different MS and social partner groups. Both positive and negative reactions to the yearly changing theme have been presented.

5. OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Introduction. This chapter will discuss matters regarding the operational effectiveness of the EW 2002 through a historical, quantitative and qualitative approach. Topics covered here include the overall management of the EW 2002 including division of labor between centralized and decentralized activities, Agency's support and publicity activities, the role and effectiveness of the SME/EW Working Group, the Good Practice Award Scheme and the final Closing Event.

5.1 Agency General Management & Coordination

In 2002 Agency established for the first time a specific task force within the Agency responsible for co-ordinating the SME Grant and EW activities. This Task Force works closely in contact with the two Agency's departments mainly involved in Campaign activities, namely the Information and Communication Unit (ICU) that is responsible for communication and promotion actions and the Work and Environment Unit (WEU) that more directly follows the GPAS. Apart from that, the decentralised organisational model of the campaign has not substantially changed respect previous years and is still based on a combination of activities by the EU Presidency, EU institutions, social partners and Agency itself.

There was a general appreciation of Agency overall operational effectiveness in managing the campaign. As shown in Table 5.1 below, the large majority of respondents are positive or even very positive in assessing Agency's responsiveness to their needs. The establishment of the Task Force was generally deemed as an effective and useful innovation both outside the Agency at the Focal Point level and within Agency itself; only minor remarks were made on unclear organisational aspects of the GPAS. Apart from aspects related to the timetable of the campaign that are generally deemed outside Agency control as they descend from the EU budgetary appropriation mechanism, the only additional qualitative comments made on campaign organizations referred to relatively minor problems regarding timing and translation of publicity materials. These issues will be discussed in further detail in the section below on Agency Support Activities.

Table 5.1 Agency Campaign Management Responsiveness to Focal Point Needs

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Agency campaign management responsiveness to Focal Point needs on EW2002-related matters. <i>1 is the least responsive and 5 is the most responsive</i>	0 0%	0 0%	2 13.3%	11 73.3%	2 13.3%	4.6	4

Trans-national Cooperation. The promotion of trans-national cooperation and exchange of expertise is left to relatively few instruments. The existing instruments are the SME/EW Working Group that was supposed to act as an instrument to facilitate trans-European co-operation, and the closing event that represents an opportunity to discuss the event at the European level. Cross-border cooperation has long been recognized as one of the EW's weakest areas. It is generally considered as a difficult undertaking per se, as campaign organisers in the various MS tend to believe that the specific (cultural, legal, etc) conditions in their countries are so different to hinder any real possibility of co-operation. Although the SME/EW 2002 Working Group broadly shared this view, it also attempted to formulate proposals that would increase co-operation. These included among others: mutual invitation to EW events and use of existing international cooperation programs for joint projects. In line with expectations and the results of previous evaluations the satisfaction with

present Agency's contribution to the promotion of trans-national cooperation is still deemed insufficient by a significant number of respondents (Table 5.2) and a generic feeling that more action is needed in this field was expressed by several interviewees. In 2002 there was just one actual cross-border initiative, and there were at least two in 2001.

Table 5.2 Trans-national Cooperation

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Agency contribution to the promotion of cooperation between MS. (1 non respondent) <i>1 is most negative and 5 is most positive</i>	1 7%	3 21%	3 21%	5 36%	2 14%	3.3	4

Contrary to what one could have expected, the perception that the lack of trans-national cooperation is a problem area is more likely to be found at the operational level among campaign organisers and national social partners than among European level institutions. The latter are more inclined to believe that the creation of OSH solutions is only possible on a national level in that they are defined within a specific language, culture and work sector and that initiatives like the Closing Event represent one of the few realistic ways to discuss and share EW experience at the EU level "among policymakers". While most national implementers do believe that trans-national cooperation is a challenging area for development, a number of respondents, especially among social partners, considered that increased trans-national cooperation should be a key element to run a successful EW week. To them in order to have trans-national projects, Agency should attempt to specifically stimulate activities among EU level employer and employee organisations or multi-national enterprises.

Linguistic Constraints. The EW suffers because of linguistic barriers to communication. There are a number of MS that are less familiar with English and suffer in their relations with Agency in that they would require all documents (for the Focal Point as well as for their constituents) in their national language. Linguistic problems with the EW have come in the following areas: translation of promotional materials and use of campaign slogans. In some cases the translations into national languages required a good deal of editing and the Focal Points did not adequate time to do so. The issue of campaign slogans came up in certain countries where social partners had reservations on how the slogan sounded in the national language and its message implications.

Distribution of Activities. There is an overall consensus that the right balance between centralised and national activities has been found and little need is felt to modify the present situation. The EW 2002 evaluation substantially confirms the previous evaluations' assessment that the current EW organisational model, based as it is on a flexible approach of centralised and decentralised activities, is a strength of the EW. When asked if there are any other Agency centralized activities that should be introduced within the realm of the campaign, the majority of Focal Points had no particular needs. Some mentioned the improvement of the connections with other Agency sectoral activities (mainly the SME grant scheme) or the distribution of newsletters on the GPAS or other EW events. All in all 10 MS (out of a total of 14 responses) were by and large happy with the balance between activities decentralized at the national level and activities centralized by Agency. Two MS would have preferred more national activities (basically national printing of campaign materials) and two would have preferred even more Agency activities.

5.2 Agency Support Activities

Background. The information materials that Agency created for the EW 2002 were shown to the Focal Points during the March SME/EW meeting. These included: i) the good practice award flyer (to be distributed by mid-March); ii) the campaign information pack (to be distributed by end of March); iii) the reprint of the Agency's report on stress research, the fact-sheets on bullying, violence & stress management (to be ready by end May/June); iv) the Agency magazines Stress (to be ready by May/June); and, v) stress balls (to be ready by June/July). Additional materials included the Information Report Systems and Programs to be delivered by October together with possible further fact-sheets. Most of these materials were printed into 11 languages after their text had been revised by the Focal Points themselves. Moreover it was announced that a section of the Agency website dedicated to the EW would be available in May. In that occasion it was not possible to brief the SME/EW Working Group about Agency media and communication activities as these had not been approved yet by Agency hierarchy. These subsequently unfolded in a main campaign launch event at the EU Parliament in July. The SME/EW 2002 Working Group highlighted the importance of promotional activities and recommended to take advantage of "silly summer seasons" lacking political and social news to attract media coverage for the EW. This was broadly the rationale behind the Agency EW press presentation. But at the same time it also highlighted the importance of having the campaign message repeated several times before the EW takes place to serve as a support for awareness raising activities at the workplace level.

As far as Agency support materials were concerned previous evaluations accurately highlighted some problems including the quality of translation into national languages, the lack of time to conduct and confirm the editing of materials in national languages and the delay in having publicity materials delivered. In both 2000 and 2001 fact sheets were the best single publicity element produced by the Agency, followed by Agency reports and promotional fliers. The postcards and posters produced usually were the least used and least appreciated articles. No problems were ever reported about the quality of graphics and quantity of materials. Since it was first used as a means for campaign publicity in the context of the EW 2000, it has been noted how the EW website functions have become increasingly high quality, reliable and complete. Recommendations were formulated by previous evaluators to increase the portal dimension of the campaign website by increasing links to resource centres and national organisations and to consider the possibility of delegating the printing of publicity materials to the national level.

The Quality and Usefulness of Campaign Materials. By and large Focal Points and campaign organisers were fairly satisfied with the quality of the campaign materials received from Agency and in particular with the factual support provided through the fact sheets, Agency report and the scientific research and ideas made available for the campaign. The main problems regarding campaign materials still mainly include organisational issues with timing and language. In 2002 the delivery of some materials was slightly delayed and MS did not have enough time to distribute them properly. These delays were especially relevant in cases concerning fact sheets seeing that they are the most valued part of Agency materials. More importantly, a number of Focal Points complained about the insufficient time for the necessary editing and linguistic corrections of materials in their national languages. Also there have been a number of working documents made available in English only thereby creating a significant linguistic barrier between Agency and some of the less multi-lingual MS. But this seems to be a more general point of the relations between the Agency and the Focal Points than a campaign specific issue.

Fact Sheets are confirmed as the most important part of the promotional materials, followed close behind by the Good Practice Flyers and Leaflets. As previous evaluations already found there

is relatively less appreciation for posters and postcards (Table 5.3). In particular, postcards appear as an item whose production can be discontinued in the future. On the contrary, additional comments focused on the high usefulness and importance of the stress ball, a EW 2002 innovation. Therefore when asked what additional materials should be produced, a number of Focal Points mentioned other small gadgets or gifts similar to the stress balls that attract attention. A few comments were made on the need to produce items such as videocassettes or computer sophisticated presentations. At any rate the majority of Focal Points think that Agency should not produce any additional materials compared while 1/3rd of them think the opposite. A few MS have made suggestions mirroring that included in previous evaluation reports, i.e. to have publicity materials printed at the national level in order to save transportation costs and reduce possible delays. However, there is a widespread understanding that this choice has large cost constraints and would not be the best option for the majority of MS.

Table 5.3 Importance of Agency Promotional Materials (14 respondents rated from 1-5)

Posters	Leaflets	Fact Sheets	Postcards	Good Practice Flyers
3.4	3.6	4.1	2.2	3.7

Focal Points were also asked to roughly assess the degree Agency publicity measures are targeted to their various national audiences. For each element, they were asked to rate the level of targeting where 1 is the least successful and 5 is the most. As shown in Table 5.4 below according to the average responses, Agency materials are considered as slightly biased in their conception towards an audience of OSH specialist and staff and are not as good and user-friendly as communication instruments aimed at the wider public.

Table 5.4 Degree Agency Publicity Measures are Targeted to MS National Audiences (rated 1-5)

General Public	Employees	Employers	OSH Staff	OSH Experts
3.1	3.6	3.6	3.9	4.0

Media & Communication. In respect to previous campaigns there is a growing appreciation of Agency media and communication support to national campaign activities, (which was previously deemed as hardly existent) although there is still substantial room for improvement. Table 5.5 below summarizes Focal Points opinions on the relationship between Agency media and communication support and individual MS activities. As can be seen, despite the generally positive comments heard about the launching of the campaign and creative promotion initiatives such as the giant stress ball, almost 30% of respondents still have a negative or fairly negative view on the synergies between the Agency media and communication campaign and their own activities and remark little visible coherence overall.

The EU level launching event received considerable praise for being a good event and for increasing the overall visibility of the EW – the giant stress ball apparently was a catchy object, but at the same time it was frequently noted how insufficient co-ordination was reached with parallel national launch events so that little real synergy was possible. Most importantly as far as the launching event is concerned, there seems to be a trade-off between a good timing for the media and a good timing to raise interest at the workplace level in the SME world. Those who are familiar with the media tend to appreciate an early summer timing because this increases the possibility of attracting journalists' attention in a period notoriously deprived of news. But those who are mainly interested in raising interest about the campaign at the SME level note that a launch in July is too

delayed to be of any real use and would prefer to see it much earlier during the year, i.e. at least in May as presently done in the UK. Finally there are those who contest in principle any attempt to organise EU level publicity events and deem that the campaign in their individual country must be completely self sufficient and completely dependant on national initiatives alone. These Focal Points feel that there is no need to have any synergy with Agency support activities at all.

The Website. The vast majority of respondents were happy with the Agency website and found it to be supportive of their national campaigns (Table 5.5). The website came in handy for consultation and Focal Points were able to download additional materials as necessary. A steady quality increase over time is generally appreciated and little specific suggestions for improvement have been made, but minor remarks on the need to continue the present move towards an increasing portal dimension and more resource-related links. Relatively little comments were heard on the newly introduced Agencynet extranet system and internal forum groups and the overall impression is that the system is still poorly used, but we lack sufficient evidence to draw any definite conclusion on this aspect.

Table 5.5 Agency Support in Media and Communication

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Amount the Agency media & communication campaign support of MS activities <i>1 is the least and 5 is the most</i>	1 7%	3 21%	4 29%	6 43%	0 0%	3.1	4
Focal Point	Amount the Agency website support in MS campaign <i>1 is the least and 5 is the most supportive</i>	0 0%	1 7.7%	2 15.4%	7 53.8%	3 23.1%	3.9	4

5.3 Role and Effectiveness of the SME /EW Group & Synergies with the SME Grant Scheme

Background. As described in Chapter 3, the SME/EW Working Group is the main liaison mechanism between Agency and the Focal Point as far as EW organisation is concerned. In 2002 the SME/EW remained a joint working group despite the fact that the two underlying initiatives were disconnected and the SME Grant Scheme had no particular theme. This will no longer be the case in 2003 when the two groups will reportedly be disjointed. The disconnection of the EW from the SME Grant Scheme was done for several reasons. Already at the time of the EW 2002 theme selection it was acknowledged how psychosocial risk and stress at work lends itself poorly to easily organise SME-related activities. On top of that the EW 2001 evaluation concluded that the overall synergies between the two initiatives were merely operational and organisational at both the national and EU level and that other synergies or enhanced impacts could not be identified through the evaluation. In practice, because of budgetary constraints the 2002 SME Grants were only awarded in September-October and *de facto* implemented during the subsequent year. Stemming from that it was recommended either to manage the two initiatives as completely distinct or to improve synergies by a longer term programming and a common theme with the GPAS. In the end it was decided to keep the two initiatives separate, but for the common Working Group. The SME Grant Scheme is being given a clearer legal basis to see whether multi-annual programming is possible and is subject to a separate evaluation exercise to provide elements to decide on its controversial continuation.

Role of the EW Working Group. There are fairly diverging views on the role of the SME/EW Working Group and the ideal synergies possible between the EW and the SME Grant Scheme. These divergences mainly depend on the relative importance practical day-to-day issues

have on ideal improvements in the mind of respondents. As shown in Table 5.6 below a majority of Focal Points does not see the need to introduce any major change to the present lack of relation between the EW and the SME Grant Scheme and is all in all fairly satisfied with the present functioning of the EW Working Group. The EW Working Group meetings are mainly seen as a forum for personal networking and information exchange. Those who have a more critical view tend to emphasize how most of the SME/EW time is devoted to SME Grant issues and that the Working Group has so far only limitedly served the purpose of facilitating the exchange of experiences in Europe. In fact, it was noted how even in the EW2002 case most of the EW Working Group's comments and contributions, although correct and appropriate on paper were not put into practice. Five Focal Points reported they are in favour of a separate working group for the EW 2002 that is completely separate from the SME Funding Scheme in order to distribute the work more evenly in terms of time commitment and number of people working on the two activities. Five other Focal Points reported that they would prefer to keep the two initiatives together in order to limit the overall number of meetings and administrative responsibilities. The remaining have a neutral attitude or are in no position to express a clear preference. On average those who would like to see a more proactive and specific role of the EW Working Group are also those who are more active in organising the campaign at the national level in terms of number and scope of activities.

Table 5.6 SME Grant Scheme / EW Group

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Opinion on the current relationship between the SME Grant Scheme and the EW2002	2 14%	3 21%	1 7%	6 42%	2 14%	3.2	4
Focal Point	Assessment of the EW Group's contribution to the EW 2002 <i>1 is most negative and 5 is most positive</i>	0 0%	1 8%	2 16%	6 50%	3 25%	3.9	4

Synergies with the SME Grant Scheme. The comments on the relation between the week and the SME Grant Scheme were highly contradictory and reflected substantially diverging views. First of all there are substantial underlying differences in the way the SME Grant Scheme is appreciated per se. In fact, it is seen by some respondents as scarcely effective, especially in comparison to the amount of effort necessary for its organisation. These are matters outside our mandate that are reported here just to allow a better understanding of the different positions on the need to limit the distance between the two initiatives and make them mutually supportive (financially as well as theme-wise) or to keep them separate. Those who oppose any synergy usually make reference to the 2001 experience and consider the SME Grant Scheme as merely a competition for funding and any relation with the EW a mere complication of responsibilities. All in all there is a fairly widespread consensus that in that occasion Focal Points, network partners and even SMEs were unable to find a rhythm in the organisation and implementation of these initiatives, whose timing was hardly compatible.

However a number of Focal Points and other respondents insist on the fact that the SME Grant Scheme the EW and GPAS are mutually supportive and should be implemented within the same logic. Therefore efforts should be devoted to make them more closely interrelated through a common theme and a modified and parallel implementation schedule like that proposed in the EW 2001 evaluation in order to take advantage of any synergies possible, even if this means overcoming administrative problems with financial regulations and budgetary appropriation mechanisms. Moreover the recent switching attitude in considering the SME Grant as related or unrelated to the EW was considered as a source of confusion by some respondents, especially those closer to the SME world and aimed at promoting workplace initiatives.

5.4 Management and Effectiveness of the Good Practice Award Scheme

Background. The Good Practice Award Scheme is an initiative whose high potential for promotional impact has generally been acknowledged, but whose concrete implementation has long had some controversial aspects. First of all there is a minority of social partners (especially employees' organisations) and government institutions that have strong doubts about the appropriateness of its sheer existence and bring up possible legal implications. There is a concern that the award could be improperly used in courts or within the framework of other legal proceedings as an element to contrast the possible findings of labour inspections or as a "proof" of proper conduct in the settlement of disputes. Therefore some maintain that it would be preferable for a European Agency to abstain altogether from granting any subject with such a certificate of good practice in the OSH field. Strictly related to this is the concern that the award should be given to genuinely pilot and innovative initiatives and not simply for having complied with the existing regulations and best practice. At any rate, since its introduction in the EW in 2000 as an additional means to highlight the objectives and outcomes of the EW and to promote the dissemination of good practice at the enterprise, and especially SME, level the GPAS has had to face a number of difficulties in its implementation.

In 2000 there were a number of problems with the GPAS including the separation from the EW, the inopportune timing of the call for examples, the timing of the MS level selection and the reportedly imprecise evaluation criteria provided by Agency. Then in 2001 the GPAS was better integrated into the EW and significant improvements were made in terms of timing and criteria for national selection. Nevertheless some weaknesses were highlighted in the EW 2001 evaluation including the fact that the activities organised in the context of the EW are not eligible for the award, that the complicated requirements for submitting a project, the limited transparency of the project selection process at the national level, and the weight of political considerations into the final selection of GPAS winners at the EU level. In order to preserve the possibility of using the GPAS as an efficient technique to boost the communication value of the EW it was recommended to review the criteria used for granting the award by switching the focus towards really innovative good practice, to maximise the process transparency and to reduce the impact of political considerations in award granting. It was confirmed the Awards Ceremony proved very important for the award winning organisations in that they were able to use the EU level recognition they received for further promotional purposes.

The EW2002 (launched a few months before the EW 2001 evaluation report was presented) was organised in a similar manner in comparison with previous years. There were only some minor modifications to the GPAS such as the replacement of the former "categories". Efforts were made to improve tripartite involvement and to clarify the project selection criteria to avoid further cases of unacceptable or commercial applications, and have them turned down at a much earlier stage by national assessors. In 2002, the European GPAS was accompanied by a number of national GPAS. The relations between the two initiatives is not always clear, as it should not be taken for granted that the winners of the national scheme were proposed as candidates for the European one. This also depends on problems with timing as the European candidatures must be submitted by July at the latest.

GPAS Publicity and Overall Satisfaction. Results from the EW 2002 evaluation confirm that the GPAS is an area where substantial further improvement is possible. Table 5.7 below shows Focal Point's degree of satisfaction with number, sector and size of enterprises that were involved in their GPAS. Overall, no Focal Points rated their satisfaction as very high, and a considerable number were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied. This is compounded with major problems with lack of visibility. More than half of total campaign partners agree that the knowledge about the GPAS in

their country was low or very low. MS used various mechanisms to communicate the GPAS to their national audiences including publication on the internet, publication of advertisements and articles in OSH magazines, distribution of information through Focal Point mailing lists and at OSH related activities, and distribution of information through contacts provided by national networks of social partners. Although some countries manage the GPAS through a call for proposal or other forms of public evidence, there are still some MS that *de facto* select applications based on an informal procedure simply by gathering examples known to their network. Therefore the principle that examples should be sought also by recourse to “press and publicity” activities as requested by Agency is not yet consistently applied everywhere.

Although there is a general consensus that the GPAS operational model implemented and the overall success of the initiative have been steadily improving important reservations still exist at both the national and the European level. The main causes for dissatisfaction are basically the same already reported in 2001: exceeding importance of political considerations when awarding the grants, lack of clarity on project innovative contents and confused distinction between normal practice or simple compliance with legal requirements, and best practice. In the specific case of EW2002a few countries mentioned an additional difficulty for a theme where there is a very limited amount of existing good practice methods. The lack of such methods increase the overall importance of the GPAS and but the same time, make a successful GPAS more difficult.

Table 5.7 Focal Point Degree of Satisfaction with the GPAS and GPAS Visibility

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Satisfaction with number ,sector and size composition of enterprises involved in the GPAS (2 non respondents) <i>1 least satisfied & 5 most satisfied</i>	2 15%	3 23%	5 38%	3 23%	0 0%	2.7	3
Campaign Partners	Please rate the overall knowledge about the European Best Practice Award Scheme in your Country <i>1 is the least knowledge 5 is the greatest knowledge</i>	22%	33%	26%	16%	2%	2.4	2

The Synergy Between the EW and the GPAS. Synergy with the EW is an essential issue regarding the GPAS. Table 5.8 below shows there is still a non negligible degree of dissatisfaction in a number of countries on the degree of actual synergy reached between the two initiatives. The GPAS is still perceived as something different from the EW and only limitedly related. Results from the Focal Point questionnaires and interviews combined with the Focal Point national reports show that the countries that have organized a large-scale national level GPAS were able to achieve a much higher level of interest and overall success rate than in those countries that just provided a few nominations for the EU GPAS in Bilbao. In this way, time dedicated to the publicity and general organisation of the national GPAS was in fact time dedicated to the EW and the two initiatives were promoted together.

Table 5.8 Synergy effects with the GPAS

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Assessment of the synergy effects between the GPAS and MS national campaign (two non respondents) <i>1 is most negative and 5 is most positive</i>	1 8%	3 23%	3 23%	4 31%	2 15%	3.2	4

Together with the lack of a widely publicized national scheme a number of causes were mentioned for insufficient synergy. These include:

- The Focal Point and EW Group Member are responsible for running both the EW and the GPAS. Time is limited for all activities and frequently the GPAS is the activity that suffers the most.
- Enterprises are not able to participate in both the GPAS and EW. This furthers the impression that the EW and the GPAS are two completely separate events occurring contemporaneously.
- This year more than in past years, Focal Points reported difficulties in soliciting SMEs and other enterprises to participate in the event, as examples are extremely difficult in a field where good practice is unclear.
- The time available for GPAS preparation and publicity is deemed inadequate. Many Focal Points were unable to solicit an adequate number of applications by the July due date, so far ahead of the actual EW2002.
- To many participants it is unclear why the GPAS is organized in such a way that the award ceremony takes place after the end of the EW and does not allow for publicity and communication of the best practices being awarded to be used within the EW itself.
- The GPAS would need a promotional launch earlier in the year to raise enterprises' attention and interest.

5.5 Organisation of the Closing Event

Background. The Closing Event in all three years of Agency EW organisation has been a large scale conference type event occurring the month after the completion of the EW. The event also includes a press conference and the GPAS award ceremony. High level politicians and OSH experts are invited to attend along with Focal Point members and GPAS award winners. No specific issues on this point was raised in the previous evaluation report.

General Comments. All interviewees and Focal Points that were given the opportunity to comment on their overall opinion of the event and attended the event agreed on their being completely satisfied and found it to be a great success, a dignified celebration that was professionally organized and without any major weak point. There was only highly specific semi-negative comment about the lack of adequate *knowledge substance presented* in the colloquium. All in all the closing event was seen as a very positive event from all sides. It gave EW organizers an opportunity to share individual experiences, although in hindsight.

At the European level it is generally considered that the closing event represents a great possibility to share information and experience among MS in a European event that otherwise has a very limited amount of cross border cooperation. We do believe that the event is an occasion to exchange experiences and foster the policy debate, but remain persuaded that it has an impact more at the political level than among the organisational layers of the campaign. In fact this cross-border cooperation aspect is much more frequently mentioned at the political level than it is at the operation one. The event also gave award winners the chance to present their work and to publicise their organisation on the EU level, although the media appeal of the event is generally considered not particularly high out of Spain where it is usually extensively reported.

5.6 Summary of Main Findings

- Overall appreciation of Agency overall operational effectiveness in managing the campaign.
- Cross-border cooperation has long been recognized as one of the EW weak areas. It is especially a difficult as some tend to believe that the specific (cultural, legal, etc) conditions in MS are so different to hinder any real possibility of co-operation.
- Satisfaction with present Agency's contribution to the promotion of trans-national cooperation is still deemed insufficient by a significant number of respondents and a generic feeling that more action is needed in this field was expressed by several interviewees.
- There is overall consensus that the right balance between centralised and national activities has been found and little need is felt to modify the present situation.
- The main problems raised regarding campaign materials include organisational issues of timing of delivery as well as timing and quality of language translation.
- Focal Points and campaign organisers were fairly satisfied with the quality of the campaign materials received from Agency and in particular with the factual support provided through the fact sheets, Agency report and the scientific research and ideas made available for the campaign.
- Fact Sheets are confirmed as the most important part of the promotional materials, followed close behind by the Good Practice Flyers and Leaflets.
- Website was a useful tool for consultation across Europe and Focal Points appreciated the ability to download additional materials as necessary.
- The GPAS represents an area with a high potential for promotional impact. The overall success of the initiative has been steadily improving.
- Some EW stakeholders worry that the results of the GPAS could be improperly used some form of legal proceedings as an element to contrast the possible findings of labour inspections or as a "proof" of proper conduct in the settlement of disputes.
- GPAS represents an area of the EW where further improvement is possible. This is especially true in terms of i) visibility on the MS level; ii) synergy with other aspect of the EW; iii) transparency and political influence in awarding at the EU level; and iv) unclear distinction compliance with legal requirements and innovative best practice.
- Opinions on the closing event showed complete satisfaction. Representatives found it to be a great success, a dignified celebration that was professionally organized and without any major weak point.

6. THE SEED FINANCING MECHANISM

Introduction. This chapter focuses mainly on the impact of the seed money financing mechanism in comparison to previously used methods. The chapter will begin with a brief explanation and analysis of the previous funding methods and then will describe in detail the following aspects of the seed financing mechanism: economic efficiency and suitability, eligible criteria and other additionality and subsidiarity considerations.

6.1 Background

The Changing Financing Mechanism. In the past three years many aspects of the EW have remained structurally unchanged and have improved through a process of learning by doing. In contrast, the financing mechanism has been completely different in each single year. In 2000, Agency, broadly following the mechanism inherited by the Commission, spent €750,000 to co-finance EW activities through an open call for proposals published in the Official Journal. Agency received a total of 67 proposals from all MS which resulted in 37 projects that ended up being co-funded at the EU level. Agency created a decentralised, tripartite system to select projects whereby each Focal Point was asked to select at least 2 national projects, each for a maximum total of €25,000. The results of the MS selections were then reviewed by the EW Group Members at the EU level. This mechanism faced a number of problems: insufficient publicity as many potential activity organisers were not aware of the possibility to receive any funding, the inconvenient timing of the call for proposals that was published at the end of the year; some inequality in allocations of funds between MS, possible conflicts of interest at the national level between project proponents and project selectors and an overall heavy administrative burden especially for Agency. Among the various national solutions the Danish model, aimed at spreading the EU financing into the highest possible number of initiatives by providing limited “seed financing” was highlighted at that time as best practice.

The funding mechanism for the EW 2001 was fundamentally different in that no EW projects were co-funded at the EU level and all Agency financial efforts were concentrated on the parallel SME Funding Scheme that received a financial allocation as high as €5 mn. This reportedly was not without major drawbacks including a practical lack of initiatives in certain MS and a certain neglect of the EW as such¹⁶ and reportedly some degree of confusion¹⁷. It was finally decided to organise the EW 2002 through seed financing. A total €700,000 financing grants out of a €1.25 mn overall campaign budget was set apart for the EW 2002 and was distributed to the Focal Points in the form of “seed money” to provide 50% co-financing for the organisation and encouragement of activities in MS. In this model, Agency provided grants to the Focal Points who were in turn responsible for the distribution of funds within their MS. Reportedly, a number of MS were reluctant to receive seed financing for various political and technical reasons. To this aim the creation of the co-applicant model was proposed. The co-applicant model, although good in principle ended up being an additional complication that was not put into use by any MS. The plans for the EW2003 currently include a repetition of the seed financing mechanism. In 2003 the total amount of EC financing grants will be reportedly reduced to €500,000 and will be distributed at a lower co-financing basis.

¹⁶ According to the related evaluation findings, it was found that the creation of a separate scheme to fund SME activities has “concentrated the management attention of both the EU level and the national level for SME matters away from the Week” Yellow Window, *Evaluation of EW2001 Final Report* (July 2002), page 4.

¹⁷ “The existence and shared promotion of both initiatives seems to have created confusion amongst the target groups in a large number of countries” Yellow Window, *Evaluation of EW2001 Final Report* (July 2002) page 41.

6.2 Efficiency and the Suitability of the Seed Financing Mechanism

General Appeal. Overall the EW2002Seed Financing mechanism is supported by a fairly wide consensus. Findings from Focal Point questionnaires (see Table 6.1 below), case studies and EU level interviews converge on considering the seed financing mechanism as the *least of all possible evils* or the *oil needed to make the engine run*. The EW 2002 financing mechanism is clearly preferred in principle to both the EW 2000 and the EW 2001 ones. A few Focal Points maintain that they are completely dependent on some kind of EU financing in order to conduct a national campaign and receive financing from their governments. In turn national funding makes possible a better functioning of the national networks and (hopefully) increased commitment from social partners. Although the appeal of the seed financing mechanisms is not necessarily always very strong, in just one case a fairly negative attitude on it was found. This was on grounds of principle as it is deemed inappropriate that a European Agency finances purely national activities. Increased participation in the EW and increased impact in regions that would otherwise be excluded from such an event are among the other reasons generally mentioned in favour of seed financing. A few respondents were unable to compare the pros and cons of the various financing mechanisms because of their lack of experience with previous EWs. In fact, it rarely happens that the technicalities of the financing mechanism are known outside the restricted circle of Focal Point key staff and EW Working Group representatives and most of the other interviewees were totally unaware about campaign financing details.

Table 6.1 Overall Opinions on Seed Financing

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Your overall opinion on the Seed Financing Mechanism <i>1 is most negative and 5 is most positive (two non respondents)</i>	0 0%	1 8%	3 23%	6 46%	3 23%	3.8	4

Administrative Burden and Quality of Reporting. Despite the general satisfaction with the seed financing mechanism, a number of issues were raised regarding the additional administrative responsibilities that come along with it. The receipt of seed financing implicates a large amount of administrative and reporting requirements including a financial application, an interim seed money report, and a final seed financing report, in addition to the final activity report on the campaign. As shown in Table 6.2 below some one third of Focal Points complained significantly either about the administrative burden required by this procedure or about the sheer difficulty found in putting together a number of initiatives to be proposed for seed-financing. These complaints were partly mitigated by the fact that with time and further experience, these procedures are expected to become less demanding and time consuming. At any rate the administrative requirements were often deemed disproportionate to the total funds provided.

To an external evaluator familiar with EC practice most of the Focal Points complaints about reporting appear related to a limited experience with EU administrative requirements. The reports vary greatly in terms of quality and quantity, but some of the reports submitted to Agency frankly push the limit of acceptability and if prepared for the EC, would be probably rejected by most Directorate Generals. The inadequacies in the reports is hardly related to the quality of the EW itself, rather it is a question of language fluency and amount of time dedicated to the reporting process. Major inconsistencies can be fairly frequently found in the data provided. The combination of these inaccuracies inevitably also results in a non-negligible secondary administrative burden for Agency staff that must read, process and understand the results.

Table 6.2 Responsibilities Linked to Seed Financing

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Rating of Focal Point experience with the administrative requirements of Seed financing <i>where 1 is most negative and 5 is the most positive (two non respondents)</i>	1 7%	3 21%	7 50%	3 21%	0 0%	2.8	3
Focal Point	Opinion on finding proposals submitted for seed-financing <i>1 is very difficult and 5 is very easy</i>	0 0%	5 33%	3 20%	4 27%	3 20%	3.3	2

Timing Difficulties. The other difficulties reported in submitting financial applications were mainly related to timing considerations. As reported in Chapter 3 (see Table 3.1) the seed financing applications were due to Agency by mid April, approximately 6 months before actual implementation of planned activities. The application form was fairly detailed requiring information about the activities being planned, the organizations participating in the EW, the planned target groups, the geographical coverage, the personnel working on the EW and the % of total budget covered by seed financing. This could create a great deal of complications. In some cases this was more information than the Focal Points felt they were able to provide at such an early stage. In order to complete the financial application, Focal Points were forced to approach potential project implementers before the money was actually granted. But, since receipt of seed money was frequently used as an incentive mechanism to convince organizations and enterprises to create or manage an activity, the uncertainty of actually receiving the money made the process much more difficult. Also along these lines, Focal Points found it exceedingly hard to describe activities and estimate costs for the seed financing applications because at such an early stage no final decisions had been made. To avoid these problems many Focal Points decided to include in the financial application just the projects they were directly responsible for.

6.3 The Remaining Co-Financing

Source of National Co-Financing. Seed financing was intended to be at a maximum 50% basis. Based on a sample of ten financial reports available the actual contribution of seed financing to total project expenditure varies from some 12-15% to 50% and total project costs range within a ten times factor from €50,000 to €500,000. Based on these sources the direct contribution of seed financing to elicit other sources of financing appears to have been very limited. In just one case the national co-financing sources other than the Focal Point own budget appear to have been used. In another case financing was partly raised through income from project activities. From the administrative point of view there is hardly any evidence of tripartite initiatives involving joint financing.

Sources of National Campaign Financing. Focal Points have access to a number of possible national sources to finance the campaign including among others: government funds, private sponsorships, the own Focal Point budget and contributions from employee/employer organisations. The Focal Points have been requested to score the relative importance of the various possible sources in a scale ranking from one (minimum) to five (maximum). However approximate this rough estimate can be, nevertheless the results shown in Table 6.3 below highlight some interesting aspects. Government funds and the Focal Point own budget (sometimes hardly distinguishable) are confirmed as the main source of campaign funding across Europe. This also because there are some MS where campaign funding with sources other than public funds is deemed as not totally appropriate or at any rate quite controversial. A number of Focal Points are by

tradition and culture hardly familiar with campaign fund raising. In all but a few MS there is notable little recourse to private sponsorship of campaign events. Also in this case the value judgments on the appropriateness of the use of private sponsorship funds in the campaign appear as highly divergent. Finally, at least in the EW2002 case, it seems that the reservations some employers' organisations had on the theme of the campaign also resulted in a lack of willingness to co-fund activities. These results have been substantially confirmed by the anecdotal evidence gathered during the case studies.

Table 6.3 Average Importance at the European Level of the Possible Other Sources of Campaign Financing (ranked from 1 to 5)

Government funds	Focal Point budget	Employer organisation sponsorship	Employee organisation sponsorship	Private sponsorship	Other
4.5	3.3	2.5	3	2.3	2.7

Campaign Partners Willingness to Co-Finance Activities. A survey was carried on among the campaign partners to estimate their willingness to co-finance campaign activities in order to have a first rough indication of the potential resources easily available to fund the EW across Europe. As Table 6.4 below shows it was found that as high as 36% of respondents were positive about their willingness to co-fund activities and this is a conservative estimate given that another 17% did not provide a well defined answer.

Table 6.4 Campaign Partners' Willingness to Contribute to EW Activities

		YES	NO	n/a
Campaign Partner	Hypothetically, would you or your organisation be willing to co-finance activities within the context of the EW?	36%	47%	17%

An attempt was also made to roughly quantify the amount of resources they would be willing and able to invest in the EW. Results are shown in Table 6.5 below. There is at least a 2% of campaign partners (6% of positive respondents) that would be willing to provide resources of the same size as Agency does another 2% would contribute between €20,000 and €50,000.

Table 6.5 Total Size of Potential Financial Contributions

		Up to €2,000	€2,000 - €5,000	€5,000 - €20,000	€20,000 - €50,000	€50,000 & up	n/a
Campaign Partner	Rough idea of the size of possible financial contributions.	26%	34%	11%	6%	6%	17%

As a result of this estimate it can be said that the average campaign contributor would be willing to contribute an average of €10,000 each. On a sample of 20 campaign partners per country this roughly means that each MS has a campaign financing potential of some €50,000 - €60,000, a substantial wealth of financial contributors and a total amount that is broadly similar to that provided by Agency. The MS widely vary in their capability to mobilise and manage these potential resources. From the analysis of 2001 campaign activities it turned out that these were the likely sources of "goodwill" funds used to finance campaign activities when national funds were not available. From an analysis of the evidence available for EW2002 it turns out there were some MS

that went further than that and even managed to raise funds from other sources, while others apparently had difficulties even in mobilising these relatively easy resources at least to the extent it was possible in 2001.

6.4 Eligibility Issues

An issue that came up fairly frequently during the evaluation was the question of eligible expenses within the framework of seed financing. The question of eligibility was divided into i) the eligibility of specific projects to justify EU level co-financing and ii) the question of what overall costs should be eligible for coverage under seed financing.

Project Eligibility. The issue of criteria for project eligibility for EU financing raised fairly cautious comments. On the one hand in principle the vast majority of respondents including 10 out of 11 Focal Points (see Table 6.6 below) agree that projects should meet certain criteria to be eligible for EU money. However when asked for better specification, some 50% would be in favour of maintaining the current criteria which are generally considered as very flexible and broad. Those who are in favour of much stricter eligibility criteria propose restricting eligible projects to: i) those that have demonstrable long lasting effects, ii) envisage collaboration with social partners including their tangible financial contribution, iii) are specifically focused on SMEs, iv) target high risk areas and sectors that do not already have an OSH infrastructure, v) include the direct involvement of enterprises.

Table 6.6 Criteria of Eligibility for EU Financing

Table		YES	NO
Focal Point	Should projects meet certain criteria to be eligible for European money? <i>(four non respondents)</i>	10 91%	1 9%

The implementation of the present project eligibility criteria has not raised any major issue and went fairly smooth probably also because of their very broad nature. As shown in Table 6.7 below there is an overall satisfaction with the criteria followed by Agency for selecting initiatives eligible for seed financing.

Table 6.7 Satisfaction with the Actual Selection of Eligible Projects

Table		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Satisfaction with the criteria followed for selecting initiatives eligible for seed financing <i>1 is least satisfied and 5 is the most satisfied (one non respondent)</i>	0 0%	0 0%	2 14%	8 57%	4 29%	4.2	4

Eligible Costs. The issue of what kind of costs should be covered by seed financing has also reportedly been long discussed. There are those who were in favour of restricting EU financing to project direct costs by not including personnel costs and other overheads. These restrictions seemed reasonable in the light of the fact that the Focal Point as such also receive a parallel grant from Agency to cover their costs as an institution. Finally it was agreed also in this case to leave criteria as flexible and broad as possible basically again with the aim of making the campaign possible in those MS that otherwise would have had difficulties. In practical terms this has resulted in highly diverging patterns in the use of resources. Based on evidence from a sample of ten financial reports

it was found that just three MS decided not to use seed financing to cover personnel costs. In all but one of the remaining cases costs for personnel account for 45-70% of total reported costs and range from €35,000 to as high as €111,000. Just five MS opted for including overheads among seed-financed cost items for amounts ranging from some €2,500 to over €30,000. Project related costs and other miscellaneous items account for highly variable shares of total reported costs. In a group of four countries they account for more than 80% (two cases 100%), in another four for between 30% and 40% and in the remaining two cases as low as 15%-20%. Computer costs and travel expenses are residual cost items usually accounting for some €1,000 - €3,000 total costs.

6.5 Additionality Considerations

Additionality and subsidiarity are two essential concepts that are intrinsically linked to the use of EU funds. The principle of additionality is that EU support must not be used as a substitute for national funds.¹⁸ In the context of the EW, this means that EC support should not be simply substituting support that would otherwise be covered on a national level. Assessing additionality is never an easy task because it attempts to hypothesise what would have happened had a certain event been organized in a different way.

Scenario Without Agency Funding. A first step to assess additionality is to try and understand what would have happened in a MS had the Agency co-funded projects not been funded. When asked this question, the Focal Points obviously reported that without financing there would be differences in the number and quality of projects co-funding. This fairly generic statement requires a number of qualifications. A few say that the MS would have had broadly the same number and quality of activities, but that they would not have been organised with the EW theme or within the context of a week long event, the majority say that seed financing simply allowed them to have a wider geographical coverage and increased visibility, while others report that no activities would have taken place without such funding. When asked if there were any difference between the projects implemented with co-funding and those without, no notable difference could be found. In just one country, the projects organised without EU financing were done so with a simply commercial goal to promote the individual enterprise.

Differing Types of Focal Points: Low & High Additionality. Upon a further scrutiny of evidence available it is possible to divide the MS into two broad categories as far as additionality is concerned. On one hand there are Focal Points that have long-term experience running national OSH campaigns and with large national budgets and or a consolidated capacity to mobilise resources and raise campaign funds. In these MS, the overall level of additionality is fairly low and the sheer existence of EU financing seems to make little difference in concrete terms. On the other hand, there are Focal Points that maintain having difficulties in organising OSH campaigns. These Focal Points are not accustomed to running a large scale OSH campaign must find a way to convince their government and their network of social partners to organise a minimum number of events. In these countries the level of additionality is apparently much higher and seed financing makes a big difference as it provides a cushion of financial support and the promise for EU visibility that serves to get the ball rolling. In a few extreme cases, the Focal Points report that they would have been unable to put together a Focal Point budget if it were not for seed financing.

Seed Financing as a Project Multiplier Mechanism. Seed financing was also conceived as a project multiplier mechanism. The Table 6.9 below gives a tentative indication of the difference in the number of projects implemented per member state for the past three EWs based on

¹⁸ Additionality is a largely counterfactual concept referring to what would have happened if no European public funds would have been available: would the activities have taken place and in which form ?

available sources including case studies. As can be seen there is no conclusive evidence that the EW2002 has acted as a project multiplier mechanism, but there are at least significant country variations and important concurring factors. In fact it was already noted in the previous evaluations how the EW 2001, without EU financing, resulted in a higher number of projects than the EW 2000.

In fact, beyond a certain minimum campaign size it seems the overall number of national EW activities depends on other factors than EU financing including the nature of the theme and other national considerations. The amount of seed-financing is too limited to represent a major factor in the process and the sheer size of seed financing available per country is unlikely to make a real difference in terms of the overall number of projects. Where additionality on paper would seem high it seems extremely likely that at least in some MS the EU financing simply replaced the lack of campaign partners' support in some rather than compensating for funds that would not have been made available. More convincing evidence can be found that seed financing has had an impact on the quality and scope of Focal Point-managed campaign activities, including the ambitiousness of their media coverage. The administrative difficulties related to involve partners in the seed financing already reported in the section above on timing difficulties apparently has played a major role in limiting the effectiveness of seed financing as a project multiplier mechanism. To sum up the case that seed financing made the commitments from social partner easier remains largely unproved, while more convincing evidence could be found at least in some MS that it made the functioning of the national networks easier.

Table 6.8 Comparison of the Number of Member State Activities

COUNTRY	2002 /2001	2002/2000	2001/2000
Austria	=	+	+
Belgium	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Denmark	= (-)	-	+
Finland	n.a.	+	n.a.
France	-	+	+
Germany	+	n.a.	n.a.
Greece	-	-	-
Ireland	= (+)	+	+
Italy	-	+	-
Luxembourg	=	-	-
Netherlands	+	+	-
Portugal	-	+	+
Spain	n.a.	+	n.a.
Sweden	n.a.	+	n.a.
United Kingdom	-	n.a.	n.a.

6.6 Subsidiarity Considerations

The Case for EU Financing in Subsidiarity Terms. The case for EU financing of the EW in subsidiarity terms is not particularly strong. The nature of the activities organised for the campaign lends itself to be perfectly managed at the national level. There are economies of scale in the production of campaign materials, but apart from that the EU financing is not presently targeted to activities requiring a European dimension or to objectives that national authorities would face difficulties in reaching on their own. The main argument for having seed financing in place is a political one: the fact that in a limited number of MS, the mere fact that the EC steps in makes EW campaigns possible. Otherwise, these national governments would be unwilling (not necessarily

unable) to support the EW initiative. In this way, the EC support creates synergies in Europe because the MS can claim they are taking part in a “European” event.

6.7 Summary of Main Findings

- The financing mechanism is the only significant aspect that has been completely different in each single year. The EW 2002 financing mechanism is clearly preferred in principle to both the EW 2000 and the EW 2001 ones
- Focal Points presented difficulties with the additional administrative responsibilities that come along with the receipt of EU level financing. The administrative requirements were often deemed disproportionate to the total funds provided. However the quality of Focal Point deliverables requires substantial improvement.
- Focal Points report general satisfaction with present criteria for project eligibility through seed financing .
- Eligible costs with seed financing are interpreted differently among MS and the current flexibility serves to make the process accessible to all MS involved.
- Seed financing receives wide consensus overall but is not a considerable project multiplier mechanism. There is conflicting evidence on its real additionality.
- Seed financing has only limitedly contributed to elicit other sources of financing. In just one case the national co-financing sources were others than the Focal Point own budget.
- A number of Focal Points are by tradition and culture hardly familiar with campaign fund raising and have made very few efforts to receive forms of private sponsorship for the EW.
- There is a notable amount of potentially untapped campaign partner financing possibilities.
- EU financing is not presently targeted to activities requiring a European dimension or to objectives that national authorities would face difficulties in reaching on their own. The main argument for seed financing seems to be political: in a limited number of MS the mere fact that the EC intervenes makes EW campaigns possible. Otherwise, these national governments would be unwilling (not necessarily unable) to support the EW initiative.

7. OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT

Introduction. This chapter will focus on the effectiveness and impact of the campaign. The analysis will cover essential aspects of the week such as awareness raising, the implementation of good practice at the workplace level and the EW's effect on policy making. Woven throughout the chapter there is a focus on the national activities covering country issues such as the types and number of organizations involved, the target audiences as well as an analysis of participants. Impact analysis includes operational and political impact consideration. A specific paragraph is devoted to the European added value. The chapter concludes with a section on national perception and satisfaction with participation and the sustainability of prevention of stress at the workplace level.

7.1 Effectiveness

The analysis of effectiveness relates to whether the original objectives of the EW 2002 have been achieved within the expected target groups. The original objectives of the EW were threefold and can be summarized in the following categories: i) awareness raising, ii) implementation at the workplace level, and iii) promotion and exchange of good practice. These three elements, among others will be dealt with here below.

Awareness Raising. There is general consensus¹⁹ among campaign stakeholders in the various countries that the overall awareness raising effect of the EW 2002 has been fairly high in both absolute terms when compared to the resources available and in relative terms when compared with previous years. This result depends on a number of factors: the appeal the theme itself had for the media and the interest it raised among the public at large, the improvements in quality and scope of the information campaigns organised by some MS, the increased support received by Agency's own information campaign at the EU level, and the concrete interest found among OSH specialists and staff in learning more about this innovative subject. All in all, when considering all these factors together it can be concluded that the awareness raising effect of the EW2002 has been even higher than in previous years.

This largely favourable assessment deserves some qualification. First of all there are obvious major country variations. Then across Europe the various campaign activities were differently targeted to the different target groups. Since the activity by far most consistently implemented has been the organisation of seminars, colloquia and workshops it is little surprise both Focal Points and their campaign partners agree in saying that the target group most extensively reached by the campaign message were OSH staff and specialists (see Tables 7.1a and 7.1b below). There is wide agreement in considering the public at large and SMEs as the two problem areas where the reach of the campaign was insufficient. In general the assessment made by the Focal Points themselves tend to be slightly more optimistic than that made by their campaign partners but differences are hardly significant. There is just one interesting area where the two assessments do not coincide. Focal Points do have the impression that their EW 2002 was targeted more towards employee's organisations than to employers' organisation while going down the organisation layer this impression was reversed. This is also broadly confirmed by the anecdotal evidence collected during the case studies. While some difficulties were sometimes reported in involving employers'

¹⁹ The awareness raising results should normally be estimated on the basis of a measurement of the target group's awareness before and after the campaign. The effect may take time to build up. Due to the nature of the EW 2002 no such measurement was done ex ante and none is envisaged ex post. This is the reason why we turned to an indirect qualitative estimate based on Focal Point and campaign partners' opinions.

organisations at the national level, it was found that their involvement in regional or sectoral initiatives.

Table 7.1a Focal Point Opinions on Awareness Raising Among Target Groups
(on a scale from 1 to 5)

General Public	Employee organizations	Employer organizations	Workplaces within large public companies	Workplaces within large private companies	Workplaces in SMEs	Among OSH specialists
2.8	3.8	3.4	3.2	3.3	2.3	4.8

Table 7.1b Campaign Partners' Opinion on Awareness Raising Among Target Groups

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Campaign Partner Please rate your opinion on the increases in awareness about stress at work among the following target groups as a direct result of EW2002.	General Public	16%	35%	34%	13%	3%	2,5	2
	OSH Expert or Consultant	2%	6%	26%	45%	22%	3,8	4
	Government	2%	16%	43%	30%	9%	3,2	3
	Employer Organisation	3%	19%	33%	34%	10%	3,3	4
	Employee Organisation	4%	24%	38%	28%	5%	3,1	3
	Public Enterprise	9%	23%	54%	15%	1%	2,8	3
	Large Private Enterprise	6%	25%	43%	22%	4%	2,9	3
	SME	21%	40%	25%	12%	2%	2,3	2

Broadly in line with preliminary evidence from the Good Practice Awards Scheme it was found that large private enterprises are on average slightly easier targets for the EW than public organisations, although there might be significant country variations and this is not always necessarily true in Southern Europe.

It is extremely difficult to quantify the extent to which the various target groups were reached by the campaign message. The evidence is admittedly patchy and with significant country-wide variations. Most MS do not have a campaign monitoring system to track down contacts and enquiries and make realistic quantitative estimates. Just in order to provide an order of magnitude four Focal Points estimated the number of people directly contacted through campaign activities other than media campaigns in a range between 6,000 and 10,000 individuals. These figures are broadly compatible with the reported number of sessions in the campaign websites that may vary from 5,000 to 30,000 per MS. The UK alone, a country whose campaign has a significant media advertising component, distributed over 185,000 campaign information packages. Very roughly speaking it can be estimated that, as a rule, a significant part of a country's OSH professional community was reached by the EW together with relevant employers' and employee's organisations staff. Attempts have been made in five countries to calculate the number of enterprises reached by the campaign message through various indirect contact multiplying mechanisms. Estimates vary from a few dozen units in one MS to some 100,000 in another for a total 270,000 companies or so. We are naturally inclined to take these estimates with a pinch of salt. If it was found that the campaign message managed to reach some hundred thousand enterprises in Europe this could be considered as a big success and a very few countries would account for a significant share of this result. More importantly there is consensus in those who dared make an estimate in considering the SME world as a minority component of this target audience accounting for some third of the total. In fact just some 80,000 of the 270,000 companies above were estimated

being SMEs. Reference figures for the number of people in the general public reached by the campaign message are available only for those countries that paid an advertising campaign. Figures in these cases can be estimated in million inhabitants.

Implementation at the Workplace Level. As already noted in previous evaluations apart from a very few MS, the degree to what the EW results in implemented activities at the workplace level is generally considered medium or medium to-low. There is widespread consensus that in the particular EW 2002 case it was probably even slightly lower than in previous years. This year's specific decrease is generally attributed to the nature of the theme and its causes have been reviewed in Chapter 4. Many campaign partners felt that there was not enough consensus or clearly defined benchmarks (legal or otherwise) to establish and promote best practice at the workplace level. For this reason, potential activity organisers evidently preferred to restrain from activities that could appear in their eyes as risky or controversial. Instead, initiatives were concentrated on more generic informational and awareness raising initiatives. The lack of concrete implementation at the workplace level is often perceived as particularly serious among SMEs and depends on a combination of factors including the nature of campaign projects and the features of the related communication policy. However, a significant number (Tab. 7.2) of Focal Points tend to consider the difficulties in involving SME in workplace level activities as a fact of life and are persuaded that in present conditions little can be realistically done to improve this state of things.

Table 7.2 Satisfaction with SME Involvement

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Rating satisfaction with the degree of SME involvement in EW activities. <i>1 is least satisfaction and 5 is most satisfaction</i>	2 15%	2 15%	8 62%	1 8%	0 0%	2.6	3

On the contrary there is evidence that there is still room for improving this aspect of the EW, even if this would imply a considerable cultural change in many Focal Points. For instance little of what is presently considered best practice in approaching SMEs in OSH campaigns is consistently implemented across Europe within the framework of the EW. As reported in Table 7.3 below, apart from a few notable exceptions hardly any MS have made specific plans or arrangements to specifically involve SMEs in the campaign and little informational materials specifically targeted at the various SMEs national realities have been produced and distributed.

Table 7.3 Mobilisation of SMEs

		YES	NO
Focal Point	Have you produced informational materials particularly targeted at SMEs? If so, what? (<i>two non respondents</i>)	4 27%	11 73%
Focal Point	Have specific arrangements been made for SMEs to ensure the highest participation possible? If so, what arrangements? (<i>three non respondents</i>)	2 14%	12 86%

Moreover there is a widespread consciousness that those activities that would be more effective at the workplace level (Table 7.4) are not necessarily those more frequently taking place during the campaign. While Focal Points rightly assess direct visits and tailored training session as the most likely instrument to spur change in OSH practice at the workplace level and are sceptical about the real usefulness of large conferences and colloquia, it remains a fact that the largest part of the total activities counted within the framework of the EW 2002 were instead conferences or seminars, and only less than a dozen of them were explicitly qualified as "training sessions" for

companies²⁰. So as already found in 2001 the decreasing trend in organising training activities continue. The other activities generally deemed having a high workplace level return are office risk assessment, meetings at the workplace and even Open Doors Day that although harder to quantify, do not certainly represent a large number of initiatives in most MS. Prevention and information at the workplace level through labour union representatives, OSH experts and labour inspectors also reportedly took place in a more limited way than in the previous year.

Table 7.4 Focal Points Opinions on Best Tools to Promote Best Practice (score from 1 to 5)

Direct Contact	Training Schemes	Media / Publications	Large Conferences
3.9	3.9	3.6	2.8

Promotion and Exchange of Good Practice. The comments that can be made on the effect the EW 2002 had on promotion and exchange of good practice in the field of psychosocial risk in Europe largely mirror what reported above. The Agency produced information materials that are deemed of the highest professional quality for the purpose, and reflecting the state of the art at the EU level. The campaign greatly facilitated information exchange and knowledge sharing about pilot initiatives among OSH specialists and OSH staff. Its direct effects on the productive world appear to have been lower. This particularly concerns promotion of best practice among SMEs. As shown in table 7.5 below this mixed picture is reflected in an overall assessment that in positive in one third of case, and negative in another third. It goes without saying that those who are negative on the overall effectiveness of the GPAS in their country (see Chapter 5) are also negative on overall promotion and exchange of good practice.

Table 7.5 Focal Point Understanding of Best Practice

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	Has participation in the EW 2002 given you an understanding of the European “best practice” on the theme <i>1 is no knowledge and 5 is complete understanding</i>	2 13%	3 20%	5 33%	4 27%	1 7%	3	3

Sources of Activities. The sources of ideas for campaign activities have been relatively limited. Focal Points have reported that most campaign ideas have come from directly within the Focal Points or from the inner range of its campaign partners. There has been a limited involvement of outsiders organisations or high level inputs. This is a factor some interviewees considered to limit campaign creativity and the sheer possibility of reaching the workplace.

Rigid Tripartite Involvement. The actual role of the tripartite network of key social partners varies from country to country. In some cases Focal Points have a well established network of social partners that meets together on a regular basis – with or without the EW. In other cases the creation of this type of tripartite coordination was done specifically for participation in the EW. Needless to say, tripartite interaction and involvement was easier and more successful for the MS with a well established and recurring network. The process to set up national steering groups mainly on tripartite consultation has generally worked reasonably well, although with some country-specific exceptions. The only possible suggestion made by some interviewees is that it might be too

²⁰ It is necessary to note that there were 197 activities that fit into the category Regional Seminars & Workshops. Some of the smaller interactive workshops and discussion groups have included elements that could be defined as training sessions.

rigid in that it has overlooked some interest groups / NGOs that could have helped in organizing events. For instance in the case of the EW2002, there seems to be some preliminary evidence that organizations for women's rights or those dealing with violence against women could have been very interested in collaborating with the campaign and extending its reach and scope.

Monitoring and Evaluation. One of the reasons why some countries achieve better results than others is the management system in place and in particular the use of monitoring and evaluation instruments. One of the easiest way to improve implementation at the workplace level is to keep track and follow up campaign inquiries. Focal Points are differently equipped for the job and in many cases this precious piece of information is lost. An effective system would require considerable manpower as (see Table 7.6) telephone calls and direct contacts still far out numbers the quantity of other inquiry modalities when it comes to request for information. Moreover almost all countries lack feedback on results and a systematic evaluation of impacts at the workplace level.

Table 7.6 Focal Point Contact Methods

Direct Contact / Phone Call	Web Site	Email requests	At an EW 2002 event
3.8	2.9	3.3	3.3

7.2 Impact

General Considerations. Campaign impact assessment would require that a certain amount of time has passed from campaign implementation. In the case of the current evaluation, the impact of the EW has been evaluated approximately 2 – 3 months after the EW 2002, i.e. after a very short period of time to draw any significant conclusions, especially as far as important details of the long term impacts of the EW such as sustainability of results are concerned. There is an overall feeling that the theme of the EW conditions the final impact results. Expectations are that the impact of a traditional OSH theme such as accident prevention (EW 2001) will be intrinsically different from the impact of a campaign on psychosocial risks (EW 2002) because of the already existing level of awareness and best practice techniques available on the topic. Moreover, because of its role on the frontier of OSH research and development, many expect the EW 2002 will have a wider impact in terms of increased sensitiveness on the issue, further research and better legislation rather than a direct visible impact at the work place. There are three different categories of EW impact: i) the impact on the media and the public debate; ii) the impact improving working conditions; and, iii) the national and international political impact. These three categories will be discussed in further detail below.

Impact on the Media. Among the poll of campaign partners there is moderate satisfaction on the impact the EW has had on the media and in influencing the public debate on the issue (Table 7.7). Again there are significant country variations and the impact was clearly perceived as higher in those countries implementing a media campaign or heavily investing in communication activities. Although campaign partners probably do not have experience with the efforts Focal Points have made to attract media attention and related difficulties, or may not even be necessarily aware of the full scope of the media activities in the MS, nevertheless they convey a rough impression that in a number of countries there is still considerable room for improving the impact the EW has on the media. This is even more important as evidence gathered during the interviews and the case studies shows that the EW 2002 was implemented within a very favourable media framework, as in a number of MS, the media was paying attention to issues such as stress and psychosocial risks of their own volition and continued an already ongoing media trend. Moreover

there was an overall consensus that the media coverage and media impact of the various events was generally higher than in previous years.

Table 7.7 Impact on the National Media

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Campaign Partner	The influence the campaign had on the media in your country. <i>1 is the least influence and 5 is the greatest influence</i>	7%	34%	34%	17%	7%	2.8	2 / 3

Improvement of Working Conditions. There are very few elements even to tentatively draw conclusions on the likely impact of the EW 2002 on improving working conditions in Europe. Too limited a time has elapsed from campaign implementation and too little systematic campaign monitoring and evaluation systems are in place in the various MS to collect reliable information about this aspect. A very rough and preliminary indicator can be given by the assessment made by campaign partners themselves based on their own experience. The emerging picture is mixed. On the one hand as high as 29% of campaign partners report their being personally aware of the EW 2002 concretely resulting in tangible improvements of stress management at the workplace level, which is a fairly high figure for an information campaign (see Table 7.8) and an indication of a good campaign potential. But on the other hand there is also limited quantitative evidence available. Less than 2000 such cases have been reported including possible double counting, of which some two thirds in one country alone.

Table 7.8 Tangible Improved Practice

		YES	NO	n/a
Campaign Partner	Do you personally know of any cases where tangible improved practice on stress at work has been implemented in the workplace because of the EW.	29%	69%	2%

Political Impact. Achieving significant political impact on the National or European level was not an intended or direct objective of the EW but in many cases, it was an additional element incorporated into other existing EW events. The simple fact that the public interest has been raised and that high level politicians have been involved in a certain area automatically forces a certain amount of political impact or at least consideration. Two events in particular added to the increased political impact: the launching and press release at the European Parliament and the Closing Event. These two events were attended by high level political officials and served to awaken policymakers eyes to the theme of the EW. The EW increased the overall visibility of psychosocial risk at the EC and National level. At the EC level, stress is one of the top priorities within OSH and the EC is currently bound to prepare an instrument on stress. In some specific countries, the EW was especially relevant to the existing MS political agenda. On the national level a number of MS strategically organised activities to invite high level politicians or to combine policy action regarding the theme with some part of the EW.

Table 7.9 below, summarises Focal Points opinion on this issue. On the EU level the theme of the EW has succeeded in influencing some high level policy action and opinions in that the theme of psychosocial risk has been confronted in the political arena through speeches and publicity events. On the MS level, examples were presented where stress has come up in policy discussions within the MS ministries and parliaments. In contrast, one Focal Point stated that it is impossible to foster or promote policy action through the EW because of the limited timeframe: by the time

policy makers would be willing or able to get involved, the Focal Point has already completed the EW and must move on to the next years' theme.

Table 7.9 Promotion of European & National Policy Action

			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Focal Point	In your opinion, how much has the EW2002 fostered or promoted policy action (in the field of the theme)? <i>Select 1-5 where 1 is the least and 5 is the most</i>	At the EU level	1 8%	2 15%	7 54%	3 23%	0 0%	2.9	3
		At the MS level	2 15%	0 0%	7 54%	3 23%	1 8%	3.1	3

7.3 European Added Value

An important aspect of the EW is the possibility to create additional European Added Value for the individual campaigns in each MS. European Added Value is a concept dealing with objectives at the EU level, the completion of which increases the visibility and success of the EW on the MS level. Within the scope of the case studies EAV was discussed extensively. A significant EAV has been created through the EW 2002 even if there is room for improvement. EAV lies in the very nature of the initiative: in the fact that an almost identical event is contemporaneously being carried out in all MS. The visibility of the campaign as a European event is generally considered as a plus that results in a positive return on image and credibility. A common initiative with a common theme places a previously national understanding of an OSH subject in an international setting. Other important factors include: 1) an overview of the European state of the art on the subject; 2) the credibility of the initiative; 3) the promotional role for the Agency and EU institutions.

Despite the general positive feeling on EAV considerations, there were also negative comments raised. A Focal Point stated that the visibility of the EW as a European initiative added very little to the overall success of the campaign. But another country mentioned having faced a euro-sceptical attitude in the past in which enterprises were unwilling to participate in an EU event but this was not the case in the EW2002. But problems were mainly voiced about the real transfer of sharing and knowledge and the lack of trans-national initiatives.

Transfer and Sharing of Knowledge Between MS . The exchange of information about good practice at the European level appears to be one of the EW's critical areas. In practice, Focal Points have been found to operate quite independently from one another and both the EW Working Group and the Good Practice Award Scheme have only very limitedly served the purpose of facilitating exchange of information and sharing of best practices. As shown in Table 7.10 below, still a considerable number of MS think the EW 2002 did not allow them to benefit from a transfer of ideas of know-how between MS. Trans-national cooperation within the scope of the EW has been very limited in all MS²¹. In a number of countries that share a language, Focal Points have cooperated on the translation and editorial work of Agency publications and publicity materials. These actions along with participation in the closing event appear to be the only exchanges of information modality implemented across Europe, but in many cases are not deemed enough.

²¹ In the countries that responded Yes to the above questions, the following types of trans-national cooperation occurred: 6 MS have cooperated to share the responsibility of language translation and editing and 4 MS have invited experts from another MS to participate in an EW activity.

Table 7.10 Trans-national Transfer of Know-how

Table		YES	NO
Focal Point	Has participation in the EW2002 allowed your country to benefit from a transfer of <u>know-how</u> or allowed you to share ideas and materials with other Member States (<i>one non respondent</i>)	7 50%	7 50%

Visibility & Common Theme. The EW is an initiative organised at the EU level by a European Agency. The national visibility within the context of a common EU event, closely linked to a large international Agency shines a positive light and adds additional credibility on individual MS initiatives. Agency's experience in various OSH fields provides individual MS with access to information that they would not otherwise possess. The image and awareness of Agency itself is raised because of its role in the EW. In addition, the creation of one theme that is common to each MS in itself creates a significant amount of European Added Value. The common theme ties MS together in a common initiative that would not otherwise have any overlap and ideas implemented in one country can be modified to fit other national realities.

Publicity and publications. Agency has successfully produced high quality publicity materials at the EU level, essential saving MS time, money and effort that they would otherwise have had to spend. Common images for the EW increase the intensity of the connection across the EU. The EU, Agency or EW image can also bring higher credibility to individual MS projects.

7.4 Overall Final Assessment

All in all the EW 2002 was considered by the largest part of interviewees and respondents as a success. There are several indirect indicators for this including: 1) the actual commitment of all MS to take part into the week; 2) the voluntary participation of countries outside the EU; 3) the fact that each year the Focal Point and Agency gain experience in campaign organisation and in working together including improved networking. Also the large majority of campaign partners (Table 7.11) had a positive or most positive overall assessment of the EW 2002.

Table 7.11 Campaign Partner Overall Assessment

		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Mode
Campaign Partner	Overall assessment of the EW 2002 <i>Where 1 is very negative and 5 is most positive</i>	2 2%	15 11%	36 27%	53 40%	23 18%	3.6	4

Most importantly, another indirect key indicator of success is the campaign partners' willingness to participate to future events of the EW. A certain "fidelity" to the campaign is being built up and people want to participate again. As shown in Table 7.12 despite the various weaknesses highlighted and areas where modifications and improvements have been proposed, as high as 90% of participants found the EW 2002 a worthwhile event that they plan to be a part of in the future.

Table 7.12 Plans for Future Participation

		YES	NO	maybe	n/a
Campaign Partner	Do you plan on participating in future European Weeks?	90%	5%	2%	3%

Sustainability. An area where concern is often voiced is perceived lack of sustainability. There is little mechanism in place for sustainability of EW results and therefore, each MS deals with the issue in its own way, some methods being more effective than others. The following list is a selection of the means proposed to deal with the sustainability of results:

- improving assessment of results with detailed evaluations at the workplace level;
- implement follow up activities such as workshops, training sessions and questionnaires.
- publish results of the EW 2002 projects online.
- continue development and strengthening of the working relationship with the tripartite network.
- continue cooperation between MS and Agency to enforce the EU message of the past year in order to create the best possible work environment for future campaigns.

7.5 Summary of Main Findings

- There is a general consensus among campaign stakeholders that the overall awareness raising effect of the EW 2002 has been fairly high in both absolute terms when compared to the resources available and in relative terms when compared with previous years.
- Two problematic target groups include the public at large and SMEs. The target group most extensively reached were OSH staff and specialists.
- The degree to which the EW results in implemented activities at the workplace level is generally considered medium or medium to-low. There is evidence that in the particular EW 2002 case it was probably even slightly lower than in previous years as a result of the nature of the theme
- There is very little data available on actual workplace implementation. Many Focal Points have not been able to keep track of the full scope of EW activities.
- Exchange of information about good practice at the European level appears to be one of the EW's weakest areas, Focal Points operate quite independently from one another and both the EW Working Group and the GPAS only limitedly served the purpose of facilitating exchange of information and sharing of best practices.
- Ideas for campaign activities have come from directly within the Focal Points or from the inner range of its campaign partners.
- Because of the role psychosocial risk plays on the frontier of OSH research and development rather than a direct visible impact at the work place, the impact of the EW 2002 is expected to be in terms of increased sensitiveness on the issue, further research and better legislation.
- The EW 2002 was implemented within a very favourable media framework and in some cases attention to the EW 2002 continued an already ongoing media trend on stress issues. Overall media coverage and media impact of the various events was generally higher than in previous years.
- Political impact on the National or European level was not an intended or direct objective of the EW rather, the simple fact that the public interest has been raised and that high level politicians have been involved automatically forces a certain amount of political impact or at least consideration. The launching and press release at the European Parliament and the Closing Event particularly added to the increased political impact.

- Visibility of the campaign as a European event is generally considered as a plus that results in a positive return on image and credibility. A common initiative with a common theme places a previously national understanding of an OSH subject in an international setting.
- The national visibility within the context of a common EU event, closely linked to a large international Agency shines a positive light and adds additional credibility on individual MS initiatives.
- Agency has successfully produced high quality publicity materials at the EU level that saved MS time, money and effort that they would otherwise have had to spend. Common images for the EW increase the intensity of the connection across the EU.
- All in all the EW 2002 was considered by the largest part of interviewees and respondents as a success. The campaign has been improving from year to year. Despite the various weaknesses highlighted and areas where modifications and improvements have been proposed, as high as 90% of participants found the EW 2002 a worthwhile event that they plan to be a part of in the future.

8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction. This section summarises the main conclusions drawn from the previous chapters in order to formulate recommendations to improve future activities. An attempt will be made to highlight recommendations that were already made in past evaluations in order to monitor improvements. More generally particular attention will be given to comment EW progress over time.

8.1 Summary of Main Conclusions

Overall Success. Despite the diverse situation in each MS and taking account of the organisational and budgetary limitations, the EW 2002 can be considered all in all as a good success. This is especially true if one considers that over 85% of a sample of some 130 campaign partners interviewed across Europe gave a positive assessment of the campaign and more than 90% of them intend to take part in future campaigns. This is a first good rough indicator of satisfaction about the EW. Other indirect indicators are other countries' willingness to take part to the initiative on a voluntary basis.

Suitability to Beneficiaries' Interests and Needs. The theme of the EW 2002 can be considered as highly suitable to the interests and needs of beneficiaries although it is very challenging and innovative from many points of view. Psychosocial risk is a theme where substantial research is still going on and where benchmarks are still being developed. This has pros and cons: on one hand such a theme can be easier to attract media attention, but on the other hand implementation at a workplace level is made harder by the lack of clearly recognized best practice. The choice of such a theme somehow inevitably has a price to be paid. The focus of the campaign is switched the promotion of best practice at the workplace level to fostering public discussion and scientific debate on the issue. This goal is not inferior to the first but the differences between the possible results must be acknowledged.

The Overall EW Model. All in all the EW model can be considered as reasonably efficient and stable. The model currently deserves only few marginal improvements and no major organisational reshuffling. The overall impression is that Agency has already largely achieved the best possible campaign organisation within the existing framework of organisational and budgetary constraints. Looking at the EW overall, even the timing issues are no longer considered a significant problem area where action needs to be taken. Any attempt to introduce radical reforms would have major budgetary and organisational implications and would require a considerable political commitment. Ideally the first area deserving such radical re-consideration is campaign follow-up(for instance a second mini-campaign continuing the theme in the following year) in order to ensure better sustainability of results. Any move towards a double campaign system appears hardly feasible and realistic in present conditions.

The Learning Curve. There continues to be a notable learning curve in the implementation of the campaign although with diminishing returns in terms of improved organisational effectiveness. The process to set up national steering groups mainly on tripartite consultation keeps improving, although it is still remains a bit too rigid. For instance in the case of the EW2002, there seems to be some preliminary evidence that the involvement of NGOs such as organizations for women's rights or those dealing with violence against women could have improved campaign organization. Networking has also been improved and remains a factor of success and a good proxy for campaign effectiveness. There was also a better use of the internet which is confirmed to be an

effective communication means for the campaign and an increased attention to the visibility of the campaign.

Major Obstacles. If it is true that one of the EW organisational strengths is its decentralised implementation model this also means that the main obstacles presently hindering substantial progress are outside Agency control. The main obstacles are: the campaign organising skills of individual Focal Points that vary greatly from country to country and slowly but constantly improve through a learning mechanism, and the sheer amount of resources the different MS put at the EW disposal. It goes without saying that the amount of EU resources provided through the seed financing mechanism would hardly be sufficient to run any successful campaign, and therefore it makes a difference whether EU funds account for 5% or 50% of total available funds for the campaign. Many Focal Points still are learners in campaign organisation and the majority of MS still attempt to organise the campaigns on a limited budget. These are the two main critical factors facing the EW.

In a few areas it can be noted there still are fundamental disagreements between MS on value judgments attached to certain campaign aspects. These considerations more specifically relate to political consensus building between MS rather than EW operational effectiveness.

Campaign Overall Management. There is a generally positive or even highly positive assessment of how the EW 2002 was managed and organised by Agency. In this respect the EW 2002 can be considered as a big success for Agency. Just a few disparaging comments were made on the delayed delivery of some fact-sheets and limited time allotted to edit and translate promotional materials, but these are minor details.

Language. Language is still considered as a problem area, but this is more in reference to relations between Agency as a European Agency and the Focal Points as national entities rather than specifically concerning EW activities or organization. In certain countries social partners had reservations on how the slogan sounded in the national language and its message implications.

Communication and Media. The quality and scope of the EW 2002 communication and media activities has further increased, partly as a result of additional EU financing, partly because of the learning effect, and partly because the theme was itself appealing to the media. Agency support also improved and the EU Parliament launching event is generally considered as very positive innovation and an event worth repeating. The material produced is generally considered to be good quality and has been used in all MS. However most of the campaign partners still perceive insufficient media impact and communication support for their activities. To address this, considerable financial resources would be required at the national level to fund media campaigns. Within available means it can be attempted to further anticipate the EU launch and make it more synergic with parallel national events.

The Good Practice Award Scheme. The GPAS is a good promotional tool and should remain an integral part of the week. However, its potential is presently underexploited and would require a wider recognition than presently in place, although some progress in this sense can be noted. The GPAS has played a slightly greater role within the framework of the 2002 campaign than in previous years and this has partly compensated for some difficulties related to defining best practice. The GPAS is still poorly advertised and communicated in a number of MS and this limits its multiplier effect at the workplace level. A improved communication process and increased visibility would create reputation incentives and would lead to changes in the aspects that still concern stakeholders, namely: transparency and real focus on pilot and innovative initiatives only.

Moreover the current timing of the award ceremony greatly reduces its usefulness in the framework of the EW.

Synergy and Coordination with the SME Grant Scheme. In the EW 2002 no synergy and co-ordination was envisaged with the SME Grant Scheme and this created some degree of confusion at the operational layer. On paper, the overall impression remains that a closer conception and supervision of the EW, the SME Grant Scheme and the GPAS could further improve their overall effectiveness as proposed by the EW 2001 evaluation as a possibility for reform. Nevertheless the concrete feasibility of such an approach faces concrete bureaucratic obstacles and major problems with budgetary appropriations that go beyond the scope of this exercise, since they would somehow involve a biennial implementation of the campaign.

Objectives The degree of achievement of the EW 2002 objectives can be summarised in the following table.

Table 8.1 Achieving Focal Point Objectives

Objective	Assessment	Compared with 2001
Awareness raising	Good	Higher
Promotion of best practice at the workplace level	Medium to Low	Lower*
Exchange of expertise at the EU level	Low	Same
Focus on SMEs	Low	Same

* Fewer total activities although occurring in a slightly higher number of MS

Awareness Raising. The awareness raising effect of the EW 2002 has been fairly high and higher than in previous years. There are huge variations in the different MS regarding resources available and the different target groups reached.

Promoting Best Practice at the Workplace Level. As already found in previous EWs also the EW 2002 has been only limitedly effective in promoting best practice at the workplace level. The situation is highly varied across MS, but in most countries the promotion of best practice in the workplace is not a particularly well-developed area. Few activities are implemented directly with this purpose. In the case of the EW 2002 the problem was made worse by the intrinsic difficulty and sensitiveness of the subject and the lack of benchmarks to define best practice in psychosocial risk reduction. Many campaign partners felt that there was not enough consensus or clearly defined benchmarks (legal or otherwise) to establish and promote best practice at the workplace level and preferred restraining from activities that could appear in their eyes as risky or controversial and instead concentrated on more generic informational and awareness raising initiatives. We are not inclined to consider this as an indicator of limited campaign effectiveness, rather it is seemingly a result of the challenge posed by the subject matter.

Exchange of Expertise at the EU Level. Exchange of information and expertise at the European level remains one of the EW's weakest areas. Focal Points operate quite independently from one another and both the EW Working Group and the GPAS have only limitedly facilitated exchange of information and sharing of best practices, that is mainly based on spontaneous contacts and informal networking. Joint trans-national projects have been hardly implemented and the cross-participation to the various national conferences appears to be the only exchange of information modality consistently implemented across Europe.

Focus on SMEs. Little notable improvement could be found regarding SME involvement. Despite the focus placed in EW guidelines on including SMEs in EW 2002 activities, the resulting role of SMEs was quite low. This is not only because of the intrinsic difficulties in reaching and organizing SME events, but also because of the sheer limited number of activities expressly aimed at them. In very few cases the Focal Points made specific plans and programs to address SME needs. Moreover limited attention is given to the SME target group in the awareness raising campaign.

The Impact of Seed Financing. Seed financing is a widely appreciated EU funding mechanism whose justification in terms of additionality and subsidiarity considerations appears to be fairly weak. Its rationale mainly lies in political opportunity considerations. Seed financing makes a real difference only in the few MS claiming that without European financial support there would be no EW campaign at all. In this way seed financing achieves the fundamental objective of having implemented the EW in all MS. Its additionality is therefore very high in small campaigns and tends to be much lower in larger ones. In fact, the larger the national EW budget becomes the more likely it appears that seed-financing simply substitutes for a portion of national funding that would have become available in any case. Moreover there is evidence that there are some potential campaign financial sources available that were exploited for the EW 2001.

There is conflicting evidence that seed financing was additional to the campaign and acted as a project multiplier mechanism. Focal Points' opinions confirm this but are naturally biased. It seems it mainly had an impact on the scope and geographical coverage of certain projects. In large campaigns the total number of national activities is mainly based on national factors and the amount of seed-financing is too limited to represent a major factor in the process. In other cases it seems it substituted for other sources of financing. From the administrative point of view it was also much easier to use seed financing to match Focal Points own funds rather than complementing other sources of financing. This compounds with Focal Points limited familiarity with EU financing reporting requirements and related complaints that do not appear as totally justified.

In subsidiarity terms valid arguments can be made that seed financing should be more specifically focused to cover areas where the current system of national incentives does not work well, so as to provide real European Added Value. For instance, a case could be made that a part of seed financing should be explicitly used to finance cross-border or pan-European initiatives that are currently lacking in the EW campaign. Alternatively, or in parallel, another possible case could be that seed financing be more directly used to specifically fund initiatives at the workplace level or directed at specific target groups, such as SMEs, or supported by effective tripartite financing. Such a proposal would meet the strong resistances of the Focal Points themselves and of their national organisers. Realistic considerations must be made that the implementation of the EW is not necessarily a high priority in the Focal Point's overall agenda, that usually limited management resources are available for EW organisation and that there is a strong desire to keep things as simple as possible (including flexibility in the use of funds and limitation of administrative reporting requirements).

In these conditions funds are used for activities that are easy to organise (such as conferences or workshops) or activities that would have otherwise been included in the Focal Point agenda. If strong conditionalities in the use of funds are introduced, this is likely to result in additional managerial burden in the organisation of events that could easily equal the EU resources received. If resources offered are not high enough these are unlikely to represent enough of an incentive. However it must also be noted that presently the typology eligible expenses under seed financing is fairly broad and this has resulted in reimbursement of cost for personnel that appear as disproportionately high when compared to total underlying project costs.

8.2 Recommendations

Most of the previous EW 2001 recommendations have been confirmed by this evaluation exercise even if in many cases some progress was achieved.

1. General Recommendations

- 1.1 *There is no good reason to radically change the EW organisational model as is. Any reform should allow the campaign structure continue, with marginal improvements.* This means that the balance of activities between Agency and the Focal Points is substantially correct and that the GPAS is worth continuing as a EW component.
- 1.2 *An interlinked management of the EW, the GPAS and the SME Grant Scheme would appear theoretically preferable.* This kind of change would imply the solution of major administrative problems, so the present management of the EW and the SME Grant Scheme as separate initiatives appears as a reasonable second best.
- 1.3 *There would be an advantage if there were a higher rate of continuity in the choice of EW Group Members.* Some progress was reached in respect to previous years. Another possible solution could be to complement the two different areas of expertise by placing two people in charge of the EW: one campaign expert that is constant from year to year and one theme expert that changes with the themes.
- 1.4 *Ensure the long term value of the Good Practice Award.* To preserve the image and credibility of the Good Practice Award Scheme should remain a Agency's priority. However together with a focus on transparency, award criteria, and selection of innovative projects, greater emphasis should be given to the GPAS in order to improve overall visibility.
- 1.5 *Improve dissemination of good practice.* There is still room for improving dissemination of good practice. For instance placing the award ceremony during the week itself, i.e. during the month of October would represent a low cost improvement.
- 1.6 *Boost efficiency by creating an evaluation culture within the MS.* There is certainly a big scope for promoting the EW effectiveness by making recourse to a more extensive use of campaign evaluations that are presently carried out in one country only. But before doing that substantial work has to be done on the monitoring system. Most Focal Points are not accustomed to tracking and follow up enquiries, do not set monitorable objectives for their activities and generally have a limited knowledge of what happens even one organisational layer below them.

2. Recommendations to improve European Added Value

- 2.1 *Greater investment in media attention including reinforcement of efforts at EU level.* Substantial progress was achieved in this respect, but further improvement is still possible.
- 2.2 *Ensure more national and European political backing to ease the availability of funds and increase media attention.* This is partly related to the recommendation above. It remains valid

and progress was reached through the increasing recourse to media events aimed at Parliaments.

- 2.3 *Make more money available for evaluations at national level – to be compared at EU level in order to enhance the exchange of good practice.* A proposal in this sense was made at the EW Working Group meeting, but not approved. We would put the emphasis first of all on devising and implementing a common campaign monitoring system.
- 2.4 *Involve more trans-national cooperation in the week in order to ensure a wider reach of efforts undertaken.* This remains a priority where little progress was made and where action is urgently needed.
- 2.5 *Increased commitment of social partners so that they can act as leverage on their members.* A positive trend of increased social partners commitment can be generally noted across Europe although in some MS this still remains a problem area. The seed financing mechanism has had little impact on this.

3. Additional Recommendations Formulated from the Findings of the Current Evaluation Exercise

- 3.1 *Anticipate the launch of the campaign earlier in the year and increase the number of parallel launch events at the national level.* We can see the rationale behind using the campaign launch as a tool to raise companies' attention and would therefore favour a much earlier launch. The EU launch event could work in better synergy with parallel national launch events.
- 3.2 *Further fine-tune the production of campaign materials.* The discontinuation of certain campaign materials poorly appreciated (such as postcards) can be considered while there is an increasing request for creative gadgets. Specific materials can be better studied for specific target groups including first and foremost SMEs.
- 3.3 *Issue guidelines for a more consistent use of the EU logo together with the campaign logo in EW-related activities.* There are fairly diverging practices on the use of the EU logo across Europe and the related communication added value appears as not fully exploited
- 3.4 *Increase the communication effort and the visibility of the Good Practice Award Scheme.* Partly related to the above, a campaign launch in May could be used as a tool to promote a call for applications for the GPAS. A certain minimum form of publicity to the initiative should become a standard.
- 3.5 *Continue seed-financing but increase its conditionality in terms of eligible activities and eligible costs.* Although the issue could be highly controversial we would be in favour of modulating EU co-financing to the kind of activities financed. It can be as high as 50% for activities directly aimed at the workplace or focused on SMEs, some 20-25% for media and communication campaigns, but no more than 5-10% or even discontinued altogether for seminars workshops and colloquia. Preferable co-financing rates should be granted to initiatives with a clear tripartite financial commitment. Caps should be introduced on the maximum share of reimbursable Focal Point personnel costs and overheads as respect total direct project expenditure.

- 3.6 *Creation of a separate budget for trans-national projects.* As already happens with the SME Grant scheme, a part of the seed-financing budget should be devoted to trans-national initiatives and not allocated on a country basis. It should be used to co-finance (with a high co-financing rate) those initiatives with a clear European, trans-national or cross-border dimension.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A – THE METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

1. The Evaluation Questions

The evaluation answers a number of essential questions (included in the original ToR) concerning assessment of the design, planning and implementation of the EW 2002, and results and ultimate impact. The evaluation questions are categorized as follows:

- *Relevance & Overall Effectiveness.* This area covers the European Added Value of the week, the suitability of this year's theme, the attainment of the expected objectives and the success of promoting European good practice in the field of stress.
- *European Organization.* This area covers Agency's overall organization and management for the EW 2002 focusing mainly on: reaching targets through the promotional campaign, the role and effectiveness of the SME/EW Working Group, the Good Practice Award Scheme and the final Closing Event.
- *Cost Effectiveness.* The evaluation specifically focuses on the economic efficiency and suitability of the seed money financing mechanism in comparison to previously used methods.
- *National Activities.* This area covers country specific issues such as the types of organizations involved, the activities planned and the target audiences as well as an analysis of participants (including number and type), the success of media coverage and publicity events, national perception and satisfaction with participation, and the success and sustainability of prevention of stress at the workplace level.
- *The Future of the Week.* In this section the evaluation looks at and compares the overall success of the three EW organized by Agency in order to make accurate conclusions and recommendations for future implementation. This section also considers the perspective of and ideas for increased effectiveness presented by the Focal Points, organizers and participants.

2. The Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation is based on a three-fold approach including: an extensive review of the literature and documentation available; in-depth case studies of five Focal Points; and the creation and completion of two questionnaires for the remaining Focal Points and for external partner organizations. The fourth evaluation tool, the direct observation of the EW 2002 Closing Event is no longer part of the evaluation methodology and was dropped after the kick-off meeting.

- *Documentary Basis.* The set of documents includes Agency EW 2002 promotional materials, Focal Point Seed Financing reports, the available Focal Point 2002 Activity Reports, documents related to Agency organization of the Good Practice Award Scheme and the Closing Event, among others.
- *The Field Visits.* Direct in-the-field visits were carried out in five selected MS (the UK, Italy, Denmark, Belgium and the Netherlands) including a balanced representation of large and small countries, northern and southern states and Focal Points with or without a significant previous experience in campaign organization. Interviewees included Focal Point representatives and campaign organizers, EW Working Group participants, and key social partners including both employee and employer organizations. In order to make the interviews homogeneous a comprehensive set of guidelines (inclusive of questions for statistical purposes) was drafted for the evaluation team internal purposes.

- *The Questionnaire to the Focal Point.* A detailed e-mail questionnaire was completed by the remaining Focal Points. In order to receive the highest quality of quantitative and qualitative data on EW achievements, the detailed questionnaire touches on all of the main aspects of the EW 2002 and includes both closed and open questions. In order to minimize the duplication of efforts, a special attempt was made to not repeat questions that were already included in the regular EW 2002 reporting process.
- *The Questionnaire to National Campaign Partners.* A short questionnaire was sent to EW2002 campaign partner organizations in all MS with a view to elicit some 150 responses out of an anticipated 300 addresses (20 per Member State). The goal of this questionnaire is to complement the qualitative information provided by the field visits and Focal Point questionnaires with more quantitative information coming directly from the campaign participants. The sample of organizations is based on lists of contacts provided by the Focal Points has been sent out by email or fax and by traditional mail where necessary.

3. Description of the Activities Undertaken

This Final Report is submitted four months after commencement of evaluation activities in early November 2002, when the bulk of EW activities had already been accomplished and only the final closing event in Bilbao had still to take place. This is the third external evaluation in a row of the EW and some comparisons are possible with previous findings. However the timing of previous evaluation exercises was slightly different and this can hinder complete comparability over time.

The Inception Phase

The evaluation formally began on November 11th 2002 at which time the evaluation team embarked upon an initial desk study based on the available project materials. An evaluation kick-off meeting with the members of the Task Force for the Campaign Program was held in Bilbao in mid November. During this meeting, the Task Force provided a full introduction to the role of the Agency and together some clarifications were made and new elements were discussed in relation to the evaluation work plan. Interviews were also carried out with other relevant OSH staff involved in the campaign. An expanded version of the detailed work plan and methodology in the form of an Inception Note was submitted on November 19, 2002, immediately after the meeting. This document also addressed the specific requests formulated by Agency staff during the meeting regarding a draft presentation letter to Member State Focal Points and a brief and non-technical note explaining the evaluation methodology. A thorough review of the campaign documents including grant applications and interim reports took place.

Subsequently Agency presented the evaluation exercise to the Focal Points and requests were made to the Focal Point to provide contact persons for both the field visits and the campaign partner questionnaire. The language to be used in the questionnaire for campaign partners turned out to be an important issue for several Focal Points that were concerned about the possibility of language being a discrimination factor for respondents. This was a particular matter of concern for those organisations that are used to work in their national languages only. There appeared to be no easy solution to this problem. The original proposal for this evaluation explicitly mentioned English as the only working language for the questionnaires. The preparation of questionnaires in national languages risked having unmanageable consequences in terms of both cost and timing considerations. Finally an admittedly compromised solution was found: in order to minimise the

risk of linguistic discrimination the questionnaire was structured in a limited number of closed-type questions only and a French version was added. In parallel, activity reports from the various Focal Points were being received from Agency.

The Field Work Phase

Step One - Field Visits

As soon as the coordinates of the relevant contact persons were received from Agency, contacts were established with the selected Focal Points to arrange the field visits. Although the evaluation team would have preferred to complete all, or at least the majority of field visits before 2003, based on busy schedules and the December holidays, this proved practically impossible.

The first Field Visit was carried out in Italy on the 18th and 19th of December, 2002. Representatives of the Italian Focal Point were met together with campaign organizers and social partners for a total of four detailed interviews. A fifth interview with a representative from a work inspector organisation turned out to be impossible as the interviewee first failed to attend the scheduled meeting and then could not be reached for a subsequently arranged phone interview. On January 6th and 7th 2003, immediately after the holiday break, a meeting with the Danish Focal Point and relevant social partners and activity organizers was held. A total of five interviews were carried out with Focal Point representatives, main campaign organizers, social partners and a campaign participant. A sixth interview could not take place due to bad weather conditions. On January 6th, 7th and 8th the third field visit was conducted in the United Kingdom including a total of seven interviews with various people at the Focal Point and Health and Safety Executive (the Focal Point hosting organization) and one social partner. Unsuccessful attempts were made to organize an additional two interviews with social partners. On January 6th a first round of interviews for the Belgian field visit were conducted. These included interviews with the Focal Point and other representatives of the Federal Public Service for Employment, Labour and Social Dialogue, (the Focal Point hosting organization). Further interviews were conducted on January 13th and 14th with social partners from both employee and employer organizations. The fifth and final field visit was conducted in the Netherlands the week of the 13th of January, 2003. A total of interviews were held with two members of the Dutch Focal Point. Unfortunately the case study was compiled without the participation of the EW 2002 Group Member who did the greatest amount of work for the EW2002. Although he set up the interview in collaboration was not present at the actual interview made no further contact to explain why.

Step Two - The Questionnaires

The Focal Point Questionnaire. The evaluation team began the questionnaire process by putting together a set of all encompassing guidelines for interviews inclusive of possible questionnaire questions with intent to refine and pilot testing during the field visits. This proved only partly possible as only one field visit was scheduled before the holiday break. The guidelines were discussed among the members of the team and sent to Agency before progressing. It was further refined based on the contents of the 2002 National Activity Reports in order to avoid overlapping and on suggestions made by Agency. The questionnaire contained thirteen sections covering crucial evaluation areas such as the seed financing mechanism, the suitability of the EW 2002 theme, awareness raising, the role played by the EW Group, the role of SMEs, and EW 2002 organization and management. On December 20th, immediately after pilot testing was carried out in

Italy, the Focal Point questionnaire was finalised and sent to Focal Point leaders and EW Group Members in the 10 remaining Member States (excluding those that had face-to-face interviews).

The Campaign Partner Questionnaire. In the light of the concerns and possible limitations to the questionnaire as reported in the previous section, many efforts were made to ensure that the questionnaire addressed to campaign partners is accessible to the widest span of participants in terms of time required for completion and language barriers. The questionnaire was limited to 8 closed questions that aimed to address the most important issues facing EW participants. The questionnaire included questions on the theme, national media participation, awareness raising among target groups, tangible forms of best practice and future participation in EW. Since most EW participants are not necessarily aware of the particulars of seed financing, the questionnaire included one important question on the individual or organization's willingness to co-finance future EW activities that can be used as a first rough assessment of unexploited financing opportunities at the national level. Moreover, since Focal Points are often unaware of the actual impact at the workplace level a specific question was introduced in this questionnaire to better quantify this aspect.

A total 300 campaign partner addresses were requested from Focal Points (approximately 20 per MS) in order to ensure some 150-200 responses. The total number of addresses was chosen with the goal to receive at least 50%-60% of total possible responses. Experience shows that the response rate of questionnaires sent to nominated addressees and followed by soliciting emails and phone calls usually is as high as 50-60%. Questionnaires were provided in both English and French and this proved enough to ensure a high response rate.

In the first working week of January the evaluation team sent out the EW 2002 Campaign Partner Questionnaire to contacts in Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Sweden and the United Kingdom, the only countries that sent out the requested contact list within the deadline. Internal contacts were made in order to put together a list of Italian contacts. For the remaining 7 MS, the Campaign Partner Questionnaire was sent out as soon as the addresses were made available (the remaining addresses gradually were made available between January 17th and January 29th, 2003).

Questionnaire Analysis and Conclusion Phase

All completed Focal Point questionnaires were received by the beginning of February, 2003 and the evaluation team commenced the process of qualitative and quantitative analysis of the results. Based upon results of the field visits and the questionnaires received, it seems that the respondents understood the questionnaires and, although the questionnaire was fairly lengthy, the combination of quantitative and qualitative questions did not turn the questionnaire into a time consuming burden.

The due date for receiving completed campaign partner questionnaires was originally January 31st, 2003 but, based on the delay in receiving the contact lists for campaign partners, the due date was extended from January 31st until February 10th in order to increase the response rate. In order to receive the maximum number of campaign partner questionnaires, the campaign partners in all MS have been contacted through email and phone calls to solicit their responses. No major problems were experienced with language.

A sizable number of responses were received from EW2002 campaign partners all over Europe. In particular 164 responses from campaign partners were received out of a total of 247

contacts provided by the Focal Points, a return rate as high as 66%. Of the 164 responses, 33 did not complete the questionnaire because they were not part of the EW, because their activity was cancelled, because they had no knowledge or because they were simply unwilling to participate. The largest group of campaign partners were representatives of a governmental organization, making for 38.9% of the respondents. The second largest group, totalling 22.9% of respondents are representatives of employer and employee organizations. The remaining categories are 15.3% of OSH experts or consultants, and 8.4% from enterprises (1.5% left the question blank). An additional 13% of respondents fit under the category “other”. Respondents in the “other” category were asked to specify what kind of organization they belong to and the results show a mix representative from universities, development centres, the pharmaceutical sector, and private safety and health or charity organisations.

Field visits were completed by mid-January at which time the evaluation team began direct interviews with the list of European important decision makers in the field of OSH (submitted by Agency). Some limitations included the fact that a number of individuals on the list represented the same office and only provided one interview and another was unable to answer all questions because of a lack of knowledge.²² A total of 7 interviews were carried out: 3 face-to-face interviews with those based in Brussels and 4 phone interviews with the remaining individuals. Interviewees were initially contacted in advance through a self-made presentation letter than briefly outlines the scope of our mandate and includes a request for an interview.

The final phase of the evaluation process was devoted to drafting the final evaluation report.

Problems with Work Schedule and Delays Experienced

In the earlier evaluation phases some minor problems were experienced in meeting the envisaged work schedule due to various delays in receiving MS reports, in scheduling the field visits around the December holidays, in receiving the completed Focal Point questionnaires and in receiving the contact list for the campaign partner questionnaires. Fortunately these issues were largely anticipated and were easily managed with some adjustments.

As of early March, a total of 10 financial reports have been received allowing the evaluation team to add partial qualitative and quantitative considerations to the final report. As already agreed in the inception phase, national evaluation reports have not been made available on time for this evaluation exercise.

²² This last expert was absent from the office because of health reasons during the scope of the EW2002.

ANNEX B – Focal Point QUESTIONNAIRE

I. THE EW 2002 AND ITS THEME

1. Please rate whether the EW2002 theme was suitable for the interests and needs in your country.
Please place an "X" on a scale of 1-5 where 1 is not suitable and 5 is very suitable

1	2	3	4	5

2. Please rate the ability to attract media attention on this particular theme.
Select 1-5 where 1 is very difficult and 5 is very easy

1	2	3	4	5

More or less than with previous campaigns?

3. What else has been happening in 2002 in the field of OSH in your country?
Have there been other parallel campaigns? Has the EW 2002 been connected with them (if any)?

4. Do you agree with the EW timeframe as it is now?
Please check one

- Yes I am satisfied with the week as it is.
- No, I would prefer to organize the event in the same week in all MS.
- No, a week is too much I would prefer a European day. (does it increase media interest?)
- No, I would prefer another concept such as: _____.

II. SEED MONEY APPROACH

1. Did you find the proposals submitted for seed-financing to be an easy process?
Select 1-5 where 1 is very difficult and 5 is very easy

1	2	3	4	5

What were your main difficulties?

2. Please rate your opinion on the current method to finance the EW2002: European SEED co-financing.
Select 1-5 where 1 is most negative and 5 is most positive

1	2	3	4	5

What financing scheme do you prefer? Comparison between schemes used in EW 2001 & EW 2000.

3. Are you satisfied with the criteria followed for selecting initiatives eligible for seed financing?
Select 1-5 where 1 is least satisfied and 5 is the most satisfied

1	2	3	4	5

What would you like to change?

4. What would have happened in your country if the Agency co-funded projects were not funded?
i.e. Would there have been the same number and quality of projects?
5. Was there any difference between the projects implemented with co-funding and those without?
If any, please evaluate in terms of quality and credibility.

6. In your opinion, should projects meet certain criteria to be eligible for European money?

YES NO If so, which ones?

7. Without the EW2002, would there have been an OSH campaign in your country?

YES NO

If so, would there have been differences in resources invested or theme?

8. Please rate your experience with the administrative requirements of seed financing.
Select 1-5 where 1 is most negative and 5 is most positive

1	2	3	4	5

9. In your opinion, what costs should eligible under SEED financing?

10. Please roughly indicate the other sources from which your Focal Point received co-financing for EW2002.

For each element below, please rate the level of co-financing provided. Place an "X" for each requested element, where 1 is least amount of co-financing and 5 is the most

	1	2	3	4	5
Government funds					
Focal Point budget					
Employer organization sponsorship					
Employee organization sponsorship					
Private sponsorship					
Other					

III. EUROPEAN ADDED VALUE

Please rate the following questions where 1 represents the most negative answer and 5 the most positive .

	1	2	3	4	5
How much has the EW2002's visibility as an EU initiative added to the success of your week? <i>1 is no addition and 5 is greatly added</i>					
Has your organization's image improved because of your role in the EW2002? <i>1 is no improvement and 5 is greatly improved</i>					
Has the EU logo been used consistently during the week? <i>1 is never and 5 is always</i>					
Has participation in EW 2002 given you an understanding of European "best practice" on the theme? <i>1 is no knowledge of best practice and 5 is complete understanding</i>					

1. Has participation in the EW 2002 allowed your country to benefit from a transfer of know-how or allowed you to share ideas and materials with other Member States?
 YES NO

Please provide concrete examples. (*i.e. access to international expertise or saving on translation costs*)

2. In your opinion, how much has the EW2002 fostered or promoted policy action (in the field of the theme)?
 Select 1-5 where 1 is the least and 5 is the most

	1	2	3	4	5
At the European level?					
At the national level?					

Please mention any specific impact.

IV. EW 2002 MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

1. Are there any other Agency centralized activities that should be introduced within the realm of the campaign?
2. Were you happy with the balance between activities decentralized at the national level and activities centralized by Agency in Bilbao? *Please check one*
- Yes More national More Agency

What changes in allocation of activities or introduction of new activities would you like to see introduced?

3. Has the Agency campaign management been responsive to Focal Point needs on EW2002-related matters?

Select 1-5 where 1 is the least responsive and 5 is the most responsive

1	2	3	4	5

What were the main difficulties? (i.e. document translation, reply to messages, availability of staff, etc.)

4. Please rate Agency contribution to the promotion of cooperation between Member States.

Select 1-5 where 1 is most negative and 5 is most positive

1	2	3	4	5

What else could be done?

5. What is your opinion on the current relationship between the SME Grant Scheme and the EW2002?

Please rate on a scale from 1 – 5 where 1 is most negative and 5 is most positive.

1	2	3	4	5

What would you change in the future?

V. Agency CAMPAIGN SUPPORT

1. Please rank the promotional materials you received by order of importance.

For each box below, please rank from 1-5 where 1 is least important and 5 is most important

Posters	Leaflets	Fact Sheets	Postcards	Good Practice Flyers

2. Do you think that Agency should produce other types of materials?

YES NO If so, what?

3. Are Agency publicity measures significantly targeted for your national audiences?

For each element below, please rate the level of successful targeting (place an "X" for each requested element) where 1 is least and 5 is the most

	1	2	3	4	5
General Public					
Employees					
Employers					
OSH staff					
OSH experts					

4. How much did the media and communication campaign organized by Agency at the European level support your individual national activities? *Select 1-5 where 1 is the least and 5 is the most*

1	2	3	4	5

Why? What could be changed to enhance synergy with national activities?

5. Did the Agency website act as a supportive instrument for your national EW 2002 campaign? *Select 1-5 where 1 is the least and 5 is the most supportive*

1	2	3	4	5

Why? What should be improved (not enough links, etc, etc.)?

VI. NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

1. Which organizations / groups were the most influential in coming up with activity ideas for the EW2002?

For each box below, please rank from 1-4 where 1 is least influential and 4 is most influential

Focal Point	Focal Point Key Partners / Network	Outside Organization	Agency Board Members

2. How were social partners involved and what kind of tripartite consultation took place?
3. Over and above the projects proposed for seed-financing have other national initiatives been carried out? *If so, please roughly estimate how many and place them in the categories below.*

Type of Activity / Target Group	Public	A given company	Workers sector	Workers Region	SME	OSH Managers	OSH Specialists
Large event / seminar							
Workshop							
Training session							
Advertising campaign							
Marketing campaign							
Published materials							
CD-ROM							
Information pack							
Other (please specify)							

4. Please highlight any outstanding features of the purely national projects.

VII. AWARENESS RAISING

1. Please try to provide information on the number of inquiries you received within the context of EW2002. For each box below, please rank from 1-5 where 1 is least number of inquires and 5 is the largest

Direct Contact / Phone Call	Web Site	Email requests	At an EW 2002 event

Please explain

2. How do you rate the amount of overall awareness raising achieved among various target groups? Please rate the level of awareness raising for the following entities where 1 is least and 5 is the greatest amount

	1	2	3	4	5
General Public					
Employee organizations					
Employer organizations					
Workplaces within large public companies					
Workplaces within large private companies					
Workplaces in SMEs					
Among OSH specialists					

VIII. PROMOTING GOOD PRACTICE: IMPLEMENTATION AT THE WORKPLACE LEVEL

1. Please provide a rough estimate of the number of enterprises that have been involved in your various activities: _____ .

Of these enterprises, how many were SMEs? _____

2. Please rate the effectiveness of the EW 2002 in promoting better practice at the workplace level using the following tools. For each box below, please rank from 1-5 where 1 is least and 5 is the most effective

Direct Contact	Training Schemes	Media / Publications	Large Conferences

3. How do you assess the overall positive impact of the EW 2002 on providing better practice at the workplace level? Please rate the level of impact for each workplace where 1 is least and 5 is the greatest impact

	1	2	3	4	5
Workplaces within large public companies					
Workplaces within large private companies					
Workplaces in SMEs					

IX. MANAGEMENT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE GOOD PRACTICE AWARD SCHEME

1. How was the Good Practice Award Scheme communicated and to what audience was it targeted?
2. How do you assess the synergy effects between the Good Practice Scheme and your national campaign?
Select 1-5 where 1 is most negative and 5 is most positive

1	2	3	4	5

What else could be done?

3. Please rate your satisfaction with the number, sector, & size composition of enterprises involved?
Select 1-5 where 1 is least satisfaction and 5 is most satisfaction

1	2	3	4	5

Please explain

X. ORGANISATION OF THE CLOSING EVENT

1. Please comment on your opinion of the event.
i.e. strengths and weaknesses, participants, timing

XI. EW GROUP

1. Please assess the contribution of the EW Group to the overall organization of the EW 2002 Campaign.
Select 1-5 where 1 is most negative and 5 is most positive

1	2	3	4	5

What could be done to improve this?

2. Would you be in favor of a specific working group for the EW 2002 separate from the SME funding scheme?

___ YES ___ NO

Please explain

XII. THE ROLE OF SMEs IN THE EW2002

1. Please rate your satisfaction with the degree of SME involvement in your activities?
Select 1-5 where 1 is least satisfaction and 5 is most satisfaction

1	2	3	4	5

2. Have specific arrangements been made for SMEs to ensure the highest participation possible?

YES NO

If so, what arrangements?

3. Have you produced informational materials particularly targeted at SMEs?

YES NO

If so, what?

XIII. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

1. Have you met your desired objectives, and what you improve or change in the future?
2. What will be done to ensure sustainability of the results achieved?
3. Were there any lessons learnt through your participation in this campaign?

ANNEX C – THE CAMPAIGN PARTNER QUESTIONNAIRES (French & English)

QUESTIONNAIRE POUR LES ORGANISATEURS DES ACTIVITES DE EW 2002

Typologie: SVP, indiquez la typologie pertinente pour votre organisation

Entreprise	Expert/ Consultant OSH	Organisation des employés	Organisation des employeurs	Organisation du Gouvernement	Autre (SVP, spécifiez)

- 1. Comment jugez-vous la convenance du thème de European Week 2002 par rapport à vos intérêts et priorités ?**

SVP, choisissez un nombre entre 1 et 5 (1 = le moins convenant et 5 = le plus convenant)

1	2	3	4	5

- 2. Comment jugez-vous l'impact que cette campagne a eu dans les médias de votre pays?**

SVP, choisissez un nombre entre 1 et 5 (1 = l'impact la moindre et 5 = l'impact maximum)

1	2	3	4	5

- 3. Comment jugez-vous la croissance du niveau de conscience par rapport au stress dans les suivantes groupes conséquent à EW2002?**

SVP, choisissez un nombre entre 1 et 5 (1= aucune croissance et 5= grande croissance)

	1	2	3	4	5
Public					
Expert/ Consultant OSH					
Organisation du Gouvernement					
Organisation des employés					
Organisation des employeurs					
Entreprises Public					
Grandes Entreprises Privées					
PME					

- 4. Connaissez-vous personnellement quelques cas dans lesquels une meilleure gestion du stress a été introduite au travail par suite de EW 2002 ?**

___ OUI ___ NO

Si OUI, pouvez-vous dire combien? _____

Combien de ces cas se sont passés dans des PME ? _____

5. Comment jugez-vous le niveau de connaissance générale de « European Best Practice Award Scheme » dans votre pays?

SVP, choisissez un nombre entre 1 et 5 (1 = la connaissance la moindre et 5 = la connaissance maximum)

1	2	3	4	5

6. Eventuellement, est-ce que vous (ou votre organisation) seriez disponible à cofinancer ou sponsoriser les activités de European Week ?

OUI NO

Si OUI, indiquez une des solutions suivantes donnant une grossière idée de la grandeur de votre possible contribution financière.

- moins de € 2,000
- € 2,000 - € 5,000
- € 5,000 - € 20,000
- € 20,000 - € 50,000
- € 50,000 ou plus

7. En général, comment jugez-vous EW2002?

SVP, choisissez un nombre entre 1 et 5 (1 = le plus négatif et 5 = le plus positif)

1	2	3	4	5

8. Pensez – vous participer aux prochaines European Weeks?

OUI NO

Questionnaire for European Week 2002 Participants

Typology: Please check the box(or boxes) that correspond to the organization you belong to

Enterprise	OSH Expert / Consultant	Employee Organization	Employer Organization	Governmental Organization	Other (please specify)

9. Please rate your opinion of the suitability of the European Week 2002 theme to your interests and priorities? Select 1 – 5 where 1 is the least suitable and 5 is the most suitable

1	2	3	4	5

10. How do you score the influence the campaign had on the media in your country?

Select 1 – 5 where 1 is the least influence and 5 is the greatest influence

1	2	3	4	5

11. Please rate your opinion on the increase in awareness about stress at work among the following target groups as a direct result of the EW2002?

For each element below, select 1 – 5 where 1 is no increase and 5 is large increase

Possible Target Groups	1	2	3	4	5
Public at large					
Agency Expert Community					
Government Organizations					
Employee Organizations					
Employer Organizations					
Public Enterprises					
Large Private Enterprises					
Small and Medium Enterprises					

12. Do you personally know of any cases where tangible improved practice on stress at work has been introduced in the workplace because of the European Week 2002?

___ YES ___ NO

If so, can you roughly quantify how many cases? _____

Of those cases, how many are Small and Medium Enterprises? _____

13. Please rate overall knowledge about the European Best Practice Award Scheme in your country?*Select 1 – 5 where 1 is the least knowledge and 5 is the greatest knowledge*

1	2	3	4	5

14. In principle, would you (or your organization) be willing to co-finance or sponsor European Week activities?

___ YES ___ NO

If so, please check one of the following categories providing a rough idea of the size of possible financial contribution

- ___ less than € 2,000
- ___ € 2,000- € 5,000
- ___ € 5,000- € 20,000
- ___ € 20,000 - € 50,000
- ___ € 50,000 and up

15. What is your overall assessment of the EW2002?*Select 1 – 5 where 1 is negative and 5 most positive*

1	2	3	4	5

16. All in all do you think are you going to take part to future European Weeks?

___ YES ___ NO

Why?

ANNEX D – LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Agency

Françoise Murillo	EW Task Force
Marta Urrutia	EW Task Force
Andrew Smith	Information and Communication Unit
Christa Sedlatschek	Work and Environment Unit
Sarah Copsey	Work and Environment Unit

EU Level Interviews

Bertil Remaesus	Swedish Work Environment Authority – Agency Administrative Board
Natascha Waltke	Union of Industrial and Employers’ Confederation of Europe – Agency Administrative Board
Luis Nascimento Lopes	Uniao Geral de Trabalhadores - Agency Administrative Board
Marc Sapir	ETUC Director – Technical Bureau for Health and Safety, Agency Administrative Board
Stephen Hughes	Member of the European Parliament
Celia Alexopoulou	DG Employment and Social Affairs
Andrew Fielding	DG Press

MS Focal Points**Belgium**

Willy Imbrechts	Focal Point Manager
Solange Gysen	Federal Public Service for Employment, Labour and Social Dialogue (FPSE), General Commissariat for the Humanisation of Work
Jan Baten	FPSE, Administration for Work Security
Jozef Vandewal	FPSE, Administration for Medical Inspectorates
Kris de Meester	VBO, Employers’ organisation
Herman Fonck	ACV, Employees’ organisation

Jean-Marie de Coninck FPSE – Director, Hygiene and Medicine

Denmark

Marianne Rosling EW Group Member, NWEA expert in Psychosocial Risk Factors

Tove Loft Focal Point leader, NWEA senior advisor and legal expert

Jakob Hjuler Tamsmark Focal Point / NWEA IT and media expert

Finn Wendelboe Employees union - Representative of the Road Vehicle Drivers Union

Signe Tonnesen Employers union -Representative of the Danish Association for Managers and Executives "Lederne"

Italy

Dr. Tavassi Italian Focal Point representative - ISPEFL

Dr Grisauda Pisa University Focal Point Partner for Research Aspects

Ing. Crivelli OSH expert - AIAS (an Association of OSH Private Consultants and Focal Point Key Partner in Reaching SMEs)

Dr. Benedettini Employee Organisation - CGIL Trade Union

Dr. Calamita INAIL Work Inspector Organisation failed to attend both a personal and a phone Interview

Netherlands²³

Carolien S.Frenkel Member of the Dutch Focal Point and VNO-NCW (Organisation of Industries and Employers), Secretary for Safety at Work

Marie-José van Rijn Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, Directorate for Safety and Health at Work; Policy Advisor

United Kingdom²⁴

Peter Rimmer Health and Safety Executive (HSE), Director of Information

²³ Unfortunately the case-study was compiled without the participation of the EW2002 Group Member, Mr Rex van de Sluys who did the greatest amount of work for the EW2002. Although he set up the interview in collaboration with the evaluation team, he did not show up at the actual interview and has made no further contact with us to explain why.

²⁴ Unsuccessful attempts were made to meet with Mark Platt – CIB (Confederation of British Industry) and with Fiona Harcombe – British Safety Council, PR Manager.

Janet Connah	HSE, Head of Publicity and Promotions
Colette Manning	HSE, Information Officer
Nicola Westhead	UK FP Coordinator
Jayne Thomas	UK FP Website Administrator
Chris Mawdsley	UK FP Manager
Owen Tudor	TUC (Trades Union Congress), Senior Policy Officer

.

ANNEX E – LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Delivered

- Focal Point applications for the Seed Financing
- Related interim reports (available on the web)
- The full set of final reports on the 2000 and 2001 EW
- EW2002Promotion plan
- EW 2000 Call for projects proposal
- The Minutes of SME EUROPEAN JURY (18-19 September 2002)
- The Minutes of the SME/EW Group Meeting (7 & 8 March 2002 - Draft)
- The Minutes of the Assessment Meeting (17-18 October 2001)
- The Minutes of the SME/European Week Group Meeting (29-30 March 2001)
- The Minutes of SME European Jury (13-14 September 2001)
- The Draft Minutes of the 15th Meeting of the Agency Administrative Board (6/7 November 2001)
- A Booklet on the 2002 GP Award Event to be distributed during the Closing Event
- A Note on the Preparation of the EW 2002 Closing Event – A Team Based Approach
- The Proposal for Themes for the EW 2002 presented to the Board in March 2001
- The Proposal for the EW 2001 – Cover Note
- A Note dated April 2nd 2002 on the Role of the SME/EW Group
- The EW 2002 Good Practice Awards Procedures
- Agency internal phone list
- The EW 2002 press package
- The explanation of seed money scheme to the Focal Points
- The model for application for funding
- The EW 2002 Strategy Paper
- The Final Report of the External Evaluation 2001

- The Final Report of the External Evaluation 2000
- The e-mail sent to the Focal Points with a request for the final report and related template
- Data on EW2002 materials production and distribution patterns among Member States
- Press clippings for the launch event in Brussels
- Summary data on the Good Practice Award Scheme candidates
- Contacts within Member State Focal Points for all Focal Points
- EW 2002 Final Activity Reports for all Focal Points
- EW financial reports from Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Sweden and the UK

Not Received

- The EW2002 financial reports from Germany, Ireland (arrived too late to be processed), Luxembourg, Portugal and Spain
- National Evaluation Reports. These reports will be available too late for our evaluation exercise

**Economisti Associati
Via Rialto 9
40124 Bologna
ITALY**

**Phone +39 051 6569606
Fax +39 051 6486838
E-mail main@economistiassociati.com**