



Appendices

*Evaluation of  
European Week for  
Safety and Health at  
Work 2004*

July 2005



Centre for  
**Strategy &  
Evaluation**

# *Contents*

---

<b>Appendices</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
A. List of Interviews	101
B. FOP Questionnaire	103
C. National Social Partners Questionnaire	115
D. Online Charter Questionnaire	117
E. SME Questionnaire	120
F. Good Practice Award Questionnaire	122
G. EU Level Social Partners Interview Checklist	125
H. Summit & Declaration Interview Checklist	126
I. Focal Points Interview Checklist	127
J. National Social Partners Interview Checklist	129
K. Overview of Previous Evaluations	131

---

# *List of interviews*

# A

## **Agency's staff:**

1. Françoise Murillo (Project Team Leader)
2. Andrew Smith (Information/Communication/Publications)
3. Brenda O'Brien (Communications Liaison in Brussels)
4. Greg Haywood (Construction Expert)
5. Hans-Horst Konkolewsky (Agency Director)
6. Marta Urrutia (FOP subsidy and National Reports)
7. Pascale Turlotte (Financial Aspects of the FOP subsidy)

## **EU level social partners/Bilbao Declaration Signatories:**

8. Marc Sapir – ETUC
9. Natasha Waltke – UNICE
10. Bernd Eisenbach – EFBWW
11. Ulrich Paetzold – FIEC (via email)
12. John Graby – Architects' Council of Europe

CSES also attended a follow-up forum where all of the Bilbao Declaration signatories met in May 2005.

## **Focal Points:**

13. Austria – Gabriele Kaida
14. Belgium – Willy Imbrechts
15. Cyprus – Marios Charalambous, Marios Kourtellis, Yiannoula Theodoulidou
16. Czech Republic – Daniela Kubickova
17. Denmark – Joergen Andersen
18. Estonia – Tiit Kaadu
19. Finland – Hannu Stalhammar, Erkki Yrjanheikki
20. Germany – Reinhard Gerber
21. Greece - Elizabeth Galanopoulou, Giannis Konstantakopoulos, Trifon Ginalas
22. Hungary – Janos Gador
23. Italy - Francesca Grosso, Sergio Tavassi
24. Latvia – Liene Maurite
25. Lithuania – Nerita Sot
26. The Netherlands – Viola Guldener, Annette Höppener
27. Poland- Wioletta Klimaszewska
28. Portugal - Maria Manuela Calado Correia
29. Sweden – Elisabet Delang
30. Slovenia – Vladka Komel (via email)
31. United Kingdom – Eleanor Keech

# *List of interviews*

# A

## **National social partners/other partners at the national level:**

32. Cyprus - Employers and Industrialists Federation: Christina Vasila
33. Cyprus - Cyprus Chamber of Commerce and Industry: Lefteris Karydis
34. Finland - The Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions: Raili Perimäki
35. Finland - Construction Trade Union :Veijo Houtari, Leena Johansson
36. Greece - Hellenic Institute for Occupational Health and Safety: Spiros Dontas
37. Italy – Trade Unions: Gabriella Galli and Giorgio Cocco
38. Italy - Employers’ organisations: Tommaso Campanile
39. Poland – Skanska Poland: Adam Sekowski
40. Lithuania - Lithuanian Builders Association of Lithuanian Industrialist Confederation: Grazina Laurynaitiene

# FOP questionnaire

# B

The European Agency for Safety and Health at work (the Agency) is undertaking an independent evaluation of Europe Week 2004. The purpose of the evaluation is to help identify ways of improving future events.

Your input to the research would be greatly appreciated. Please complete the following questionnaire and return it to the evaluators (Centre for Strategy & Evaluation Services – CSES) **by 10th April 2005**. This can be done either **by e-mail (scook@cses.co.uk)** or **fax (+ 44 (0)1959 525 122)**. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Sonia Cook directly (email: scook@cses.co.uk or phone + 44 (0)1227 763180). Alternatively, you can phone CSES’s general enquiries line on +44 (0) 1959 525122.

If you are filling in the form electronically, please type your answers in the shaded text boxes ( ). The dotted lines are provided should you wish you complete the form by hand, but they are not suitable for typing the text in. You will also be able to select the check boxes (  ) electronically by clicking your mouse over them.

Please note that the identity of respondents will not be made known to the Agency. Thank you in advance for your cooperation. The results of the evaluation will be published by the Agency.

<b>1. Europe Week 2004 Aims and Outcomes</b>				
<b>1.1 Please specify how appropriate was it to select the construction sector as a topic of EW2004?</b>				
Very appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> Not appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> If you selected ‘not appropriate’, please explain why: ..... ..... .....				
<b>1.2 How relevant were the EW2004 activities to the needs of construction sector in your country? Please tick appropriate boxes:</b>				
	<b>Very relevant</b>	<b>Relevant</b>	<b>Not very relevant</b>	
National level activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
EU level activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>1.3 Has the focus on a single sector made EW2004 organisation easier in comparison with previous EWs in terms of the following (please tick appropriate boxes):</b>				
	<b>Much easier</b>	<b>Easier</b>	<b>The same</b>	<b>Less Easy</b>
General EW management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Finding partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increasing campaign visibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Campaigning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reaching SMEs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reaching workplaces in large private companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reaching workplaces in large public companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please briefly explain whether you think that the organisation of EW2004 has been affected in any other way as a result of single sector focus? ..... .....				

# FOP questionnaire

# B

1.4 To what extent do you think that the key objectives of EW2004 been reached? Please tick appropriate boxes, where 1 is the least and 5 is the greatest:

Objective	1	2	3	4	5
Focus on SMEs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Awareness raising at workplace level (both SMEs and larger companies)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Best practice promotion at workplace level (both SMEs and larger companies)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Awareness raising among wider public and at the political level	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Involving and committing the Social Partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exchange of expertise between member states	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

How many SMEs do you estimate have been reached in your country, either directly or indirectly?

Up to 500  500-2000  2000-5000  5000-8000  8000-10 000  10 000 -15 000  Over 15 000

1.5 Please rate how does the EW2004 compare to previous EWs in terms of the number of workplaces reached and sharing of trans-national experience/know-how between member state:

	Much higher	Somewhat higher	The same	Somewhat lower	Much lower
The number of workplaces reached within SMEs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The number of workplaces reached within large public sector companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The number of workplaces reached within large private sector companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trans-national exchange of experience	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.6 How would you rate the extent to which different audiences in your country have been reached by the EW activities (this includes both the activities organised at the national and the EU level)? Please tick relevant boxes, where 1 is the least and 5 is the greatest:

Audience category	1	2	3	4	5
General public	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employee organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employer organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workplaces within large public companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workplaces within large private companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workplaces in SMEs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Health and safety at work specialists	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Labour inspectors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Construction industry associations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you selected 'other' please specify who they were:

# FOP questionnaire

# B

.....  
 Please give us a **rough estimate**, if possible, of the total number of participants in EW2004 events in your country:  
 Up to 1000  1000 – 2000  2000- 5000  5000-8000  8000-10000  10 000-15 000  Over 15 000

**1.7 How effective were the different categories of participants in EW2004 activities in communicating EW messages to the workplaces (e.g. by disseminating EW information, sharing insights from the events, organising their own events, etc)?** Please tick relevant boxes, where 1 represents the least effective and 5 the most effective.

Participant category	1	2	3	4	5	N/A*	Don't know
Employee organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employer organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participants from large public companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participants from large private companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participants from SMEs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Health and safety at work specialists	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Labour inspectors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Construction industry associations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

\*Select N/A if the participant category was not included in Europe Week 2004 activities

If you selected 'other' please specify who they were:

.....  
 .....

**1.8 Which activities do you think have been most effective in raising awareness/promoting good practice at workplace level?** Please rate by ticking relevant boxes, where 1 is the least and 5 is the greatest:

Activity category	1	2	3	4	5	N/A*
Regional seminars/training events	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National seminars/training events	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conferences, fairs, exhibitions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Campaign materials distribution	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workplace visits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Media coverage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agency EW 2004 website	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National EW 2004 website	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you selected 'other', please briefly define what that is:

.....

# FOP questionnaire

# B

**1.9 Which activities have been most cost-efficient to run?** Please rate by ticking relevant boxes, where 1 is the least and 5 is the greatest value:

Activity category	1	2	3	4	5	N/A*
Regional seminars/training events	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National seminars/training events	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conferences, fairs, exhibitions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Campaign materials distribution	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workplace visits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Media coverage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agency EW 2004 website	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National EW 2004 website	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

\*Select N/A only if an activity has not been carried out in your country

**1.10 Although the Agency will not provide any additional funds for the purposes of EW2004, how likely is it that the results of EW2004 will be sustained in the future anyway (e.g. by attracting external funding, through continuing usage of existing materials, etc)?**

Very likely       Quite likely       Likely       Not very likely       Unlikely

If you have any ideas on how to increase sustainability, please state here:

.....  
 ....

## 2. Role of the Agency

**2.1 Please rate how satisfied were you with the following organisational aspects of EW2004** by ticking appropriate boxes:

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not very satisfied
Agency support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agency's facilitation of trans-national experience exchange regarding EW organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall EW2004 timetable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FOP involvement in the planning stage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Were there any difficulties in relation to the Agency support and facilitation of trans-national experience exchange?

.....  
 .....

What were the main difficulties in relation to the EW2004 timetable, if any?

.....  
 .....

Should anything be changed regarding the FOP involvement in the planning stage?

.....  
 .....



# FOP questionnaire

# B

**2.2 Please rate the impact which the participation of EU level Social Partners had in your country.**  
Please tick appropriate boxes, where 1 is the least and 5 is the greatest.

	1	2	3	4	5
Increased the visibility of EW2004	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Involved their affiliated organisations in EW2004	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Helped reach more workplaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Facilitated trans-national cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please briefly specify if there were any other benefits/if you have any comments:

.....  
 .....  
 .....

**2.3 Please rate how relevant were the campaign materials to the different EW2004 audiences.** Please tick suitable boxes, where 1 is the least relevant and 5 is the most relevant.

	1	2	3	4	5
General public	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employee organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employer organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workplaces within large public companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workplaces within large private companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workplaces in SMEs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OSH specialists	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Labour inspectors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Construction industry associations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you have any suggestions on how the campaign materials can be made more relevant to the needs of workplaces, particularly SMEs, please briefly state here:

.....  
 .....  
 .....

**2.4 Please rate how useful you found the individual campaign materials** by ticking suitable boxes:

	Very useful	Useful	Not very useful
Factsheets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Magazine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information pack	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Campaign pack (poster, leaflet, GPA flyer, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information report "Achieving better safety and health in construction"	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
NAPO DVD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Booklet with GPA winners case studies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Were the materials made available in time? Please tick one:

Yes  A bit early  A bit late  Very late

# FOP questionnaire

# B

If you have any further comments on the campaign materials (e.g. which ones you would like to see more of, new ones that should be added, suggestions regarding timing, etc) please explain briefly:  
 .....  
 .....

**2.5 Has the design of campaign materials been more helpful in overcoming linguistic barriers in comparison with previous years?** Please tick one box. Yes  The same  Less helpful

**2.6 Are there any parts of Agency’s EW2004 website that could be improved?** Yes  No   
 If you answered ‘yes’, please outline briefly what:  
 .....  
 .....

**2.7 Do you think the Agency’s profile has been higher during EW2004 than in previous EWs?** Please tick one box.  
 Higher  The same  Lower

**2.8 What do you think has been the impact of the simultaneous launch of Europe Week 2004 and simultaneous October Week in terms of their impact on increasing visibility, organisational aspects?**

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative
Impact on Organisational effort	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Impact on EW visibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3. European Added Value and Political Impact**

**3.1 To what extent is the EW2004 is recognised as a European campaign among your national audiences?**  
 Completely  Mainly  Somewhat  Not much  Not at all

**3.2 Please rate the following questions by ticking appropriate boxes, where 1 represents the least value and 5 the greatest.**

	1	2	3	4	5
To what extent has the visibility of the campaign as a European Campaign contributed to its success at the national level?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To what extent have the campaign materials you used in EW2004 been branded with the Agency’s stickers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has the image of your organisation improved as a result of your co-ordination of EW2004 activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you feel that the information and activities provided by EW2004 have given your workplaces an understanding of European best practices in construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
How strong was the synergy between EW2004 and Senior Labour Inspectors’ Committee (SLIC) campaign?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

# FOP questionnaire

# B

**3.3 How compatible have the EW2004 activities been with the national priorities in health and safety in your country and with national social partners' activities?** Please select a statement that applies (you can select both a and b if applicable):

- (a) Compatible with the existing initiatives/priorities in the construction sector
- (b) Compatible with the existing initiatives/priorities on other H&S themes
- (c) Not compatible with any existing initiatives/priorities at all, but was valuable anyway
- (d) Not compatible with any existing initiatives/priorities at all and it clashed with them

Please briefly comment on the above, if you have anything to add:

.....  
 .....  
 .....

## 4. Organisational Aspects at the National Level

**4.1 How satisfied are you with the involvement of national social partners in the planning and implementation of EW2004 activities at the national level?** Please tick appropriate boxes.

	Highly satisfied	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not very satisfied	Not satisfied at all
Involvement in planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Involvement in implementation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Involvement in general in comparison with previous EWs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please comment briefly if you can think of any ways in which the involvement can be increased:

.....  
 .....  
 .....

**4.2 Please indicate by ticking appropriate boxes which organisations outside the official tripartite network have participated in organisation of EW activities/might be interested to participate in the future.**

	Participated	Might be interested	Not interested
Government institutions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OSH expert organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Expert organisations working with construction sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Business associations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statutory Accident Insurance Organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

# FOP questionnaire

# B

Private companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If any of the above organisations have participated despite being outside the official network, do you know why that has been the case?  
 .....  
 ...  
 .....

**4.3 Have the EW activities been more/less extensively covered in the media than in the previous years?**

Significantly more       More       The same       Less       Significantly less

**4.4 Please rate the following questions on a scale 1-5, 1 being the least value and 5 the greatest.**

	1	2	3	4	5
What was the level of Agency’s support to increase the coverage of national activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
How strong was the synergy between Agency’s communication campaign and national activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What, if anything, Agency could do to increase the profile of national activities?  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

**4.5 Please estimate how many visits have you had on your national EW website:**  
 .....

**5. FOP subsidies**

**5.1 Please rate on a scale of 1-5, 1 being the least value and 5 the greatest, how efficient is the FOP subsidy process.**

	1	2	3	4	5
Application procedure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Timelines (application deadline, length of approval and payment procedures,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarity of activity eligibility criteria	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarity of cost eligibility criteria	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reporting requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

# FOP questionnaire

# B

Reporting requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>				
Please briefly comment further on any of the above:					
.....					
...					
.....					
...					
<b>5.2 How suitable do you find the financing model for FOP subsidies (50% co-financing requirement, 25% sub-contracting limits)?</b>					
Very suitable <input type="checkbox"/> Quite suitable <input type="checkbox"/> Suitable <input type="checkbox"/> Not very suitable <input type="checkbox"/> Unsuitable <input type="checkbox"/>					
Can you suggest any alternatives?					
.....					
.....					
.....					
<b>5.3 If there was no FOP subsidy, what do you think would have happened with the activities which were co-funded through the subsidy (please tick <u>only one</u> box):</b>					
(a) The activities would have gone ahead anyway	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(b) The activities would have gone ahead on a smaller scale	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(c) The activities would not have gone ahead at all	<input type="checkbox"/>				
<b>5.4 Please tell us if the fact that FOP subsidy was granted helped you or your Social Partners to win some funds for additional activities at the national level or if it has spurred additional activity at the national level (e.g. complementary activities by players outside the tripartite network such as private enterprises or other government bodies):</b>					
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>		
Funds for additional activities won by FOP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Funds for additional activities won by social partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Independent activities started outside tripartite network	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>5.5 What have been the sources of co-financing at the national level? Please give a weighting to each category, where 1 represents the least value and 5 the greatest.</b>					
<b>Sources</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Government bodies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FOP budget	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employer associations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employee associations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private enterprises	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

# FOP questionnaire

# B

If you selected other, please specify briefly who they were:  
 .....  
 .....

**6. Good Practice Awards Scheme**

**6.1 How were the winning/shortlisted good practices at the national level/EU level disseminated to other workplaces?** Please tick all applicable options:  
 Published a Good Practice leaflet  Media coverage  Organised Awards ceremony  No promotion   
 Published on the national EW2004 website  Other   
 If you selected other, please tell us briefly what that is:  
 .....

**6.2 Please tell us what you think about the following questions** by ticking appropriate boxes:

	Yes	The same	Less than in previous years
Has the EW2004 GPA scheme raised the profile of EW2004 more than the GPAs in previous Europe Weeks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has the promotion of GPA 2004 at the EU level been more active than in the previous Europe Weeks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has the promotion of GPA 2004 at the national level been more active than in the previous Europe Weeks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you have any ideas on how the GPA can be used to further raise EW profile or how it can be better advertised, please outline your ideas below:  
 .....

**6.3 Preliminary data indicates that the response of SMEs to the GPA Call in EW2004 has been generally quite low. Please rate the following factors that may have caused it in your country, 1 indicating the least important factor and 5 indicating the most important:**

	1	2	3	4	5
Low OSH standards in construction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Weak GPA scheme promotion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GPA scheme timetable was unsuitable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The cost of participation is high for SMEs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The SMEs do not see the benefits in participation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you entered anything for 'other' in the above table, please state what it is:  
 .....  
 .....

# FOP questionnaire

# B

How does the response of the SMEs to the GPA Call in EW2004 compare to previous EWs in your country?

Significantly higher  Higher  The same  Lower  Significantly lower

**6.4 Please tell us what you think of the following organisational aspects of the GPA in EW2004 by assigning 1-5 ratings, 1 being the least score and 5 the highest.**

	1	2	3	4	5
Were the GPA guidelines/the flier made available to FOPs in sufficient time?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has the publication of GPA Call been timely and has it allowed sufficient time for companies to prepare applications?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have the selection criteria been clear, suitable and easy to understand?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
What was the level of trans-national experience exchange regarding GPA organisation/promotion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The number of nominations was limited to one per country. Has this increased cost-efficiency for you as an FOP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Should there be more than one nomination per country? Yes  No

**6.5 If a national GPA scheme has been organised, has it made it easier to nominate projects for the Agency's EW2004 GPA scheme? Please select one:**

Much Easier  Easier  The same as when it is not organised   
 Much more difficult  More difficult  National GPA scheme has not been organised

## 7. Other Events - Online Campaign Charter, Construction Summit and Bilbao Declaration

**7.1 How was the Online Charter promoted in your country? Please select as many options as applicable:**

National EW2004 website  Partner websites  Specialist press  Campaign materials dissemination   
 Press  TV  Radio  Other methods

**7.2 How much do you think the Construction Summit and Bilbao Declaration have contributed to raising the profile of EW2004 in your country? Tick suitable boxes, where 1 is the least and 5 is the greatest.**

	1	2	3	4	5
Construction Summit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bilbao Declaration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Thank you for your completing this questionnaire. Please return it by e-mail (scook@ceses.co.uk) or fax (+ 44 (0)1959 525 122).**

# *National social partners Questionnaire*

# C

The European Agency for Safety and Health at work (OSHA) is undertaking an independent evaluation of Europe Week 2004. The purpose of the evaluation is to help identify ways of improving future events.

Your input to the research would be greatly appreciated. Please complete the following questionnaire

The name of your organisation:  
 .....

Your country:  
 .....

**Please note that the identity of respondents will not be made know to the Agency or to your Focal Point. We are asking for these details only to help us follow up any details with you if necessary.**

and return it to the evaluators (Centre for Strategy & Evaluation Services – CSES) **by 10th April 2005**. This can be done either **by e-mail (scook@cses.co.uk)** or fax (+ 44 (0)1959 525 122).. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Sonia Cook directly (email: scook@cses.co.uk or phone + 44 (0)1227 763180). Alternatively, you can phone CSES’s general enquiries line on +44 (0) 1959 525122.

If you are filling in the form electronically, please type your answers in the shaded text boxes ( ). The dotted lines are provided should you wish you complete the form by hand, but they are not suitable for typing the text in. You will also be able to select the check boxes (  ) electronically by clicking your mouse over them.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation. The results of the evaluation will be published by the Agency.

**1. Please check the box (or boxes) that best describe organisation you belong to:**

Enterprise	OSH specialist	Trade Union	Employer body	Other
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2. How relevant were the EW2004 activities to the needs of the construction sector in your country? Please tick the appropriate boxes:**

	Very relevant	Relevant	Not relevant
National level activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EU level activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



# *National social partners Questionnaire*

C

**3. To what extent have different groups in your country been reached by EW activities? Please tick relevant boxes, where 1 is the least and 5 is the greatest:**

Audience category	1	2	3	4	5
General public	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employee organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employer organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workplaces within large public companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workplaces within large private companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workplaces within SMEs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OSH specialists	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Labour inspectors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Construction sector associations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**4. Which activities have been most effective in raising awareness/promoting good practice at the workplace level? Please tick relevant boxes, where 1 is the least and 5 is the greatest:**

Activity category	1	2	3	4	5	*N/A
Regional seminars/training events	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National seminars/training events	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conferences, fairs, exhibitions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Campaign materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workplace visits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Media coverage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agency EW2004 website	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National EW2004 website	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

\*Select N/A only if an activity has not been carried out in your country

**5. How satisfied are you with the support you have received from your FOP in relation to EW2004 matters, with overall EW2004 timetable AND with your involvement as well as the involvement of other social partners in EW2004 national activities? Please tick appropriate boxes, where 1=not satisfied at all and 5=very satisfied:**

	1	2	3	4	5
FOP support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall EW2004 timetable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your involvement/involvement of other social partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

# *National social partners Questionnaire*

# C

**6. Please rate the impact which the participation of EU level Social Partners (FIEC, EFBWW, EBC) had in your country. Select 1-5 where 1 is the least and 5 is the greatest:**

	1	2	3	4	5
It increased the visibility and credibility of EW2004	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It helped reach more workplaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It facilitated trans-national cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It raised the profile of your organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**7. Do you think that EW2004 activities have been more/less extensively covered in the media than in the previous years?**

Significantly more     A little more     The same     A bit less     Significantly less

**8. Have you co-funded with your FOP any of the national EW2004 activities?**    Yes     No

If you answered 'yes' above, please tell us what would have happened if no funding was provided by your FOP (please select only one):

- (a) The activities would have gone ahead anyway
- (b) The activities would have gone ahead on a smaller scale
- (c) The activities would not have gone ahead at all

**Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return it by e-mail  
([scook@ceses.co.uk](mailto:scook@ceses.co.uk)) or fax (+ 44 (0) 01959 525 122).**

# Online charter signatories questionnaire

D

The European Agency for Safety and Health at work (OSHA) is undertaking an independent evaluation of Europe Week 2004 (EW2004). The purpose of the evaluation is to help identify ways of improving future events.

Your input to the research would be greatly appreciated. Please complete the following questionnaire and return it to the evaluators (Centre for Strategy & Evaluation Services – CSES) **by Wednesday 16th March 2005**. This can be done either **by e-mail (scook@cses.co.uk)** or **fax (+ 44 (0)1959 525 122)**. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact either Dragana Vojakovic or Jack Malan at CSES (Tel. + 44 (0)1959 525 122). Please note that the identity of respondents will not be made known to the Agency. Thank you in advance for your cooperation. The results of the evaluation will be published by the Agency.

If you are filling in the form electronically, please type your answers in the shaded text boxes ( ). The dotted lines are provided should you wish you complete the form by hand, but they are not suitable for typing the text in. You will also be able to select the check boxes ( ) electronically by clicking your mouse over them.

Before answering the questionnaire, please provide the following information about your organisation:

(a) Which country is your organisation located in?

.....

(b) Is your organisation a private company? Yes  No

(c) How many people work for your organisation? <50  51-250  251-500  >501

---

## 1. How did you hear about the Online Charter? Please tick the relevant boxes:

Specialist press  EW2004 Website  A government body

EW2004 publications  TV  Radio

Newspaper  EW2004 event  Health and safety/labour inspector visit

Other

If you selected 'other', please specify what this source was:

.....

## 2. When you signed the Online Charter you indicated that you were going to undertake one or more health and safety related activities for EW2004. Have you undertaken any of these activities?

Yes, all of them  Yes, most of them  Yes, some of them  No, none of them

# *Online charter signatories questionnaire*

# D

Please use the space below to briefly explain what sort of activities you undertook if you answered YES or to explain what limits or difficulties you faced if you answered NO: ..... .....	
<b>3. Have you used the certificate issued by the Agency in any way?</b> Do you think the certificate will help your organisation any way?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Overall, how useful do you think the Charter has been as a way of promoting health and safety at work? Very useful <input type="checkbox"/> Quite useful <input type="checkbox"/> Not useful at all <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>4. Have you told any of your affiliated organisations (e.g. suppliers, clients, etc) about:</b> The Online Charter EW2004	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>5. Please tell us briefly why your organisation signed the Online Charter?</b> ..... .....	
<b>6. Do you think that Online Charter needs to be changed in any way (e.g. the wording, the layout, the name, the registration process, promotion, confirmations sent to you, etc)</b> ..... .....	
<b>7. Would you sign the new Online Charter for EW2005 on noise?</b> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Why? ..... .....	
<b>8. Were you aware of other EW2004 activities in your country?</b> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> If you answered 'yes', how relevant do you think they were to the needs of construction sector companies?	

# *Online charter signatories questionnaire*

# D

Very relevant <input type="checkbox"/>	Quite relevant <input type="checkbox"/>	Not relevant at all <input type="checkbox"/>
Did you/your organisation take part in any of those other activities?		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
		No <input type="checkbox"/>
Why?		
.....		
.....		
<b>9. Have you seen any of the EW2004 information materials available from your national Focal Point or EW2004 website?</b>		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
If you answered 'yes' to the above question, did you/your organisation make any use of these materials?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
If yes, explain briefly how you used the materials:		
.....		
.....		
Do you think that the materials successfully addressed the needs of construction sector SMEs?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>10. Were you aware of the following events/activities:</b>		
EW launch on 30 <sup>th</sup> April 2004	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
EW October Week in 2004	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
The Construction Summit on 22 <sup>nd</sup> November 2004	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

If you would be interested in receiving a copy of the analysis of the responses, please tick the box

**Thank you for your completing this questionnaire. Please return it by e-mail  
(scook@cses.co.uk) or fax (+ 44 (0)1959 525 122).**

# *SME questionnaire*

# E

## **Questionnaire for SME Funding Scheme beneficiaries who are involved in work with the Construction sector, but who have not signed the Online Charter**

The European Agency for Safety and Health at work (OSHA) is undertaking an independent evaluation of Europe Week 2004. The purpose of the evaluation is to help identify ways of improving future events.

Your input to the research would be greatly appreciated. Please complete the following questionnaire and return it to the evaluators (Centre for Strategy & Evaluation Services – CSES) **by 10th April 2005**. This can be done either **by e-mail (scook@cses.co.uk)** or fax (+ 44 (0)1959 525 122).. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Sonia Cook directly (email: scook@cses.co.uk or phone + 44 (0)1227 763180). Alternatively, you can phone CSES's general enquiries line on +44 (0) 1959 525122.

If you are filling in the form electronically, please type your answers in the shaded text boxes ( ). The dotted lines are provided should you wish you complete the form by hand, but they are not suitable for typing the text in. You will also be able to select the check boxes (  ) electronically by clicking your mouse over them.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation. The results of the evaluation will be published by the Agency.

The name of your organisation: .....	
Your country: .....	
<b>Please note that the identity of respondents will not be made know to the Agency or to your Focal Point. We are asking for these details only to help us follow up any details with you if necessary.</b>	
1. <b>Have you heard about the EW2004 Online Charter?</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
If you have answered 'yes' above could you tell us if you have told any of your affiliated organisations (e.g. suppliers, clients, etc) about the Online Charter	
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2. Please tell us briefly what has prevented you from signing the Online Charter?</b>	
.....	
.....	
3. <b>Were you aware of other EW2004 activities in your country?</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
If you answered 'yes' above:	
a) How relevant do you think they were to the needs of the construction sector SMEs?	

# SME questionnaire

# E

Very relevant <input type="checkbox"/>	Quite relevant <input type="checkbox"/>	Not relevant at all <input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have you told any of your affiliated organisations (e.g. suppliers, clients, etc) about it?		
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have you taken part in any of the EW 2004 activities and how?		
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
.....		
.....		
<b>4. Have you seen any of the information materials available from your national Focal Point or EW2004 website?</b>		
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
If you answered 'yes' to the above question:		
a) did you think that the materials successfully addressed the needs of construction sector SMEs?		
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
b) have you used the materials in anyway and how? Yes <input type="checkbox"/>		
		No <input type="checkbox"/>
.....		
.....		
<b>5. Were you aware of the following events/activities?</b>		
EW launch on 30 <sup>th</sup> April 2004	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
EW October Week in 2004 (18 <sup>th</sup> -22 <sup>nd</sup> October)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Construction Summit on 22 <sup>nd</sup> November	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

**Thank you for your completing this questionnaire. Please return it by e-mail (scook@cses.co.uk) or fax (+ 44 (0)1959 525 122).**

# *Good practice award scheme questionnaire*

# F

The European Agency for Safety and Health at work (OSHA) is undertaking an independent evaluation of Europe Week 2004 (EW2004). The purpose of the evaluation is to help identify ways of improving future events.

Your input to the research would be greatly appreciated. Please complete the following questionnaire and return it to the evaluators (Centre for Strategy & Evaluation Services – CSES) **by 10th April 2005**. This can be done either **by e-mail (scook@cses.co.uk) or fax (+ 44 (0)1959 525 122)**. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Sonia Cook directly (email: scook@cses.co.uk or phone + 44 (0)1227 763180). Alternatively, you can phone CSES’s general enquiries line on +44 (0) 1959 525122.

If you are filling in the form electronically, please type your answers in the shaded text boxes ( ). The dotted lines are provided should you wish you complete the form by hand, but they are not suitable for typing the text in. You will also be able to select the check boxes (  ) electronically by clicking your mouse over them.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation. The results of the evaluation will be published by the Agency.

The name of your organisation: .....				
Your country: .....				
<b>Please note that the identity of respondents will not be made know to the Agency or to your Focal Point. We are asking for these details only to help us follow up any details with you if necessary.</b>				
<b>1. Please check the box (or boxes) that best describe the involvement of your company in the Good Practice Award (GPA) scheme:</b>				
<b>Winner at the national level/nominated for the EU level GPA</b>	<b>Shortlisted at the national level</b>	<b>Our application was rejected</b>	<b>Participated in the EU level GPA</b>	<b>Winner at the EU level GPA</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2. How did you hear about the European Good Practice Award Scheme (GPA)?</b> Please tick as many boxes as applicable.				
EW2004 Website <input type="checkbox"/>	National GPA scheme <input type="checkbox"/>	EW2004 publications <input type="checkbox"/>		
EW2004 event (eg. Conference) <input type="checkbox"/>	A government body <input type="checkbox"/>	Name:.....		
Labour Inspector visit <input type="checkbox"/>	Specialist press <input type="checkbox"/>	GPA official Call <input type="checkbox"/>		
TV <input type="checkbox"/>	Radio <input type="checkbox"/>	Daily press <input type="checkbox"/>		
EW2004 National Launch <input type="checkbox"/>	EW2004 EU level launch <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>		
If you selected ‘other’, please specify what it was: .....				



# *Good practice award scheme questionnaire*

# F

<p><b>3. Did you find out about the Scheme <u>before</u> the publication of the official Call for nominations on February 2004?</b></p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>      No <input type="checkbox"/>      If you answered ‘yes’, please let us know how and when you found out:</p> <p>.....</p>
<p><b>4. Did you have enough time to prepare the application after you found out about the GPA scheme?</b></p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>      No <input type="checkbox"/>      If you answered ‘no’, how much more time would you have liked and why?</p> <p>.....</p>
<p><b>5. Have the project application criteria been clear, suitable and easy to understand?</b></p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>      No <input type="checkbox"/>      Are there any particular criteria that you would like to change?</p> <p>.....</p>
<p><b>6. Do you think that the selection process was clear and transparent?</b></p> <p>At the <u>national</u> level      Yes <input type="checkbox"/>      No <input type="checkbox"/>      At the <u>European</u> level      Yes <input type="checkbox"/>      No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Please use the space below for any comments, e.g. on how the procedures could be improved:</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>
<p><b>7. Do you think that the winners of the European GPA awards should be announced before the EW2004 Closing Event (it was in November 2004 in case of EW2004)?</b></p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>      No <input type="checkbox"/>      It does not matter when they are announced <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>8. Has your company signed the Online Campaign Charter?</b></p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>      We were aware of it, but haven’t signed <input type="checkbox"/>      This is the first time we hear about it <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>If you were aware of it, but have not signed, could you briefly tell us why not?</p> <p>.....</p>
<p><b>9. Were you aware of other EW2004 activities in your country?</b>      Yes <input type="checkbox"/>      No <input type="checkbox"/></p>

# *Good practice award scheme questionnaire*

# F

If you answered 'yes', how relevant do you think they were to the needs of the construction sector?

a) Very relevant       Relevant       Somewhat relevant       Not very relevant

b) Have you participated in any of the activities and if so, in which ones? Yes       No

.....

.....

---

**10. Have you seen any of the information materials which were produced during EW2004 and which were available from your national Focal Point or on EW2004 website?**

Yes       No

a) If you answered 'yes' to the above question, did you think that the materials successfully addressed the needs of construction sector?      Yes       No

b) Have you used any of the materials and if so, how?      Yes       No

.....

.....

**Thank you for your completing this questionnaire. Please return it by e-mail  
([scook@cses.co.uk](mailto:scook@cses.co.uk)) or fax (+ 44 (0)1959 525 122).**

# *EU level social partners interview checklist*

# G

Note:

The European Agency for Safety and Health at work (OSHA) is undertaking an independent evaluation of Europe Week 2004. The purpose of the evaluation is to help identify ways of improving future events.

Your input to the research would be greatly appreciated. The following checklist highlights the key issues being examined with regard to the Closing Summit and Bilbao Declaration. It will be used by the evaluators (Centre for Strategy & Evaluation Services – CSES) to carry out the interviews.

Please note that the identity of respondents will not be made known to the Agency. Thank you in advance for your cooperation. The results of the evaluation will be published by the Agency.

- 
1. How good was the fit between the construction sector focus in EW2004 and a wider EU policy agenda?
  2. Are you aware of any policy changes at the EU level that may have been prompted by EW2004 activities?
  3. How successfully did the European Week 2004 address the needs of SMEs?
  4. How satisfied are you with the level of your involvement in the planning and implementation of EW activities?
  5. What were the strong points in your cooperation with the Agency?
  6. What were the weak points in your cooperation with the Agency? Do you require any additional/different support from the Agency?
  7. What kind of actions have you undertaken at the EU level in relation to the European Week 2004?
  8. How did you involve your affiliated organisations in EW2004 activities? Has their involvement resulted in action at the national level?
  9. What kind of actions have you undertaken in order to facilitate trans-national cooperation?
  10. Are you aware of any impacts that your involvement has had on reaching the SMEs?
  11. Can you give us any indications on the overall awareness of the EW2004 activities within the construction sector in the EU?
  12. Have you got any suggestions regarding EW2004 areas that could be improved (e.g. its programme/activities, promotion, national level activities, etc.)?

# *Summit and declaration interview checklist*

# H

Note:

The European Agency for Safety and Health at work (OSHA) is undertaking an independent evaluation of Europe Week 2004. The purpose of the evaluation is to help identify ways of improving future events.

Your input to the research would be greatly appreciated. The following checklist highlights the key issues being examined with regard to the Closing Summit and Bilbao Declaration. It will be used by the evaluators (Centre for Strategy & Evaluation Services – CSES) to carry out the interviews.

Please note that the identity of respondents will not be made known to the Agency. Thank you in advance for your cooperation. The results of the evaluation will be published by the Agency.

---

1. Was the coverage of topics at the Closing Summit relevant to the needs of the construction sector, particularly SMEs?
2. How much, do you think, did the Summit do to help raise the awareness of the health and safety issues in construction sector? Were there any other benefits from the Summit/Bilbao Declaration and, if so, what were these?
3. What led your organisation to participate in the Summit and to sign the Declaration?
4. The Bilbao Declaration outlines several areas in which action should be undertaken to improve health and safety in construction sector. How have you approached the implementation of these actions?
  - Procurement - building in safety
  - Enforcement - improving compliance
  - Guidelines - sharing good compliance practice
  - Designing safe and healthy construction work
  - Improving safety and health performance through social partner commitment
5. How satisfied are you with the progress so far and which areas will need focusing on during 2005? What have been the complications, if any, with implementation and how have they/could they be overcome?
6. What did you think of the overall organisation of the Summit (timing of the event, programme, type of participants involved, etc)?
7. More generally, have you got any suggestions regarding Europe Week areas that could be improved (e.g. its programme/activities, promotion, national level activities, etc.)?

# *FOP Interview Checklist*

# I

## Note:

The European Agency for Safety and Health at work (OSHA) is undertaking an independent evaluation of Europe Week 2004. The purpose of the evaluation is to help identify ways of improving future events.

Your input to the research would be greatly appreciated. The following checklist highlights the key issues being examined with regard to the Focal Points. It will be used by the evaluators (Centre for Strategy & Evaluation Services – CSES) to carry out the interviews.

Please note that the identity of respondents will not be made known to the Agency. Thank you in advance for your cooperation. The results of the evaluation will be published by the Agency.

## **1. Introductions:**

1.1 CSES's role in the evaluation of Europe Week 2004 (EW2004)

1.2 FOP's role in organising the EW2004 activities

## **2. EW2004 general activities:**

2.1 How effective have the EW2004 activities been in raising the awareness of risks in construction and promoting best practice at the workplace level in your country?

2.2 Which of the activities that you organised do you consider as the most successful and why? Do you know of any cases where practices in the workplace changed as a result of EW2004 activities?

2.3 Have you got any suggestion on what activities should be incorporated in the future European Weeks?

## **3. EW2004 organisational aspects in your country**

3.1 How satisfied are you with your cooperation with your national social partners? What was their involvement and are you planning to modify it in the future?

3.2 Could you give us some examples of particularly successful activities which you organised with your social partners? How did you go about organising them?

3.3 Are there any ways in which the Europe Week can be better promoted in your country or by the Agency at the EU level?

3.4 Have you produced any materials in your country/used any existing ones? Which ones have been particularly successful and why? Which campaign materials produced by the Agency did you find particularly useful and which ones would you change?

## **4. Good Practice Award (GPA) scheme, Online Charter and the Closing Summit:**

# *FOP Interview Checklist*

# I

- 4.1 How does the response to the GPA in 2004 compare to the previous years?
- 4.2 How successful do you think GPA has been in promoting good practice in the workplaces and in increasing visibility of EW2004? Are there any organisational aspects of GPA that could be changed?
- 4.3 How useful do you find the Online Charter as a way to reach the workplaces and promote the Europe Week? Could anything be changed in terms of its promotion, wording, etc in order to increase the number of signatories?
- 4.4 How successful has the Closing Summit and the Bilbao Declaration been in promoting the EW2004 and health and safety in construction in your country?

## **5. EW2004 organisational aspects – you and the Agency:**

- 5.1 What have been the strong points in terms of coordination of EW activities by the Agency? Are there any aspects that could be improved (e.g. the overall timetable, timing and type of communication with you, trans-national exchange of experience, timing of the launch and the October Week, etc)?
- 5.2 The European Social Partners have been involved in the Europe Week for the first time in 2004. What has been the impact of their involvement in your country?
- 5.3 The Agency has requested you to report on the EW activities and it has provided you the reporting templates. Are there any ways in which the reporting process or templates can be improved?

## **6. FOP subsidies:**

- 6.1 How important was the FOP subsidy for organising EW2004 activities in your country? If the subsidy had not been granted, would the activities have happened anyway?
- 6.2 What do you think about the FOP subsidy process (application process, eligibility criteria, co-financing and sub-contracting criteria, reporting, etc)? What are the key aspects that need to be improved?
- 6.3 When preparing your application/reports, would you be able to get some help from a person dealing with the accounts in your company?

# *National Social Partners’ Interview Checklist*

## J

### Note:

The European Agency for Safety and Health at work (OSHA) is undertaking an independent evaluation of Europe Week 2004. The purpose of the evaluation is to help identify ways of improving future events.

Your input to the research would be greatly appreciated. The following checklist highlights the key issues being examined with regard to the National Social Partners. It will be used by the evaluators (Centre for Strategy & Evaluation Services – CSES) to carry out the interviews.

Please note that the identity of respondents will not be made known to the Agency. Thank you in advance for your cooperation. The results of the evaluation will be published by the Agency.

### **1. Introductions:**

- 1.1 CSES’s role in the evaluation of Europe Week 2004 (EW2004)
- 1.2 NSP’s role in organising the EW2004 activities

### **2. EW2004 general activities:**

- 2.1 What has been the involvement of your organisation in Europe Week 2004 activities?
- 2.2 How effective have the EW2004 activities been in raising the awareness of risks in construction and promoting best practice at the workplace level in your country? How compatible were they with the already existing activities on health and safety in construction in your country/within your organisation?
- 2.3 Which EW2004 activities do you consider as the most successful and why? Do you know of any cases where practices in the workplace changed as a result of EW2004 activities?
- 2.4 Which campaign materials did you find particularly useful? Would you change them in any way? Have you produced any materials /used any existing ones for the purposes of EW2004?
- 2.5 Have you got any suggestion on what activities should be incorporated in future European Weeks?

### **3. EW2004 Organisational Aspects**

- 3.1 How satisfied are you with your cooperation with your Focal Point (FOP)? Is there anything you would change in terms of your relationship and involvement (e.g. the type of activities you are involved in, communication with your FOP, etc)?

# *National Social Partners’ Interview Checklist*

## J

- 3.2 Could you give us some examples of particularly successful activities which you organised with your FOP? How did you go about organising them?
- 3.3 Has your organisation benefited in any way from participating in EW2004?
- 3.4 Have you co-financed any projects with your FOP? If the FOP had not provided the co-financing, would have you gone ahead with the activities anyway?
- 3.5 Are you aware of the involvement of the EU level Social Partners in EW2004? What kind of impact do you think has their involvement had on the EW2004?

#### **4. Good Practice Award (GPA) scheme, Online Charter, the Closing Summit**

- 4.1 How successful do you think GPA 2004 has been in promoting good practice in the workplaces and in increasing visibility of EW2004? Do you think that you could get involved more in GPA in the future?
- 4.2 How useful do you think Online Charter is as a way to reach the workplaces and promote the Europe Week? Could anything be changed in terms of its promotion, wording, etc in order to attract more signatories?
- 4.3 How successful do you think the Closing Summit and Bilbao Declaration have been in promoting the EW2004 and health and safety in construction in your country



# Overview of Previous Evaluations

## K

The European Week was evaluated three times in the past. The table below outlines the methodology which was used in the evaluations, the evaluations' structure and insights, and key findings. The evaluations were carried out for the European Weeks which were run in 2000, 2001 and 2002:

1. EW 2000, Theme: Musculo-skeletal Disorders, by Yellow Window Management Consultants, February 2001
2. EW 2001, Theme: Prevention of Accidents, by Yellow Window Management Consultants, July 2002
3. EW 2002, Theme: Working on Stress, by Economisti Associati, April 2003

	EW 2000	EW 2001	EW 2002
<b>Methodology:</b>	<p><b>Phase 1:</b> Information analysis  <b>Phase 2:</b> Develop evaluation system and tools  <b>Phase 3:</b> <i>Survey FOP</i> (seems that the survey was carried out over the phone or Face to face)  <b>Phase 4:</b> <i>Survey project organisers</i> (again F2F or phone).</p> <p><b>Tools:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Questionnaires for the interviews with project organisers</li> <li>▪ FOPs – no questionnaires. Analysed the reports submitted by the FOPs and then tailored interviews accordingly</li> </ul>	<p><b>Phase 1:</b> Briefing  <b>Phase 2:</b> Desk research and final methodology  <b>Phase 3:</b> <i>Survey of FOPs and organisers of activities.</i> 1 face to face interview with EW Group member and 14 telephone interviews, 16 phone interviews with sample of organisers.  <b>Phase 4:</b> <i>Survey of GPA winners</i> – to examine importance and impact of winning (5 phone/email interviews).</p> <p><b>Tools:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ EW Group – no questionnaires. Analysed the reports submitted by the FOPs and then tailored interviews accordingly.</li> <li>▪ Project organisers- questionnaire developed</li> <li>▪ GPA interviews – checklist</li> </ul>	<p><b>Phase 1:</b> Documentation review</p> <p><b>Phase 2:</b>  3 tools- In-depth <i>case studies</i> of 5 FOPs + 2 questionnaires for remaining FOPs and for <b>External partner organisations</b>  <i>Questionnaires:</i> translated in French in addition to English.</p>

# Overview of Previous Evaluations

# K

<p><b>Evaluation structure and insights:</b></p>	<p><u>Effectiveness:</u></p> <p>Impacts: European (coordination) + National level impacts. Varied picture regarding national level impacts.</p> <p>European Added Value: A limited number of states used to running such programmes and plans for them. Additionality – high.</p>	<p><u>Effectiveness:</u></p> <p>Impacts: As in 2000 + good national participation (built up loyalty); negative influences (lack of national funding, weak national networks); important that national budgets foresee EW activities + that national activities in line with EW theme are organised</p> <p>European Added Value : as in 2000. The largest cooperation was between Scandinavian countries and in France/Germany cross-border region. To make EW ‘more European’ through media coverage, political backing, more evaluation money, dissemination, MNCs involvement, Social partners involvement. Additionality is more limited because of the absence of project co-funding.</p>	<p><u>Relevance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ FOPs satisfied with the flexibility to choose the timing of the Week.</li> <li>▪ Choice of yearly theme – to find balance between stakeholder, FOP/government and media needs</li> <li>▪ The EW’s visibility as an EU scheme has a positive success of national EWs</li> <li>▪ The theme was perfectly suitable to wider EU policy agenda</li> </ul> <p><u>Overall effectiveness and impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 2 problematic groups – public at large and SMEs. OSH staff and specialists are reached most extensively</li> <li>▪ Exchange of good practice information at the EU level is one of the weakest areas</li> <li>▪ Overall media coverage is higher than in previous years</li> <li>▪ The national visibility within a context of an EU event adds credibility to FOP initiatives</li> <li>▪ Agency promotional materials – high quality</li> </ul>
--	---	---	--

# Overview of Previous Evaluations

# K

	<p><u>Efficiency of the organisation:</u>                  Organisation and coordination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Timeframe – adequate</li> <li>▪ Organisational model – decentralised via FOPs. EW Working Group (includes reps of each member state: FOPs or experts) lead to increased efficiency as issues are too diverse in each country</li> <li>▪ Communication – positive feedback</li> </ul> <p>The Call for proposals for Co-funded projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The response lower than expected (1<sup>st</sup> time run, lack of awareness, weak national promotion)</li> </ul> <p>Organisation and impact of National projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Varying degrees across countries – 3 levels of impact</li> </ul>	<p><u>Efficiency of the organisation:</u>                  Organisation and coordination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Similar timeframe as in 2000, but the theme announced earlier (in March Vs June in 2000)– an improvement</li> <li>▪ Organisational model – as in 2000 but better involvement of the national networks</li> <li>▪ The theme – divided opinions whether it should be kept broad</li> <li>▪ The national organisation of the week: dependent on members state commitment + better to keep the same organisers on EW Group</li> </ul>	<p><u>Operational effectiveness:</u>                  Main findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Positive feedback regarding OSHA</li> <li>▪ Cross-border co-operation continues to be weak</li> <li>▪ OSHA’s efforts regarding promotion of trans-national activities could be strengthened</li> <li>▪ There is right balance between centralised and national activities</li> <li>▪ The main issues regarding campaign materials: timing of delivery and translations</li> <li>▪ Fact Sheets are the most important element of promotional materials</li> <li>▪ Website – a useful tool for consultation and downloads</li> <li>▪ GPA – an area with a high potential for promotional impact. It has been steadily improving</li> <li>▪ GPA needs to be improved regarding: synergy with other EW aspects; visibility at MS level; transparency and political influence regarding EU level awards; unclear distinction regarding best practice and mere compliance with legal requirements</li> <li>▪ Complete satisfaction with the closing event.</li> </ul>
--	---	--	---

# Overview of Previous Evaluations

# K

	<p><u>Specific activities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ GPA (process – bad timing for calls and for selection of nominations, imprecise criteria, short timeframe to translate nominations for the Jury)</li> </ul>	<p><u>Specific activities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Promotional material use (Website, printed material – the fliers re GPA and EW promotion particularly useful; posters and postcards – not that useful; keyrings and pens useful)</li> <li>▪ Suggestions: more fact sheets, A2 posters, stickers, leaflets in national languages, examples of good practice, involve FOPs regarding materials content.</li> <li>▪ Some MSs produced extra materials.</li> <li>▪ Media coverage – better than in 2000 (improved even more in 2002)</li> <li>▪ GPA (process – weak promotion; the requirement to submit visual material frustrating; Agency put forward complicated eligible categories; too many political criteria such as satisfying legal requirements – not really innovative; more dissemination; more networking among the winners to act as ‘pioneers’); impact on winning organisations is high regarding their customers and staff</li> </ul>	<p><u>The Seed Financing Mechanism:</u></p> <p>Main findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 2002 financing model preferred to earlier ones. General satisfaction with present criteria for project eligibility</li> <li>▪ FOPs: admin requirements disproportionate to the funds provided. The quality of FOP deliverables requires a substantial improvement</li> <li>▪ Interpretation of eligible costs vary among MS= flexibility to allow all MS to get involved</li> <li>▪ No significant project multiplier effect and there is varying evidence regarding its additionality</li> <li>▪ Mainly co-financed from FOP budget</li> <li>▪ Low familiarity with fundraising for private sponsorship due to cultural differences</li> <li>▪ There are potentially untapped campaign partner financing possibilities</li> <li>▪ Not targeted to activities requiring a European dimension or to objectives that MSs could not reach on their own. Political relevance of seed financing – the fact that EC intervenes, makes EW campaigns possible</li> </ul>
--	---	--	---

# Overview of Previous Evaluations

## K

<p><b>Key findings/recommendations</b></p>	<p><b>1. Effectiveness:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Good – varies between countries</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Significant European Added Value</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ High level of additionality</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Efficiency</b></p> <p>Significantly improved re previous weeks:</p> <p>Improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ choice of 1 theme</li> <li>▪ using call for proposals</li> <li>▪ 3 partite approach</li> <li>▪ website use</li> <li>▪ quality and availability of promotional material</li> <li>▪ investments by MSs</li> <li>▪ higher visibility of initiative</li> <li>▪ GPA as an additional technique</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Specific activities re experience exchange</li> <li>▪ More European Added Value needed</li> <li>▪ Too short timeframe</li> <li>▪ conflict of interest in selecting proposals (same people selecting and running the projects)</li> <li>▪ dedicate part of the budget to dissemination</li> </ul> <p>translation issues + more efficiency in production of promotional materials</p>	<p><b>1. Effectiveness:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Good – varies between countries</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Significant European Added Value</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Additionality – important, but more limited than in 2000 since SME Funding Scheme was set up separately</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Efficiency</b></p> <p>Improvements since 2000:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 3-partite approach at the national level strengthened</li> <li>▪ Personal networking at the EU level of national organisers of EW increased</li> <li>▪ More attention to ‘exchange of experience’</li> <li>▪ Enhanced Website use</li> <li>▪ Higher visibility of EW</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To define specific activities regarding experience exchange</li> <li>▪ More European Added Value needed</li> <li>▪ Too short timeframe</li> <li>▪ More transparency in selecting GPA winners</li> <li>▪ Dedicate part of budget to dissemination</li> <li>▪ Translation issues + more efficiency in production of promotional materials</li> <li>▪ Systematic evaluation not embedded in the EW</li> <li>▪ Scope for more EU level activities to support the national level ones.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overall a success – 85% of campaign partners gave a positive assessment</li> <li>▪ Suitability to <b>beneficiaries interests and needs</b> – interest high/practical implementation hard: lack of recognised best practices. Campaign focus switched from promotion of good practice to stimulating public debates = differences in possible results</li> <li>▪ <b>EW model:</b> reasonably efficient and stable. Timing not an issue any more. Any radical reforms = major budgetary impact. A mini follow up campaign the following year would ensure sustainability</li> <li>▪ <b>The learning curve:</b> continued. 3partite consultations somewhat rigid – involve NGOs to improve organisation. Internet as an effective means of communication</li> <li>▪ <b>Major obstacles:</b> Decentralised approach a strength, but also obstacle to progress; 2 main issues: FOP organising skills and MSs resources re co-financing, are outside Agency control</li> </ul>
--	---	---	---

# Overview of Previous Evaluations

## K

	<p><b>4. Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Choice of 1 theme</li> <li>▪ Good quality material</li> <li>▪ Website use</li> <li>▪ Decentralised approach</li> <li>▪ Networking -3partite at EU level, similar at national level</li> <li>▪ GPA – increased impact of EW</li> </ul> <p><b>5. Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Limited sharing of experience btw the member states</li> <li>▪ Conflict of interest – co-funded projects only</li> <li>▪ Short timeframes and timing (proposals had to be prepared during holiday period)</li> </ul>	<p><b>4. Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Good quality material</li> <li>▪ The website use</li> <li>▪ Decentralised approach = efficiency</li> <li>▪ Networking: 3partite at EU level, similar at national level – improvement since 2000</li> <li>▪ GPA – increased impact of EW</li> </ul> <p><b>5. Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ EW less focused on SMEs (Funding Scheme ran for the first time, more attention given)</li> <li>▪ Limited sharing of experience btw the member states</li> <li>▪ Short timeframes</li> <li>▪ Limited number of trans-national activities – would have increased the profile. Reasons: short timeframe, finance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Campaign overall <b>management</b> – positive</li> <li>▪ <b>Language</b> – a problem area regarding Agency relations with FOPs</li> <li>▪ <b>Comms and Media:</b> the quality and scope increased due to learning effect + topic interesting to the media</li> <li>▪ <b>GPA</b> – underexploited potential – requires a wider recognition. Poorly advertised and communicated to MSs = limits multiplier effect</li> <li>▪ No synergy was envisaged for SME funding scheme= confusion</li> <li>▪ The impact of <b>Seed financing:</b> must be linked to additionality. Dependent on national circumstances + reimbursement of costs to FOP staff seems disproportionately high</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

# Overview of Previous Evaluations

# K

	<p><b>6. Recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ European Added Value as the key criteria for management decisions</li> <li>▪ Central evaluation at EU level</li> <li>▪ Integrate GPA better into EW – a late addition in 2000, suggested 2 year EW cycle, rather than 18 months</li> <li>▪ To change model: no co-funded projects (adopted for the 2001 EW), seed money to member states (adopted for 2002 EW), cut budget</li> <li>▪ Process – reduce bureaucracy regarding cost justification on part of project organisers</li> <li>▪ Improve quality of translations. Deliver material in electronic format, rather than printing</li> <li>▪ Clearer instructions for evaluators of co-funded projects/clearer criteria with weightings</li> <li>▪ Strengthen good practice sharing – most significant improvement. Lack of resources at Agency key reason – set a separate budget for that.</li> <li>▪ Strengthen dissemination – set a separate budget</li> </ul>	<p><b>6. Recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Model (Agency to define the theme and produce materials; decentralised campaign management; seed money to national level; GPA at the EU level; no funding for EU level projects (this model seems to have been applied in 2002)</li> <li>▪ SME funding scheme – manage it separately</li> <li>▪ <b>Other recommendations:</b> long-term EW group membership; increase long term value of GPA (criteria, distinction between innovative approaches and good practice, transparency); dissemination budget; evaluation culture to boost efficiency regarding management of individual projects</li> </ul>	<p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <p><b>1. General:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No good reason to radically change the model</li> <li>▪ Interlinked management of EW, GPA and SME funding scheme preferable</li> <li>▪ Higher rate of continuity in the choice of EW Group members</li> <li>▪ Ensure long term value of GPA – improve visibility</li> <li>▪ Improve dissemination of good practice – place Award ceremony during the event = low cost improvement</li> </ul> <p>Boost efficiency – foster evaluation culture in MS's</p> <p><b>2. European Added Value</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Greater investment into media attention, including EU level media</li> <li>▪ Ensure more national and political backing to get more funds/media coverage</li> <li>▪ Make more money available for evaluations at national level + compare them at EU level as good practice exchange</li> <li>▪ More trans-national cooperation = wider reach</li> <li>▪ Increase commitment of social partners</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

# Overview of Previous Evaluations

## K

			<p><b>3.Additional Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Anticipate the launch of the campaign earlier and increase number of parallel launches in MSs</li> <li>▪ Fine-tune promotion materials = creative gadgets. Use EU logo with EW activities</li> <li>▪ Increase visibility of GPA</li> <li>▪ Increase conditionality for seed financing regarding eligible activities and costs + modulate co-financing depending on activity type</li> <li>▪ A separate budget for trans-national activities</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--



# Suggested questions for the FOP report

L

We list below some suggestions on the questions that could be integrated into the reports that the FOPs submit in relation to the EW activities. These questions would help to further classify and quantify the activities carried out at the national in relation to the EW.

1. Europe Week 2004 General Data		
Please specify the number of activities which were implemented in your country under the umbrella of EW:		
Activity*	Number supported through FOP subsidy co-financing	Number funded purely through national resources***
Regional seminars/workshops/ training events		
National seminars/workshops/ training events		
Regional conferences/ exhibitions/ fairs		
National conferences/ exhibitions/ fairs		
Production of new/translation of existing campaign materials (written materials, audio-video production)		
Media coverage (TV)**		
Media coverage (Radio)**		
Media coverage (press and specialist magazines)**		
<p>* Currently the reports ask the FOPs to define a category to which the event they organised belongs, before describing the details of the event. We suggest that this is made even more specific by using above categorisation is also in this part of the report. The FOPs would specify via tick-boxes which category the event belongs to in order to avoid ambiguity. The option 'other' could also be incorporated to allow flexibility.</p> <p>** these figures refer to the number of iterations. E.g. if 1 advert/TV programme was produced, but it was aired 20 times, then the number which counts is 20.</p> <p>*** these figures refer to the activities that have been funded either purely from the FOP budget or from other government budget/institutions, by the social partners/other members of tri-partite network or bodies and private companies outside the tripartite network.</p>		
<p>How many <b>workplaces</b> do you estimate have been reached in your country, either directly or indirectly?</p> <p>Up to 500 <input type="checkbox"/> 500-2000 <input type="checkbox"/> 2000-5000 <input type="checkbox"/> 5000-8000 <input type="checkbox"/> 8000-10 000 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 000 -15 000 <input type="checkbox"/> Over 15 000 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Please estimate the proportion of SMEs among these workplaces: ..... %</p>		

# *Suggested questions for the FOP report*

L

<b>4.6 Organisation of the Europe Week</b>					
<b>How satisfied are you with the involvement of your social partners in the planning and implementation of EW2004 activities at the national level? Please tick appropriate boxes.</b>					
	Highly satisfied	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not very satisfied	Not satisfied at all
Involvement in planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Involvement in implementation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Involvement in general in comparison with previous EWs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please comment briefly if you can think of any ways in which the involvement can be increased: ..... .....					
<b>Please indicate by ticking appropriate boxes which organisations outside the official tripartite network have participated in organisation of EW activities/might be interested to participate in the future.</b>					
	Participated	Might be interested	Not interested	Don't know if interested	
Government institutions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OSH expert organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Expert organisations working with construction sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Business associations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statutory Accident Insurance Organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4.7 Have the EW activities been more/less extensively covered in the media than in the previous years?</b>					
Significantly more <input type="checkbox"/> More <input type="checkbox"/> The same <input type="checkbox"/> Less <input type="checkbox"/> Significantly less <input type="checkbox"/>					
<b>4.8 Please estimate how many visits have you had on your national EW website:</b> .....					
<b>6. Good Practice Awards Scheme</b>					
Have you organised a national GPA award? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>					
If yes, was it co-funded via the FOP subsidy? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>					

# *Suggested questions for the FOP report*

L

<p><b>6.6 How were the winning/shortlisted good practices at the national level/EU level disseminated to other workplaces?</b> Please tick all applicable options:</p> <p>Published a Good Practice leaflet <input type="checkbox"/>    Media coverage <input type="checkbox"/>    Organised Awards ceremony <input type="checkbox"/>    No promotion <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Published on the national EW2004 website <input type="checkbox"/>    Other <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>If you selected other, please tell us briefly what that is:                  .....</p>
<p><b>7. Other Events - Online Campaign Charter, Construction Summit and Bilbao Declaration</b></p>
<p><b>7.3 How was the Online Charter promoted in your country?</b> Please select as many options as applicable:</p> <p>National EW2004 website <input type="checkbox"/>    Partner websites <input type="checkbox"/>    Specialist press <input type="checkbox"/>    Campaign materials dissemination <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Press <input type="checkbox"/>    TV <input type="checkbox"/>    Radio <input type="checkbox"/>    Other methods <input type="checkbox"/></p>