



EVALUATION OF THE EUROPEAN WEEK 2001
Final Report

July 2002

Document approved by :
Alain Denis,
Managing Director



Written for :
The European Agency for
Safety and Health at Work,
Bilbao

yellowwindow management consultants
a division of eadc n.v.

minderbroedersstraat 14 2000 antwerp-belgium
phone: +32-3-2410024 fax: +32-3-2035303
mail@yellowwindow.com www.yellowwindow.com

Table of contents

	<u>Page</u>
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
2. INTRODUCTION.....	11
2.1 Objectives & scope	11
2.2 Methodological approach.....	13
2.3 Structure of the report	16
3. OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS	17
3.1 Objectives.....	17
3.2 Impacts	18
3.3 European Added Value (EAV)	24
4. EFFICIENCY OF THE ORGANISATION.....	27
4.1 European organisation and coordination.....	27
4.3 The national organisation of the Week	29
4.4 National activities.....	31
5. SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES.....	35
5.1 Use of promotional material.....	35
5.2 Media coverage	37
5.3 The Good Practice Awards Scheme.....	38
5.4 The SME Funding Scheme	41
6. EW 2001 vs. EW 2000 : A COMPARISON.....	43

ANNEXES

1. Checklist for interviews with organisers of activities
2. Checklist for interviews with Good Practice Award winners

1. Executive Summary

1. Introduction

The European Week 2001 was organised in October 2001 by the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work along the theme 'Prevention of Accidents'. It was the second time such a European Week was organised by the Agency. The previous Week took place in October 2000 on the theme of MSD (Musculo-Skeletal Disorders). Earlier Weeks were organised by the European Commission.

Compared to 2000, a different 'model' for the Week was used in 2001. The main difference lies in the fact that no projects were co-funded at the European level in the context of the European Week 2001.

Consequently, in 2001 the Week consisted of two levels of activities :

- tasks performed by the Agency : mainly the coordination and the development of information products and communication tools;
- a multitude of activities that were organised in the context of the Week at the national and/or local level.

The funds invested at the EU level for the EW 2001 have also been extremely limited.

Activities have de facto been spread over the whole year of 2001, with a concentration in October 2001.

In 2001, the SME Funding Scheme was organised for the first time. This Scheme focussed on the same theme as the EW2001 ('Prevention of Accidents').

The 'model' decided for by the Agency for the EW2002 is again different from the two previous Weeks. For the EW2002, 'seed money' is provided to the national levels (focal point / EW group member) for the organisation and stimulation of the Week in their respective countries. The SME Funding Scheme is also being organised in 2002, although not focussing on the same theme as the EW2002.

The method followed for the present evaluation has clear limitations:

- this is a European level evaluation, no assessment is made of what happened at the national level;
- we have started from secondary material: the national reports that were drafted by the FOPs and EW group members;
- this was complemented with a limited number of interviews (32) with EW group members, organisers of activities and winners of awards.

The reader has to take this into account when interpreting this report.

The reader should also take into account the decentralised character of the action. When the management of the action is described, this can cover the EU level, the national level or both.

2. Effectiveness

The overall effectiveness of the EW2001 is good, although the actual effectiveness can vary from poor to excellent, depending on the Member State.

Globally, the impacts of the Week correspond to the objectives :

Objective	Assessment	Compared to 2000
• Awareness raising on accident prevention	Good to high impact	Improved
• Promotion of activities to reduce the number and severity of work-related accidents	Good	Improved
• Focus on actions at the work place	Good	Stable
• Focus on SMEs	Limited	Mixed*

* mix of larger impact with lower focus (depending on country) - see below

One measurement of the impact of the EW2001 is the actual commitment of Member States to participate in the Week. Although the picture is far from uniform throughout the EU, the result is positive for a voluntary initiative and has improved in comparison to 2000.

As was also the case last year, this overall positive picture is however not a complete success. Some Member States have developed very little activities at the national level. As for the EW2000, the motivations for this were : non availability of national funds, non availability of management or staff resources, lack of cooperation with the social partners, etc.

Another aspect influencing to an important extent the impact of the Week is the learning effect being built up. Clearly, the fact of organising such European Week for the second time creates 'recognition' or 'image' effects, as well as benefits on the level of the partnerships and organisation aspects.

Although it is difficult to estimate the number of activities that have taken place in total, we estimate that it has again been thousands (as was also the case in 2000). The impact of activities that were organised varies significantly depending on the Member States as the actual number of activities that took place in a single Member State can vary from a couple to more than 70,000.

The effectiveness of the focus on SMEs has been difficult to estimate. The change of the model, with a separate SME Funding scheme, has concentrated the management attention of both the EU level and the national level for SME matters away from the Week. The objective of a "focus" on SMEs is probably less successful, as it was also in 2000.

Still, the impact on SMEs has been significant in most countries and in some, much higher in 2001 than in 2000.

For 2001, we group the countries into following categories :

1. Countries who used the EW2001 for a major EW2001 campaign with stimulation of various types of initiatives. These countries could make budgets available for the EW2001, and/or leveraged on national actions (planned or set up).
2. Countries where the (tripartite) networks and partnerships with other organisations provided for sufficient resources to set up a range of EW2001 initiatives.
3. Countries where activities were limited.

3. European Added Value

Significant European Added Value has been created.

In general, and as in 2000, the EU management level uses the concept of European Added Value implicitly e.g. in defining the objectives and theme, in the targeting, and in the development of material for the Week.

As was also the case in 2000, the European Added Value created is significant and has increased in comparison to 2000, e.g. through the increasing exchange of good practice that takes place compared to 2000 – not only at the workplace level, but to an important extent also at the level of those involved in the organisation of the Week itself.

Additionality :

The level of additionality created by the use of European public funds in the context of the EW2001 has been important, although more limited than in 2000.

Linked to the European Added Value concept, is the concept of additionality¹. Overall, we consider the level of additionality created by the use of the public funds is still high in the context of the EW2000 – although more limited than in 2000 because of the absence of project co-funding.

The same distinction must be made between Member States as for the EW2000 :

- a limited number of Member States are used to running such campaigns. They link the European Week to their normal action plan and devote resources to it. We can assume that campaigns would have taken place in any case in these countries, with a similar level of resources, but not necessarily on the same theme. In these countries there is little additionality, except for the European Added Value mentioned above (these countries are mainly from the first category as described earlier);
- the majority of Member States had not planned activities and had to decide to make an action plan and devote (or find) resources in the context of the Week. In these countries the level of additionality is high (these are mainly the countries from the second and third category as described earlier).

¹ When studying the ‘additionality’, the question is asked what would have happened if no European public funds would have been made available : would the activities have taken place, and in which form ?

4. Efficiency

There is a clear learning effect, increasing the efficiency of the organisation of the Week.

This learning effect is valid both at the EU and the national levels.

<i>Improvements identified in comparison to the EW 2000 :</i>	<i>The main areas for improvement for future Weeks are :</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the improved functioning at the national level of the tripartite approach embedded in the process; • the increased (inter-personal) networking at European level between those involved in the organisation of the Week at national level; • the increased attention for ‘exchange of experience’, including at organisational level; • the use of the web site : an enhanced use of the Internet as a medium for information, communication and exchange of ideas (forum); • a higher visibility of the initiative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the development of specific activities to increase the identification and systematic exchange of experience; • the creation of European Added Value; • the time frame which was generally experienced as too short; • the (transparency of the)selection of Good Practice Award winners • the dissemination of results (e.g. good practice examples identified), by dedicating part of the budget to this end; • some practical aspects, as there are : translation issues, potential cost savings and efficiency gains in production of the promotional material; • evaluation culture: the use of systematic evaluation to feedback the management process and seek continuous improvement is not sufficiently embedded in the Week.; • although we definitely recommend to keep a decentralised approach, there is scope for more EU-level activities and initiatives that would support the national level.

5. Strengths

It appears that the main strengths are :

1. The material produced :
This is generally considered of good quality and has been used in all Member States.
2. The web site :
Internet has again been used as a medium in the EW2001 initiative. This has meant a boost in the use of Internet for this type of issue. The unique characteristics of the medium have been used adequately.
3. Decentralised approach :
The freedom of each Member State to do its own programming boosts efficiency.
4. Networking :
Use of networking has been a critical factor of success. At the European level, the Agency has effectively mobilised its tripartite networking approach. At the national level, similar approaches were used. Countries with the highest impacts are probably also the countries where networking has been used more effectively as a leverage. We noticed improvements on this aspect in comparison to 2000, probably a result of the learning effect.
5. The Good Practice Awards :
This activity has increased the impact of the EW2001 and is confirmed as an efficient technique to boost the communication value of the organisation of the Week.

6. Weaknesses

The main weaknesses identified are :

1. Limited sharing of ideas, experience and good practice between the Member States :
Resources were not available to organise specific activities. Still, we have noticed a real improvement in comparison to 2000. The human networking is functioning and countries exchange spontaneously.
2. Timing problems
This opinion is expressed by most of the nominated persons. In general the timeframe was considered too short. Still, there is improvement on this aspect in comparison to 2000.
3. European Week / SME funding scheme synergies. The Week and the SME funding scheme are two distinct and different activities, which were run partly in parallel and often by the same people.
Synergies between both initiatives were mainly to be found on the operational and organisation aspects, both at the European and at the national levels. However, apart from these elements other synergies or enhanced impacts have not been identified through the evaluation.
4. The SME focus has been partially lost in the Week. The strongest component of attention to SMEs in 2000 came from the co-funded projects that guaranteed a minimum level of SME-oriented activities. In 2001, probably due to the SME focus of the separate funding scheme, the attention given to SMEs in the awareness raising campaign has clearly lost priority status.
5. Limited number of transnational activities
Only very few transnational activities took place in the context of the Week, although most nominated persons recognise such initiatives would enhance the European dimension of the Week. The timeframe of the Week, the fact that such initiatives are more complex and expensive than national activities, and the lack of (financial) stimuli to set up such activities were raised as the main reasons for absence of transnational activities.

7. Recommendations

The model

*Our main recommendation concerning the model to be chosen for the Week is **continuity**.*

Based on the experience of 2001, we confirm our recommendation made after the 2000 evaluation, for a model of the Week whereby:

- The role of the Agency is to define the theme and produce common communication tools
- The management of the campaign itself is decentralised at the national level
- The EU level provides seed money to the institution in charge of the management of the Week at the national level to ensure a minimum level of activities
- A good practice award scheme as an integral part of the Week at the EU level
- There is no funding for individual projects at the EU level.

This model is also the model that is being applied for 2002. The persons who are managing the Weeks at the national level have built a comparative experience on the basis of the experience in 2000, 2001 and partly 2002. Their opinion is clearly in favour of the 2002 model.

Synergy and coordination with the SME Funding Scheme

To clarify the relationship between the Week and the SME funding scheme, we consider there are two potential routes for the Agency:

1. Manage both actions as completely distinct

They are different types of instruments, which are pursuing also different goals, and have a different time cycle. We would therefore recommend to manage and communicate them as completely separate actions.

2. Manage both actions as interlinked

If the Agency would want to keep both actions interlinked, we would recommend to create the link through the choice of theme. The main implications would be that the programming of themes has to be done more long term and that the Good practice Awards Scheme is fed partly by the SME Funding Scheme projects.

Main steps in the process:

- Year -1 : the theme for year +1 is defined
- Year 0 : theme of the Week is different than the theme of the Good practice Award (= theme of year -1). The call for the SME Funding Scheme is for projects linked to the Week's theme of year +1
- Year +1 : submissions for the Good practice Awards Scheme in year +1 are welcome from the various activities that took place in year 0 in the context of the Week, as well as projects that were approved and co-funded through the SME Funding Scheme.

At the closing ceremony :

- The theme for year +3 is announced
- The campaign for year +2 is launched
- The call for the SME Funding scheme is launched (theme of year +3)
- The Week of year +1 is closed
- The Awards are given for projects and initiatives on the theme of year 0

Other recommendations

- To maximise the learning effect, it would be an advantage if there were a high rate of *continuity in the choice of persons who are acting as EW Group Member*. Some countries chose specialists on the theme of the Week as EW Group Member. The advantages of continuity and of networking among the EW Group Members are however bigger, than specialist knowledge.
- *Ensure the long term value of the Good Practice Award.*

Risks are starting to appear on the image of the Good Practice Awards Scheme. The technique used is efficient to boost the news value of the Week, get press attention, and act as multiplier for messages of the Week. In the longer term, this technique makes however only sense if the value of the Award is recognised by all concerned. We would therefore recommend to have a closer look at the critical factors in this respect :

 - the criteria used to choose the awards (really good practice and not merely application of the law, sensitivity of ‘political’ balance)
 - make a distinction between innovative approaches and good practice
 - maximise the transparency
- *Dedicate part of the budget of the Week to disseminate good practice identified:* the potential added value of systematic dissemination of the good practice identified through the award scheme is significant. At the moment, the dissemination is ‘event’ or news related and concentrates on the award winners. The potential is however bigger and includes all nominations.
- *Boost efficiency by creating an evaluation culture.*

One of the reasons why some countries have a much better impact than others is undoubtedly the management systems used. Management of a campaign is a cycle starting with realistic planning and ending with evaluation to feed back results in the decision-making process.

Our recommendation is to use good practice and try to convince all countries to apply similar systems. At the moment, the budgets or resources at EU and national levels, devoted to evaluation, are extremely small. The management cultures and attitudes towards the need for evaluations are also very diverse.

The Agency has leverages to create an evaluation culture:

 - propose similar tools so that results can be compared
 - link the seed money to the realisation of an evaluation

The good practice we propose to use is the one applied in the UK, and already (partially) applied in a few other countries:

 - have a questionnaire inside each info-pack that is at the same time a submission form for the Award Scheme;
 - analyse the returned questionnaires as a first level of measurement that is easy to do and a small investment;
 - collecting additional information can be done through a sample of telephone interviews with non respondents. This implies that the distribution of info packs is centralised and that a data-base of contacts is set up.
- When evaluating the EW2002, it will be very important to verify the effective leverage created by the seed money allocated by the Agency to the national level. The additionality, although difficult to measure, will need to be estimated. Also the transmitting of money by the national level to the other tripartite partners will be an important aspect to be verified. After the EW2002 evaluation, good practice identified in the use of the funds can subsequently be translated into conditions for approval of budgets or additional incentives for the allocation of funds.

2. Introduction

2.1 Objectives & scope

The present report is the result of an external evaluation of the organisation and operation of the European Week 2001. The main questions that are being answered are :

- How objectives for the European Week 2000 have been fulfilled and, if not fully, to what extent they are fulfilled;
- How the resources to achieve this have been used (taking into account there has been no project co-funding by the Agency in 2001);
- How the results and impacts achieved compare with the EW 2000.

It was agreed upon with the Agency that the evaluation and the final, written report would particularly consider the following points in comparison to the evaluation carried out on the EW 2000 and in light of the fact that no project funding was available in 2001:

1. Overall effectiveness and general issues

- ◆ The effectiveness of the Week in promoting good practice regarding the prevention of accidents at the workplace;
- ◆ The added value of organising a European Week – is it more than the sum of its individual parts?
- ◆ The value of focusing the Week on a specific theme (changed on an annual basis);
- ◆ The promotion of the Week's activities at workplace level (including SMEs);
- ◆ Comparison in effectiveness between models used for the Week.

2. European organisation

- ◆ The Agency's role as co-ordinator of the Week, including the activities of the EW Group, closing event and conference;
- ◆ The communication tools made available at the European level;
- ◆ The information tools made available at the European level;
- ◆ The synergies with the award scheme (and Good Practice award ceremony);
- ◆ The synergies with the SME Funding Scheme.

3. National activities

- ◆ Organisation of the Week at national level (models used, their advantages and disadvantages);
- ◆ The engagement of social partners (trade unions, trade associations, etc.) in the Week and how this is encouraged;
- ◆ Profiles of organisations involved in the Week's activities at the national level;
- ◆ Types of activities organised;
- ◆ Target audiences;
- ◆ Participants in events – number and types;
- ◆ Numbers people/companies contacted/informed
- ◆ Publicity – media coverage;
- ◆ Organisers' perception of the success or otherwise of their activities;
- ◆ Organisers' confidence in the Week – will they take part again in future years ?
- ◆ Methods used to measure the impact of the Week at national level.

4. The future of the week

- ◆ Organisers' views as to how the effectiveness of the Week might be improved in the future (objectives, organisation, and performance);
- ◆ The opinions on the advantages and disadvantages of the three different models used in 2000, 2001 and 2002.
- ◆ Recommendations for future Weeks.

2.2 Methodological approach

The main activities have been :

1. A briefing meeting at the Agency about the European Week 2001 and the objectives of the evaluation
2. A preliminary documentary evaluation of the activities/projects
3. Survey among the Focal Points and activity organisers
4. Survey among Good Practice Award winners
5. Analysis and reporting

These different phases are described in detail below.

Phase 1 : Briefing

Purpose of this phase has been to :

- Collect the information needed to get an overall view of all activities linked to the EW2001
- Collect information likely to be needed in the subsequent phases of the evaluation, e.g. the national reports.

Activities in this phase consisted of :

- A meeting at the Agency.

Phase 2 : Preliminary documentary evaluation of the activities/projects

Purpose of this phase has been to :

- Exploit the information available in the national reports ;
- Exploit the information available in the national evaluation reports.

Activities in this phase consisted of

- ◆ Analysing the reports received at the Agency from the focal points or coordinators at national level ;
- ◆ Identifying activities for inclusion in the field phase ;
- ◆ Developing the tools to be used in the field phase. These questionnaires / checklists have been different for the different target groups (focal points / EW group members, activity organisers and Good practice Award winners), and covered all aspects of the objectives, as mentioned above.

Phase 3 : Survey among Focal points and organisers of specific activities

Purpose of this phase has been to :

- Complement the information available through the national reports by interviews with the focal points or European Week group members in all Member States, and with organisers of activities (one in each Member State).

It has been agreed with the Agency that at national level, the authors of the national reports would be targeted for an interview. In all cases, it has turned out that interviews were with the European Week group member. These interviews focussed on 'gaps' identified in the information gathered from their national report, and on country specific elements (e.g. models

used in the countries). All interviews – although all based on the same checklist – were tailored to the different situations in the different countries.

We are aware that, due to the budgetary restrictions, the sample size of organisers (only one per country was targeted) is very limited. Still, we are confident that from the analysis of national reports and the interviews with the European Week group members in each Member State, we do have a vision on what the Week has actually consisted of in each of the countries. Further, the interviews with activity organisers have provided us with concrete data about specific activities (type of actions, target groups, geographical reach, scope, etc.).

Activities in this phase consisted of :

- 1 face-to-face in-depth interview with the European Week group member in Belgium;
- 14 telephone interviews with European Week group members;
- 16 telephone / e-mail interviews with a sample of organisers of activities;
- analysis of the UK national evaluation reports over the EW2000 and the EW2001 (only documents received about a national evaluation) ;
- collecting and analysing additional documents about the national organisation, programme of activities, etc. when available.

Phase 4 : Survey among Good Practice Award winners

Purpose of this phase has been to :

- explore the importance and impact of winning a Good Practice Award for the organisations concerned

Activities in this phase consisted of :

- 5 telephone / e-mail interviews with Award Winners of different countries

This target group appeared surprisingly more difficult to reach. We contacted 12 award winners for 6 interviews to be realised. The others did not react, could not be reached (on mission, on holiday), or could not make time available within the timeframe of the evaluation study.

This activity was added to the evaluation study at the request of the Agency, but was originally not foreseen in our proposal.

Phase 5 : Reporting and presentation

During this final phase we have consolidated all information collected to answer the evaluation objectives.

The tools

We did not develop a 'standard' questionnaire for the interviews with the European Week Group Members. We proceeded – like for the evaluation study on the EW2000 – by analysing their individual reports in preparation of each single interview with a EW Group Member and made checklists of points to be covered per respondent. By doing so, we optimised the level of information to be obtained through the interview, and could complement the information provided in the report with subjects that required further attention.

The national reports were all available when we started our assignment. All had been written using the same structure. This common structure has been a significant advantage for our work.

The learning effect compared to 2000 is also significant. The use of English as a reporting language and the quality of the English have also both improved.

We developed a questionnaire for the interviews with organisers of activities. A draft version of this questionnaire was discussed at the briefing meeting in Bilbao, and subsequently finalised. A copy is attached in annex 1. to this report.

Telephone interviews with winners of the Good Practice Award were based on a checklist, of which a copy is added in annex 2 to this report.

Timing

The timing of the present evaluation exercise has been different than last year. Indeed, as opposed to last year, the evaluation has this time taken place clearly after termination of all EW 2001 activities. While the briefing meeting in Bilbao for the evaluation took place on 15 April 2002, actual fieldwork started on 6 May and was finalised by mid June 2002.

A consequence of this timing difference has been that respondents who are at national level responsible for the organisation of the Week are in the meantime in the middle of the organisation of the EW2002.

This has had as disadvantage that the experience of the EW2001 was not so 'fresh' anymore and that it has sometimes been rather difficult to ask for comparisons with the EW2000 experiences. The advantage, on the other hand, has been that respondents already could express their opinion on the EW2002 model as well – as the comparison of the EW2001 was more easily made with the EW2002.

A clear limitation of the present evaluation study has been the (very) restricted budget available, making it impossible to measure the impacts created by the EW2001 to their full extent.

Another limitation of the present evaluation is that it concentrates on the European level. The method used and the size of the project does not allow to make national evaluations. The information that was collected at the national level is of course significant, including the national reports produced under the responsibility of the network of national Focal Points (FOPs). We have used this information as a raw material in order to understand the overall impact, efficiency and effectiveness of the EW2001.

2.3 Structure of the report

The first part of this report contains the Executive Summary of the study. This text describes the main results of the European Week 2001, the positive aspects of the Week, the areas for possible improvement and the options to be considered for future Weeks.

Part Two is the Introduction, presenting the objectives and scope of the study as well as the methodology followed for the evaluation exercise.

Part Three focuses on the overall effectiveness of the EW2001, reviewing the realisation of the Week's objectives, the impacts of the Week and the European Added Value created.

The efficiency of the organisation is described in Part Four of this report. The different sections of this Part subsequently look at the European organisation and coordination, the national 'models' used for the Week, and the national activities.

In Part Five, specific activities are analysed being : the promotional material produced by the Agency, the media coverage obtained for the EW2001, the Good Practice Awards Scheme, and the SME Funding Scheme organised by the Agency.

Part Six presents a comparison between the EW2000 and the EW2001, comparing the different models used and the results obtained through these different actions.

3. Overall effectiveness

3.1 Objectives

The logical starting point to evaluate the effectiveness of the EW2001 are the objectives of the Week as formulated ex ante.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the European Week 2001, we have based ourselves on the following objectives :

1. The highest level covers the objectives as they were formulated to justify the organisation of European Weeks in general.
2. The 'overall objective' of the EW 2001 is drawn from the above-mentioned leaflet.
3. The 'additional objectives' for the EW 2001 are our synthesis of the elements found back in the leaflet, and the elements put forward by the Agency for our evaluation.

Objectives pursued through the organisation of European Weeks

- To continue the efforts made by all parties concerned to reduce risks and improve the quality of life at work by making workers, employers and social partners more aware of the hazards at the workplace and of prevention measures
- To promote safety and health activities related to specific risks at European and national level
- To encourage the development and exchange of information about good safety and health practices
- To inform European citizens of the importance of health and safety at work and of the activities relating to health and safety at European level

Objectives of EW 2001

The 'overall objective' of the EW 2001 has been defined as follows by the Agency :

'To make Europe a safe and healthy place to work by promoting activities to reduce the number and severity of work-related accidents.'

Additional, related objectives are :

- Promote information and projects at work place level to prevent work-related accidents;
- Relevance to the specific needs of SMEs;
- Contribute to cutting the human and economic toll of accidents in Europe.

3.2 *Impacts*

3.2.1 *Different dimensions*

The impacts of an awareness raising campaign normally have to be estimated on the basis of a measurement of the awareness at the target group level before and after the campaign. Impacts on awareness also take time to build up.

Due to the nature of the EW2001, the size of the target market and the budgets available, no measurement was done *ex ante* and none is foreseen *ex post*. This is why we concentrate in this section on qualitative aspects or indications of what the longer term quantitative impacts could be.

Another important aspect for this assessment is the relevance of the theme. Indeed, as the theme chosen for the EW 2001 is widely applicable and has a (very) high level of relevance for all countries involved in the Week, overall awareness for the subject was already quite high before the Week. Therefore, it seemed that the Week rather served the purpose of ‘emphasising’ the importance of accident prevention. Consequently, the impact created is likely to be lower than could have been the case when a fairly ‘new’ or more focussed theme were chosen.

The EW2001 can be split into two levels in terms of impacts ² :

1. the European level : producing common tools for the campaign, including information material; organising and coordinating activities;
2. The national level : this is described more in detail in the next chapter, but the reality is that activities range from “very limited” to more than 70.000 depending on the country.

The second level is the most significant in terms of impact. The first level is meant to trigger and support activities at the national level. In practice however, the Agency, as the coordinator and initiator does not control any of the national activities. Member States have, strictly speaking, no obligation to invest in the EW.

3.2.2 *Take-up effect at national level*

A first measurement of the impact of the EW2001 is the actual commitment of Member States to participate in the Week.

As was also the case for the EW 2000, the picture varies significantly throughout the EU. Still, the result remains quite impressive – particularly taking into account the absence of funding.

We believe there are several factors explaining this situation :

- The success of the previous experience in the EW 2000, which has clearly worked as a stimulus, both at national and at activity level. ‘Loyalty’ is being built up, people want to participate again. This allows to maintain a certain stability in people involved, while new participants can be ‘recruited’;

² Three levels of impacts were identified for the EW 2000. The level of the co-funded projects does not apply for the EW 2001 as there was no co-funding of activities by the Agency in 2001.

- The networking approach and the improved networking effect over time among the members of those networks : involvement of Member States through the FOP network and the EW2000 group members in the decision-making;
- The positive image and efficiency of the Agency, which are motivating for the national level.

While in last year evaluation of the EW 2000 it was stated that the challenge for the Agency will be to keep the credit it had because of its youth, the motivation and enthusiasm of its staff, etc.; it now seems that the Agency is succeeding in doing so.

As was also the case last year, this overall positive picture is however not a complete success. Some Member States have developed very little activities at the national level. Like for the EW2000, the motivations mentioned for this were : non availability of national funds, non availability of management or staff resources, lack of cooperation with the social partners (which was a point not raised last year), etc.

For a few of the respondents who are responsible for the organisation of the Week at national level (European Week Group Members), the experience of the EW 2000 has been slightly demotivating : the fact of not being fully 'supported' at national level (through national funds), disappointment in the functioning of the national networks, commitments by social partners to organise activities not being fulfilled, etc. These factors have exceptionally had a negative influence on the efforts being undertaken and the time being devoted to the EW 2001 by the persons involved.

Overall, our analysis points out that impacts have been largest in countries where :

- national budgets were foreseen for the Week that have in fact served as seed money to trigger more initiatives at local level;
- national campaigns or programmes focusing on the same theme as the European Week were organised. Some of these campaigns were foreseen (e.g. in Denmark), others were 'inspired' by the Week (e.g. the National Accident Prevention Programme, set up in Finland, and meant to run till 2005).

In those countries where no national budgets were available, activities were mainly initiated out of 'goodwill' and because of the 'obligation' created through the existing networks at national level.

The Belgian case has been an exception this year because, although no national budget was foreseen for the European Week, a part of the budget foreseen for the Belgian Presidency of the European Union could be used. This money was used for the organisation of a Belgian Good Practice Award competition and a national event (combined with a national award ceremony) taking place at the European Parliament the day before the official closing event of the European Week.

3.2.3 Direct impacts of activities

The **overall objective** of the EW2001 was formulated as :

'To make Europe a safe and healthy place to work by promoting activities to reduce the number and severity of work-related accidents.'

When looking at the foreseen impacts, most activities generated in the context of the Week are linked to this overall objective.

Advertising campaigns with a wide target audience were organised in 5 Member States at the initiative of the national organisation in charge of OSH. These campaigns have only an awareness raising effect and have to be seen as support tools for other activities. Still, they have a significant impact because of their visibility. Their cost to the national budgets is also significant. Examples include :

FIN	Advertising campaign to promote the Good Practice Award Scheme in 3 regional daily newspapers
IRL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advertising campaign in regional and national press ▪ Sponsoring of an Irish TV programme
UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advertising in the national health and safety press, and construction titles ▪ Publication of a European Week supplement in a magazine (35,000 copies)
IT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advertising campaign on phone cards ▪ Advertising campaign in national newspapers
PT	4 television spots broadcast on national television (28 broadcasts)

Next to this (paid) press coverage, nearly all countries undertook significant efforts to obtain *coverage in media* through the dissemination of press releases, the organisation of press conferences, and by stimulating activity organisers to do the same. Although success rates vary, these efforts have overall resulted in a very considerable number of articles published in several printed media, as well as in radio and TV coverage.

The success rate with these public relations activities towards the media varies very significantly. We believe there are two potential routes for improvement in this respect:

- Learning from good practice: some of the countries can learn from others how they managed to build privileged relationships or which techniques increase the 'news' value and therefore the attention from journalists.
- More action at the EU level: some countries claim that it is easier for the EU level to catch the attention of journalists. More initiatives from the Agency level might therefore make sense, like joint press conferences with the national level.

Other types of *publications* include :

- the production of websites dedicated to the European Week and its theme (done in a majority of countries),
- the production of a book with good practice examples (in Finland and in Sweden);
- the publication of brochures, targeting specific sectors in Italy;
- the initiative to reprint existing successful publications about the prevention of accidents in Greece.

As was also the case last year, activities that were organised in all Member States are various types of *events, seminars and workshops*. Nearly all Member States have used this type of activity. Most of these events were targeting staff or management in charge of OSH in private and/or public sector organisations, but events or seminars were also organised that were targeting employees only, a combination of employees and employers, whether in one company, one sector, one region.

While we estimated that between 150 and 200 such events were organised in the context of the European Week 2000, it is now more difficult to estimate this number as 'supervision' or 'control' by the national level on what was organised was lower because of the absence of project co-funding. Still, on the basis of the available information we estimate that the total number of such events has been even higher in the EW 2001. Again, all target groups were reached through these seminars :

- employees
- employers, and particularly the persons in charge of OSH within larger companies

- trade unions
- associations of employers
- professionals in OSH

While in the EW2000, an important number of projects focused on *training*, this has apparently been less the case in the EW2001. The trainings that took place targeted the workplace level, professionals in OSH as well as students being trained for specific professions with a high risk factor.

Prevention and information at the work place, other than by training, also took place. This was mainly through the Labour Union representatives, those responsible for Health & Safety at the workplace, and also (more than last year) by the labour inspectors who were first informed and briefed themselves about the issue of accident prevention.

The additional objectives

As mentioned above, additional objectives were put forward on top of the general objective of “awareness raising”.

Promote information and projects at work place level to prevent work-related accidents

A very high proportion of activities generated through the Week did take place at the work place level and are directly related to prevention. We did not measure this proportion as this is not a realistic task, and as many activities not taking place at the work place level, ultimately have an impact at that level as well. It is however certain that this objective has been adequately met through the activities generated.

Contribute to cutting the human and economic toll of accidents in Europe.

Measuring the impact of the EW 2001 on this objective requires a quantitative analysis both before and after the action. Such figures are not readily available, and it has not been possible to gather them within the scope of this evaluation. Further, it would be very difficult to distinguish the effects caused by the EW2001 from other factors influencing these figures. We consider, however, that the impact created is positive as the better people are informed and aware of the risks, the lower the number of actual accidents will be and hence the costs of accidents.

The third additional objective is the relevance to specific needs of SMEs. The SME dimension is covered in a separate section 3.2.5 below.

3.2.4 Other impacts

An important objective which was clearly set for the EW 2000, but not explicitly for the EW 2001 has been the following :

Promote the exchange of information on good safety and health practice on prevention of (for this year) work-related accidents.

Also on this objective, there has been a real – although limited – impact. Our conclusions in this respect are similar as they were for the EW 2000.

One of the activities of the Agency for the EW2001 has been to produce information material. As described below in another chapter, this material has met expectations :

- it is of the highest professional quality for the purpose meant

- it covered the needs for different types of actions and target groups
- it corresponds to the state of the art on the subject at the EU level

Other activities linked to this objective have as a matter of fact been limited. They have included :

- the organisation of the good practice awards, at European but also at national level in a number of countries : this has clearly created added value corresponding to this objective. The good practice award scheme and its impact are described in chapter 5;
- the meetings of the EW2001 group : these meetings have been a forum for personal networking and exchange of information. The limit has been the number of meetings (3 in total), the fact that these meetings were ‘combined meetings’ to discuss the SME Funding Scheme and the EW (while in practice most of the time was devoted to the SME Funding Scheme) and the time available for exchanges. Still, the impact in this respect is increasing as people get to learn each other better (if they are the same for the consecutive European Weeks);
- the web site, where information is made available on both the activities taking place at national level and on the Good Practice Awards;
- spontaneous exchanges between EW2001 group members (personal networking).

As was the case for the EW2000, the EW2001 has also had various other impacts that are more indirectly related to the objectives pursued. We are describing briefly below the most significant of these impacts, which are mainly qualitative.

Image effect at national level In some Member States, the activities have significantly improved the image of public sector organisations involved with OSH.

Image effect for the Agency The European Week is clearly an initiative strengthening the overall image of the Agency, both in terms of promotion of its existence and its activities. This should further help the Agency in being more effective for its other activities.

Promotion of prevention • A large number of inspectors, normally involved in the application of legislation, have been actively involved in prevention measures in the context of the week.
 • Some Member States where prevention measures are still underdeveloped, have moved into this direction.

Boost in the use of Internet The web and the Internet have again been important media used at both the European and the national levels. The enhanced (efficiency of) the use of this medium have boosted its impact in more than one respect : reach of the audience, facilitation of exchange of experiences, dissemination of information and ‘good practice’, etc.

Identification of good practice Particularly through the Good Practice Awards, examples were presented that can be taken over by others in other countries. As mentioned above, more can be done to actually identify this good practice and disseminate it. Still, compared to the EW 2000, this impact has been smaller because of the absence of project co-funding (which triggered more innovative ideas).

Structural changes at workplace level Individual companies have been able to identify better their needs and to improve their own action plans in terms of accident prevention.

Functioning of local networks and tripartite cooperation

Several respondents confirmed the strengthening of local networks and tripartite cooperation, triggered by the repeated co-operation in the consecutive European Weeks.

3.2.5 Impact on SMEs

SMEs are traditionally a more difficult target group to reach for prevention measures, than public sector organisations and large companies. While in the context of the EW2000 a commitment was made to focus on SMEs, the approach for the EW 2001 has been different. Indeed, a separate initiative for SMEs was set up in 2001, ‘the SME Funding Scheme’ targeting exclusively this target group³, while the EW 2001 remained a broadly targeted action.

As was the case with the EW 2000, due to the nature of the EW2001 and the variety of means used to reach the different target groups, it is extremely difficult to actually control and measure the real impact on SMEs compared to other types of organisations.

Our main conclusions in this respect are :

- The change of the model, with a separate SME Funding scheme, has concentrated the management attention of both the EU level and the national level for SME matters away from the Week. The objective of a “focus” on SMEs is probably less successful, as it was also in 2000. Still, the impact on SMEs has been significant in most countries and in some, much higher in 2001 than in 2000.
- Although the Week was not primarily focused on SMEs, there is no doubt, however, that SMEs were an important target and were reached.
- Large enterprises can be a good leverage to access SMEs : they have the capacity to manage and integrate project results, which is often more a problem with SMEs, and can also act as transfer agents with their SME suppliers, or in the context of good neighbour schemes (like in the UK and in Ireland).

³ Please refer to section 5.4 for a more detailed analysis of the synergies between both initiatives.

3.3 European Added Value (EAV)

European Added Value is a concept derived from the subsidiarity principle that could be defined as the added value that could not be generated at national or regional level. In more practical terms, EAV relates to objectives to be pursued at European level and involves the development of critical mass, the contribution to the implementation of Community policies and to addressing European problems.

Our conclusions regarding the creation of European Added Value remain the same as for the EW 2000 : even if a significant European Added Value has been created through the EW2001, there is scope for improvement in this respect.

The main elements identified in terms of EAV creation, are :

At the EU level

1. The creation of an overview of the ‘state of the art’ at European level on the theme. This allows to compare and to generate new ideas for action at both the national and the European level. This also corresponds to the mission of the Agency.
2. The role of the Agency as ‘portal’, information made available on the subject of OSH at the workplace.
3. The positive image of the Agency has a positive influence on projects : projects that are run in the context of the EW have a higher credibility than projects supported by institutions at national level.
4. The production of artwork and contents centrally for a highly decentralised EW2001 initiative. This has created cost savings.
5. The boost in awareness and image of the Agency. This increases the EAV the Agency is creating by its normal activities.
6. The choice of one theme, which allows for Member States to pick up ideas / material from other Member States on the same subject.
7. A contribution to promote high OSH standards in all Member States based on common and consistent levels of regulation, enforcement and prevention.

At the national level

8. For Member States where actions related to prevention were still underdeveloped : a transfer of know-how
9. In some Member States, a boost for the image of the OSH related agency
10. Participation of foreign speakers in events

At the project level

11. Higher credibility thanks to the label of the EW2001
12. Transnational projects : sharing of resources, higher impact (e.g. Scandinavian countries)

For the public at large

13. Contribution to the European idea and integration by bringing people nearer to Europe.

International cooperation and transfer of know-how between Member States has not been a criterion in the management of the EW2001. As a consequence, at the activity level there are only a few examples of international cooperations. This is mainly between neighbouring

countries. The largest activity in this respect has been the cooperation between the OSH administrations in the different Scandinavian countries, who organised a common “Nordic Fork-Lift Action Day”.

Other examples were found in the cross-border region of France / Germany (Strasbourg) where two events took place allowing exchanges between these Member States.

One reason given for the absence of such activities has been the lack of time to prepare activities. Setting up transnational projects would be more complicated and time-consuming and is thus avoided from the start.

At the European coordination and management level, efforts specifically aiming at the promotion of exchanges between the Member States have been very limited. The web site has been used in this respect, as well as the 3 meetings of the EW2001 group. Still, such exchanges do happen and are increasing as also recognised by the EW Group Members.

The potential is however much higher and initiatives could be taken by both the Agency, as the coordinator, but also by Member States.

At the national organisation level, examples of international co-operation and exchange mainly concerned the (revision of the) translations of the promotional material produced by the Agency. E.g. Austria and Germany worked together on the German language, Belgium and The Netherlands on the Dutch version of the documents.

Probing for possibilities to further enhance the European Added Value, respondents at national level were asked how the European Week can be made ‘more European’. Suggestions included :

- a reinforcement of the efforts at European level to obtain media attention : e.g. investing in media campaigns promoting the Week by purchasing space in printed media; issuing more press releases in all languages; investing in a TV spot; organising joint press conferences (national level together with the Agency); organising a press conference combined with video conference with all EU countries; etc. ... (these suggestions were made by respondents responsible for the Week at national level in 2 Member States);
- ensure more political backing (both at European and at national level) : resulting not only in the easier availability of funds, but also in increased media attention if ‘well known’ politicians are willing to come up for the Week;
- to make more money available for evaluations at national level, to be compared at European level in order to enhance the exchange of good practice;
- to invest more resources into dissemination efforts;
- to involve more multi-national enterprises in the Week, in order to ensure a wider reach of the efforts undertaken – in exchange for some form of recognition for these companies (e.g. a ‘label’ or award);
- to commit the social partners more intensively in the same way to have them act as leverage on their members – requiring probably funding of their efforts;

Additionality

Linked to the European Added Value concept, is the concept of additionality. When studying the ‘additionality’, the question is asked what would have happened if no European public funds would have been made available : would the activities have taken place, and in which form ?

Measuring additionality is always difficult, because it is trying to know what would have happened in another situation. In practice, the best way is to ask to the persons involved, knowing that the answers are potentially biased.

Overall, we consider the level of additionality created by the use of the public funds is still high in the context of the EW2001 – although more limited than in 2000 because of the absence of project co-funding.

The same distinction must be made between Member States as for the EW2000 :

- a limited number of Member States are used to running such campaigns. They link the European Week to their normal action plan and devote resources to it. We can assume that campaigns would have taken place in any case in these countries, with a similar level of resources, but not necessarily on the same theme. In these countries there is little additionality, except for the EAV mentioned above (these countries are mainly from the first category as described earlier);
- the majority of Member States had not planned activities and had to decide to make an action plan and devote (or find) resources in the context of the Week. In these countries the level of additionality is high (these are mainly the countries from the second and third category as described earlier).

4. Efficiency of the organisation

4.1 European organisation and coordination

Time frame

The time frame for the week has been as follows :

Choice of theme	March 2000
GP examples selected nationally and forwarded to the Agency	By 1 July 2001 (By 15 August 2001 for GP example documents in English)
Jury selects winners	By 20-21 September 2001
Week	October 2001
Closing event and Award Ceremony	22-23 November 2001

The time frame for the organisation of the EW2001 was globally not much different than in 2000.

The important differences have been :

- the earlier announcement of the theme chosen for the Week (in March, whereas the theme for the EW2000 was announced in June) – an improvement clearly appreciated by those involved;
- the improvement of the planning of ‘milestones’ related to the Good Practice Awards Scheme (avoidance of the Summer holiday period);
- as well as the absence of the dates related with the co-funding of projects by the Agency.

Organisational model

The Agency has chosen for a decentralised model for the organisation of the European Weeks, with a strong involvement of the FOP network and a concentration of decision-making at the national level. This has been the case both in 2000 and in 2001.

The Agency has set up a European Week Group with representatives from each Member State, who were appointed by the Focal Points. As a result of this approach, a variety of different profiles and skills were represented in the EW Group : some Focal Points acted themselves as EW Group member, other appointed another person (often an OSH expert : medical doctor or physiotherapist) as EW Group member.

The purpose of the Agency was for the EW Group members to support the FOPs in the stimulation of their respective national networks and in promoting activities at the national level. This has been the case for the majority of Member States although in effect, some EW2001 group members also played a role in the management of the EW at national level and others acted more as a support function to the FOP.

A number of EW group members were the same for the EW2001 as for the EW2000. In other countries, however, another person was appointed EW Group Member in 2001 than it had been in 2000. In such case, this was motivated in most cases by expertise in the area of OSH chosen as theme for the Week.

We believe this model of working with a European Week Group has confirmed to be one of the reasons of the success of the European Week, as it leads to more efficiency.

Further, at national level, the Focal Points were asked to involve their national network for certain tasks : e.g. promotion of the Week, stimulation of activities at the local level, promotion of the Good Practice Awards Scheme. The actual involvement of the national networks in the different countries has varied across the countries, although overall it has been better than in 2000. This is again a positive impact of the experience being built up over time through repeated organisation of a European Week.

The theme

The theme chosen for the EW2001 “Prevention of work-related accidents” was generally perceived as ‘very broad’, although highly relevant in nearly all countries.

There exist opposed opinions as to whether or not the theme for the Week should be broad or more focussed. Two different approaches and views were in this respect put forward by the respondents.

The fact of choosing such a broad theme for the EW2001 has proven to be a disadvantage in a number of countries (a.o. in AT, BE, DK, FR) – as was pointed out by EW Group Members (and also a number of activity organisers). It appeared in these countries to be more difficult to obtain backing for and to set up activities around such a wide theme, than were the theme more focussed. Therefore, a preference was expressed for a more narrowly defined theme for future European Weeks, although it remains a requirement that the theme must be relevant and attractive to all countries involved.

The theme chosen for the EW 2002 ‘Tackling work-related psychosocial risks – with a special focus on stress’ is in this respect generally not perceived as better. ‘Dangerous substances’ (as potential theme proposed for the EW 2003), however, corresponds more to these requirements.

Others (e.g. UK, FIN) explicitly stated they prefer a broader theme, in order to allow a broad approach targeting a wide audience.

In a few countries, (part of) the activities were not focussing on the EW2001 theme, but covered more broadly ‘risk prevention’ or ‘awareness-raising on OSH’.

We also noticed in one country that some activities organised under the umbrella of the EW2001 still focussed on the theme of the EW 2000 (MSD). This has been a spill-over effect from the EW2000.

Both activity organisers and EW Group Members were asked for suggestions for potential themes for future European Weeks. The list of these suggestions is mentioned below. As can be noted from this list, an important number of potential themes are related to ‘working conditions’ while the link with ‘safety and health’ is less direct. Respondents were aware of this fact, but still emphasised the importance of these aspects.

- ‘harassment’ (mentioned by 2 EW group members);
- ‘temporary workers’;
- ‘procurement’;
- ‘precarious work’;
- ‘chance groups’ (women, older workers, disabled, ...);
- ‘women at work’;
- ‘ageing of the workers’ population’;
- ‘employability’;
- ‘in-company services : safety technicians, hygienists, ...’;
- ‘promoting the process of risk analysis, inventarisation and action plan’;
- ‘reintegration after absence due to illness’.

4.3 The national organisation of the Week

At national level, the distinction can be made between following levels of activities :

- (management) tasks performed by the FOP / EW group members linked with the organisation, coordination, promotion and communication regarding the European Week - this aspect is covered below;
- a multitude of activities that were organised in the context of the Week at the national and/or local level – this subject is covered under the next section of this report.

As regards the management of the Week, the same EW group members were appointed as for the EW2000 in a number of countries. In other countries, however, another person was appointed EW Group Member in 2001 than it had been in 2000. When EW group members were different, this was motivated in most cases by expertise on the subject chosen as theme for the Week.

Comparing these different approaches, it appeared from the interviews that those persons who have for a second consecutive year the responsibility for the EW can build upon the experience and benefit from efficiency gains. Moreover, they also develop and build on personal relationships allowing more easy exchanges of experiences with the other EW group members. The others, who were EW group member for the first time in 2001, did not benefit from these advantages.

We would consequently recommend Focal Points to keep the same person responsible as EW group member for longer periods than one year, because in our opinion the advantages of the learning effect outweigh a potential expertise in the area of OSH chosen as theme for the European Week.

Another important element determining the scope and the impact of the EW2001 at the national level is the actual commitment of Member States to participate in the Week. As was also the case for the EW 2000, the picture varies significantly throughout the EU.

As mentioned above, we consider that impacts have been largest in countries where :

- national budgets were foreseen for the Week that have in fact served as seed money to trigger more initiatives at local level;
- national campaigns or programmes focusing on the same theme as the European Week were organised. These initiatives reinforced the European Week, and vice versa. Some of these campaigns were foreseen (e.g. in Denmark), others were ‘inspired’ by the Week (e.g. the National Accident Prevention Programme, set up in Finland, and meant to run till 2005).

Indeed, whereas national budgets were made available for the Week in some countries, the focal points in a number of other countries only had their own resources (staff time, contacts, etc.) available for the Week. Several of the respondents in this situation criticised the lack of political backing for the subject of OSH in their country, explaining the difficulty to free resources for the European Week. However, this lack of political backing was also valid for the European level policy makers, according to some.

The Belgian case has been an exception this year because, although no national budget was foreseen for the European Week, a part of the budget foreseen for the Belgian Presidency of the European Union could be used. This money was used for the organisation of a Belgian Good Practice Award competition and a national event (combined with a national award ceremony) taking place at the European Parliament the day before the official closing event of the European Week.

In those countries where no national budgets were available, activities were mainly initiated by the Focal Point or EW group member him-/herself or by other members of the national networks. In the majority of these cases, the number of activities organised at national level was limited.

However, not only the absence of national budgets was given as a reason for a limited number of national activities. Also the absence of project co-funding by the Agency was exceptionally mentioned as 'alibi' for limited co-ordination efforts at national level. Further, a few of the respondents who are responsible for the organisation of the Week at national level (European Week Group Members) said they have been slightly demotivated by the experience of the EW 2000 by difficult functioning of the national networks and/or commitments by social partners to organise activities not being fulfilled. In a few cases, such experiences (high personal efforts, for relatively little commitment from others) have had a negative influence on the efforts being undertaken and the time being devoted to the EW 2001 by the persons involved.

In general, however, we consider that the EW2001 has demonstrated the overall improved networking effect over time among the members of the national networks. This has resulted in increased commitment, but also in a 'moral obligation' to participate again in the Week by setting up activities. Also the success of the previous European Week clearly paid off in 2001 as both at national and at activity level loyalty is being built up : people want to participate again. Figures illustrating this point were provided in the UK evaluation report : whereas 70,000 action packs were distributed in 2000, this number rose to 105,000 in 2001. The number of feedback forms received rose from 718 in 2000 to 2,654 in 2001.

As regards evaluations carried out at the national level, it appeared that although some national reports about the EW 2001 mentioned that national evaluations were taking place or were planned, it is necessary to differentiate between types of evaluations. Following types of 'evaluations' were identified :

- the management of the Week at national level collects information and makes a report;
- a 'hearing' is organised : key people involved in the Week are gathered to discuss the outcome of the Week;
- a questionnaire is sent out by the management to participants in national activities, activity organisers, Good Practice Award winners, and this is analysed (small universe of maximum 10-20 respondents);
- an external evaluator is contracted (only done in the UK).

Both in Finland and Ireland a feedback form was sent out together with the promotional material ('Info Pack'). In Finland, no exploitation has been done yet of the answers received; whereas in Ireland it was said that this initiative did not result in actual feedback.

In The Netherlands, the previous European level evaluation (the EW2000 evaluation study performed by Yellow Window) was used to review their own national approach and to make improvements. This has resulted in more resources being made available for the Week (particularly in terms of staff time).

Still, there is overall a general recognition of the value of national evaluations being compared at European level, particularly in order to exchange good practice. An important conclusion in this respect is that, even if the 'evaluation culture' is different among the countries, a clear need is recognised for more co-ordination and stimulation of good practice.

4.4 National activities

The organisation and impact of the EW2001 has been quite different in the Member States. This diversity is linked to following factors :

- different needs;
- different degrees of experience with this type of awareness raising actions;
- availability of budgets;
- the place of prevention in the national policy;
- the planned or existing actions at national level in relation to the theme.

We are grouping the countries into three main categories :

1. High Impact. Availability of funds at national level

Countries who used the EW2001 for a major EW2001 campaign with stimulation of various types of initiatives. These countries could make budgets available for the EW2001, and/or leveraged on national actions (planned or set up) focusing on the same theme as the European Week. Impacts both in qualitative and in quantitative terms are high.

2. Medium to high impact. No or little national funds

Countries where the (tripartite) networks and partnerships with other organisations provided for sufficient resources to set up a range of EW2001 initiatives. Qualitative impact is always high for these countries. Quantitative impact can be high as well.

3. Medium to low impact. No or little national funds

Countries where activities were limited. This has much to do with a lack of motivation or capacity to mobilise resources for the EW2001. Impacts will be low, and in most of the countries in this situation, less than 10 national activities were organised in the context of the Week..

The factors explaining this take-up effect at the national level, and the number and impact of activities subsequently initiated, are elaborated more in-depth in section 3.2.2 of this report.

When looking at the national activities, we should make a difference between :

- activities that were initiated by the FOP and/or the EW 2001 group member. These will normally be campaigns or activities targeting a wide audience, and promoting the week in general;
- decentralised activities that are triggered in the context of EW2001.

All Member States have had activities of the first type, although not all created a snowball effect.

Inventorising the first type of activities is fairly easy, as they have been organised centrally and the FOP was in one way or another involved. For the second group of activities, making an inventory is more difficult. Still, most Member States managed to have a relatively fair view on this⁴.

⁴ We again want to highlight the technique used by the UK to inventorise activities (ex post) as example of good practice : a questionnaire is part of the Action Pack sent out; organisations who fill in this questionnaire and send it back are entering a good practice contest and are, if selected, invited at regional award ceremonies

Below, we provide an overview of the target groups reached by the different activities that took place as well as of the types of activities organised in the context of the EW 2001. Due to the difficulty to obtain a full overview of all activities that took place, we cannot guarantee that no activities were overlooked. Consequently, where we mention numbers of countries, this is based on the information available to us, while the actual number can be higher.

Target groups

Various types of activities, aimed at various target groups, were organised at national level. We are reviewing below the most common target groups for whom the activities or projects were organised.

<i>Public at large</i>	Significantly less countries than in 2000 have had activities which are targeting the public at large. In 4 countries a campaign with national coverage was set up, in 1 country a regional campaign took place.
<i>Workers in one company (SMEs or large companies)</i>	At least half of the countries had activities for this type of target. Two of these countries had about the largest number of activities generated at the national level. Except for these two countries, there is a dominating impact on large companies from the public sector rather than smaller (private) companies.
<i>Workers and employers in one sector</i>	Nearly all countries had activities at sectorial level, with a broad targeting – which is considerably more than was the case with the EW2000. Sectors chosen varied, and covered sectors dominated by SMEs as well as others.
<i>Workers and employers in SMEs in general</i>	We identified four countries that had activities addressing the SMEs in general as a target group.
<i>Management and/or staff in charge of OSH in private and/or public sector</i>	Nearly all countries have organised activities targeting this particular group.
<i>Professionals in OSH</i>	As is the case with the above-mentioned target group, nearly all countries had activities targeting this group.

Type of activities

The overview below gives an impression of the wide range of activities that took place at the national level. Individual projects at the national level have been very diverse : they range from the organisation of one event to complex projects with various interrelated activities like a survey, publication of the results and a direct marketing campaign, all combined in one project.

<i>Large event / seminar</i>	In nearly all Member States, this type of activity has taken place.
<i>Workshop</i>	Again a very popular type of activity, being organised in a large majority of the Member States. Target groups of workshops were mainly staff in charge of OSH, OSH experts, employers.

<i>Training sessions</i>	Training sessions were organised in fewer countries than was the case with the EW2000. We identified 3 countries that had training sessions. Target groups included a.o. trainers ('training the trainer' sessions), OSH inspectors, as well as students in certain (technical) orientations.
<i>Advertising campaign</i> - posters - press / magazines - TV - radio - other (e.g. advertising on telephone cards)	At least one third of the countries used advertising campaigns, of which 3 countries used at least 2 different media. Advertising in press/magazines has been most used. Advertising was used as technique mainly in countries with a national budget available for the Week. The technique was used as a leverage to trigger other initiatives or simply as a way to reach the public at large.
<i>Publications on paper</i> - flier - brochure / magazine - technical information - book - calendar with activities planned at national level	In half the countries, national activities included publications on paper.
<i>Combination of various communication tools as pack for dissemination</i> <i>'Open doors day'</i>	In three countries, various communication tools were compiled in one pack ('Action Pack' or 'Info Pack'). In three countries this type of activity took place. E.g. large companies inviting staff, their families, their suppliers, to show their initiatives; but also at SMEs and inspectorates such days were organised.
<i>National good practice awards scheme</i>	Three Member States organised their own national good practice awards competition on the same theme as the EW2001.
<i>Direct Marketing campaign</i>	At least three countries used Direct Marketing techniques during the EW2001.
<i>CD-ROM</i>	A CD-ROM was produced in 1 Member State.
<i>Other</i>	Other types of activities than those mentioned above took place in at least seven countries.

Among 'other' activities, a variety of different types of initiatives are categorised. This includes sometimes less conventional approaches. Examples of these 'other' activities are :

- exhibitions,
- a survey on accident prevention, and subsequent publication of the results,
- workplace assessments,
- hazard spotting,
- a survey on accident prevention and subsequent publication and dissemination of the results,
- quizzes and competitions (including for children),
- special focussed inspections under the theme of EW2001, ...

Types of organisers

The profiles of the organisers of activities set up in the context of the EW 2001 varied widely. Whereas in some countries organisers were mainly the members of the national networks (social partners, public institutions in charge of OSH), also many other types of organisers were involved in national activities : individual enterprises (both large companies and SMEs), associations, insurance companies, municipalities, schools, etc.

Still, despite the undeniable variety in profiles of organisers, there has been a predominance of involvement from large versus smaller organisations, as well as from public versus private sector organisations.

5. Specific activities

5.1 Use of promotional material

5.1.1 EW web site

The EW2001 web site, as part of the Agency web site, appreciated already during the EW 2000, was indicated as a highly important, very popular and widely used source of information. Comments pointed out the high quality, reliability and completeness of website materials, the modern and appealing way in which it has been created, and the fact that it was adjusted to the need of potential users.

FOPs particularly appreciated how the website has been facilitating their work as the more information available on the website, the less they had to provide additional information by phone or by mail.

Although we did not dispose of all the data regarding the number of visitors checking the EW 2001 website, the UK pages of the Agency's web site, which featured EW2001 from 10 August, registered 88,000 'hits' in the first three weeks and 160,000 'hits' in September. These figures show how successful the website was.

Many FOPs indicated that national EW websites were checked first and then, in case of doubts, visitors referred to the European site.

Organisers of activities appreciated their own language versions as a facilitator of raising awareness and interest among employees.

Although the overall opinion about the EW 2001 website is highly positive, there is still room for improvement. Suggestions were made by the FOPs, organisers of activities within EW 2001 and also by the Good practice Award Winners mainly with regard to following points :

- The EW website could be improved by making the Good Practice site more easily accessible, completed with rankings from the former award competitions, graphically attractive (pictures), and by including links or contact details of the companies which can share their good practice examples.
- Some important information was published too late or was not constantly updated – this was the most often repeated criticism.
- Another suggestion was to place on the website promotional materials, ex. translations of leaflets and fact sheets in all national languages and in an easy accessible format allowing for copying and printing them, ex. in Word or RTF format.

5.1.2 Printed material

All respondents were very positive about the quality of the printed material produced by the Agency - the given score varied from good to excellent. The raised points concerned beautiful printing, very good quality of paper, nice graphics, excellent slogan. Also the quantity of the provided printed materials appeared to be sufficient in the vast majority of countries. The additional orders were due to an underestimation at a national level of the number of materials needed.

As was also the case for the EW 2000, from the printed material, *the fact sheets* were praised as most effective and successful, especially by health and safety experts. Their strength lies in the fact that they are concise, provide high quality insights in an understandable language, and appeal to a wide target audience (H&S practitioners, employers, employees, etc.). Still, there were some respondents who said that they were too “academic”, the text too long and difficult to read. They suggested shorter texts, less formal language and simple, practical pieces of advice or lists to follow.

The fliers (promotion of the EW2001 and of the Good Practice Awards Scheme) were mainly used in mailings and Action Packs and served to inform a very wide audience. They were particularly appreciated by Ireland and UK as these countries included them in all packages that were sent out.

The posters generally were not perceived of very high interest. The main reason for this was that it was very difficult and costly to mail them, they did not say a lot about accident prevention or about the week itself and their size was not attractive from the promotional point of view. Therefore, a few respondents suggested that posters should be bigger, ex. A2 format, in order to attract more attention.

The same points as mentioned for the posters are valid for *the postcards*. Therefore a couple of respondents wished to receive less posters and postcards. Contrary to this, *key rings and ballpoints* proved to be very popular especially during meetings and seminars and their number was in a few cases insufficient.

Areas for possible improvements with regard to the quality of printing material are :

- As last year, a suggestion made by the national level with regard to the material was to have the design and artwork developed centrally by the Agency, while the printing could happen at the national level. This would allow for cost savings (transport and logistics) and increased efficiency (collating into Action Packs, faster re-ordering of material, etc.). It was particularly highlighted by the UK and Ireland which would be very willing to co-operate in order to produce English language versions cost effectively.
- Although timing of delivery of promotional materials did not pose an important problem to most of the respondents, many of them indicated that an earlier distribution of material would result in higher numbers of participants in activities of the EW, in higher interest and number of applications for the Good practice Award and, generally, it would reinforce the whole campaign.
- In spite of the fact that all Focal Points appreciated an opportunity to be involved in translating the material to their national language, they found it difficult due to time constraints imposed by the Agency. It was said that time given for that was insufficient taking into account how time-consuming it was, in particular in case of Member States which have more than one official language and co-operated with its neighbouring countries to work out a common version.

5.1.2 Suggestions for additional material that might be provided by the Agency

Respondents mainly asked for :

- more fact sheets,
- A2 size posters as a better way to attract attention (as already mentioned above),
- stickers,
- more leaflets in national languages,

- more examples of projects, activities and initiatives of good practice.

Further suggestions included :

- A couple of FOPs came up with an idea of involving national EW representatives into works on the content of promotional materials in order to have a wider range of topics, which would better correspond to the national needs.
- In one country, the OSH experts at workplace level responded that a short campaign video would be beneficial to the promotion of EW activities.
- Some respondents identified the need for original materials and logos in an electronic version (ex. on the Website) for copying them into different leaflets used during the campaign.

5.1.4 Other material produced at national level

Again, very different situations were identified across the countries. While in a number of countries no other material was produced, others have produced extra supportive material as additional folders, a CD-ROM, Action Packs, brochures containing Social Directives, reprints of previous health and safety publications.

One country produced 120 000 additional copies of facts sheets, and two other countries published books containing good practice examples and the results of a survey on accident prevention respectively.

5.2 Media coverage

Media coverage of the European Week 2001 has included both advertising campaigns and editorial coverage.

A number of *advertising campaigns* in media (mainly in printed press) were developed and paid for from national budgets (as was the case e.g. in Finland, UK, Ireland, Italy)⁵.

Obtaining *editorial coverage* in media proved to be a challenging task for the national level. Still, efforts, e.g. by means of press releases produced by the FOP / EW Group member, have been (very) significant in nearly all countries. Although in a number of countries results were rather poor, overall results have been quite impressive.

Indeed, even mass media as national newspapers, television and radio were reached (e.g. in UK, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg). Some countries have obtained significant results by targeting regional media (press, radio, TV), rather than national media. Also results among the specialised press (with focus on OSH) have been good in all countries.

Generally, we can conclude that press coverage has been better than for the EW 2000. This was also confirmed by the EW Group members in a number of countries. They stated that this is partly due to the increased awareness for the Week.

Those countries which organised a national 'good practice awards scheme' mentioned that this is a successful initiative to attract media attention. Also the use of public personalities (e.g. politicians) and their support for the theme was mentioned as a good way to generate media interest.

⁵ Please refer for more details to section 3.2.3.

5.3 The Good Practice Awards Scheme

The Scheme

As opposed to EW 2000, the Good Practice Awards Scheme was for the EW 2001 from the start included in the concept of the Week. As such, the initiative has been promoted together with the EW 2001, forming an integral part of it. This has been a clear improvement.

Again, the Good Practice Awards Scheme has clearly added value to the Week on the very important aspect of exchange of 'good practice'. Moreover, due to the repetitive character of the initiative and because of the positive experience of last year, this added value created has been more important than it has been with the EW 2000. This fact was recognised by many EW group members.

As last year, focussing the Good Practice Awards Scheme on the same theme as the European Week, offered following advantages :

- it reinforced the objective of the EW2001 to stimulate the exchange of good practice on the theme of work-related accident prevention;
- it allowed at the same time to let the Closing Event of the Week coincide with the Awards Ceremony, thus creating a bigger event and attracting more interest for the Week, including from the press because of the 'news value' of the awards.

The process

Although a number of the difficulties in the process of the organisation of the Scheme were avoided for the EW2001 (the improvement of the timetable, the clarity of the criteria provided for the national selection of nominations), there were still a number of problems mentioned by the respondents :

- as for the promotion of the 'call' for Good Practice examples, the Agency relies on the FOP and EW 2001 Group (with their national network), the success of the Scheme at national level depends on the efforts of these people. However, as a number considered that (too) many other tasks were also expected from them (related both to the EW 2001 and to the SME Funding Scheme), promotion for the Scheme was not always up to standard and the level of response very low in a number of countries;
- the fact that activities being organised in the context of the EW 2001 are not eligible for an Award (as not finished and thus missing proven results) is apparently still creating confusion – as mentioned by several EW Group members;
- the fact that the submission of visual material (pictures or video material) was a strict requirement for all nominations has, although such material is generally recognised as very valuable, created some frustrations with those who had projects whereby visual material is not available (because not always relevant to the project). Apart from this, the procedural requirements for submissions were not considered as too complicated;
- the categories put forward by the Agency for the Awards are by some considered as complicating the search for 'good practice examples'. Rather, it was suggested to select Awards according to categories based on the size or sector of the organisation submitting the nomination;
- an important number of respondents, both at the national level and at project level (award winners), criticised the fact that too many political criteria are playing in the selection of Awards at the European level. The need was emphasised to look for real innovation, the

proven positive effects, the accents which make a project outstanding. It has been said that too many projects being awarded are just about the 'legal minimum' – which is not considered an 'achievement'. This damages the image and value of the 'Award' and the Scheme in general. This opinion is linked to the state-of-the-art of OSH in the countries of the respondents concerned.

The Awards Ceremony to which all Award Winners were invited took place on 22-23 November 2001 in Brussels, coinciding with the Closing Event of the EW2001. Although this recognition demonstrated through the Awards Ceremony is undeniably important for the Award Winning organisations, the Event in itself was by these people not experienced as 'interesting' from the point of view of information being provided, contacts with other organisations / awards winners, or other.

As regards the dissemination of good practice, we recommended last year to stimulate the Focal Points to build on the Scheme for further initiatives at national level : e.g. by publishing all national examples received on the national website. This recommendation has clearly been taken on board : (both national and European) good practice examples were indeed put on national websites, and also other ideas were implemented (e.g. national Good Practice Awards scheme) or are planned for the EW2002.

Still, there are clearly needs in this respect for further and more systematic dissemination of the good practice examples identified. This includes not only the Award-winning projects, but also the nominated projects.

One Award Winner told us he produced publications himself about his project and idea in order to facilitate dissemination and encourage others to take up the idea.

One Award Winner suggested the Agency should facilitate networking among the Award Winning organisations, as these are acting as 'pioneers' in the area of OSH within their sectors and each have their own networks which can benefit from an improved dissemination of good practice ideas.

Good Practice Awards Schemes at national level

In Belgium, a national Good Practice Award Scheme was organised for the first time in the context of the EW2001, focussing on the same topic. The projects that were awarded at national level were the selected nominations for the European Good Practice Award Scheme. The experience was considered satisfactory, although the number of nominations submitted for the national scheme had been below expectation (15 were received). For political reasons the initiative would however not be repeated for the EW2002.

A comparable initiative to this Belgian example is planned for the EW2002 in The Netherlands and in Germany. In The Netherlands, however, the 'award' that would be given to the winners would be financial as this is thought to be more motivating.

Other countries where Good Practice Awards Schemes are organised at national level are Ireland and the UK.

In Ireland, the Scheme existed already before, but is now linked to the European Week by focusing on the same topic and by allowing the nominees to indicate whether they want to go for the national and / or the European competition.

In the UK, those activity organisers that return the feedback form (sent to them together with the Info Pack) and provide information about their initiatives, automatically enter into the national Good Practice Awards competition. This approach is used as stimulus to make people report on what is being organised.

The impact of the Award for the Award-winning organisations

As also appeared last year, the fact of winning the Good Practice Award generally proves to be very important for the organisations concerned.

- Award winners stated that the Award reinforces the confidence in their organisation, from their own staff, from their customers, or – in the case of an association – from their members.
- While the Award has a clear positive image-related effect for the organisation, only one award winner stated that this has also clearly paid off commercially.
- Furthermore, also due to the fact that the Award is used by the organisation for public relations efforts and to obtain media attention, the fact of winning the Award gives visibility to the organisation within and beyond its sector. This was confirmed by two Award winners who said they had been contacted also by other industries following the Award.
- Another important impact of the Award is that it proves to be effective in helping to promote OSH within the organisation, both at staff and at management level. Even when it is considered that further promotion is not really necessary anymore, the Award is considered as a very important symbol of recognition for the efforts being undertaken, motivating to continue.
- One award winner confirmed that the attention for the subject has actually resulted in a decrease of the statistics of the working accidents and near-miss accidents.

Conclusions

1. The Scheme proves to be an effective tool in the European Week initiatives with real added value at all levels. We would consequently support the idea to keep the initiative in future Weeks.
2. The initiative clearly has a positive impact on the Award winning organisations. Towards the external world, this impact is predominantly image-related, while actual commercial effects are less clear. Within the organisation itself, impacts as regards attention for OSH-matters are also very positive.
3. The Agency has maintained the two-level evaluation system (national and European). We still believe a one-level (European) system would have the advantage of creating real EAV and a real contest. The present system however ensures maximum communication effects as all Member States are ‘guaranteed’ of success. It also allows the organisation of a national Good Practice Awards scheme which is then the logical ‘first step’ towards the European contest.
4. To solve the problem of the confusion created by the timing of the Good Practice Award Scheme, it might be worth to consider the possibility to organise a Good Practice Award selection on projects related to the theme of the previous year Week, with the Award Ceremony coinciding with the European Week.
5. The dissemination of good practice can be further stimulated by :
 - the exchange of experiences among the Focal Points as regards possible initiatives at national level;
 - facilitation by the Agency of networking among the Good Practice Award winners.
6. Improvements are still possible at the level of :
 - the promotion of the Scheme;
 - the selection criteria used for choosing the Award Winners, which is clearly an important and sensitive issue as it considerably influences the long-term image-building of the Scheme in general and the ‘value’ attached to the award in particular;
 - evaluation of the take-up effects and impacts created by the Award-winning projects.

5.4 The SME Funding Scheme

The process

In 2001, the SME Funding Scheme took place for the first time, with the Open Call for Projects being published in the Official Journal of the European Communities on 21 April 2001. The Scheme focussed on the same theme as the EW 2001 : 'prevention of accidents'. Deadlines for the submission of project proposals have been :

- 29 June '01 for national projects;
- 16 July '01 for European / transnational projects.

A pre-assessment of the applications, after verification of the formalities and eligibility criteria by the Agency, took place :

- by the Focal Points, in co-decision with the social partners, for the national projects : the evaluation and ranking was to be sent to the Agency no later than 15 September '01;
- by a European jury for the EU / transnational projects : a meeting took place on 13-14 September 2001.

At European level, an assessment of the applications took place at a joint meeting of the SME/EW group, together with the European Jury, on 17-18 October '01. Subsequently, the Agency took the final decision on which projects would be funded, published the list of selected projects and carried out all administrative, financial and contractual tasks.

Consequently, projects started in the last quarter of the year 2001, to run for a maximum period of 12 months. This means that projects normally will run till the end of September 2002.

Organisational aspects

While the same people were involved in both initiatives, both at European and at national level, efficiency gains were realised in terms of organisational efforts. Also the promotion of the two actions could for a large part be done in parallel.

At the same time, however, a number of EW Group members mentions this has led to an increase in workload and an even tighter schedule for them than was the case with the EW 2000.

Synergies between the EW 2001 and the SME Funding Scheme

Despite the fact that both initiatives focussed on the same theme and were intended to reinforce each other, synergies between both initiatives were mainly to be found on the operational and organisation aspects, both at the European and at the national levels.

However, apart from these elements, other synergies or enhanced impacts have not been identified through the evaluation. Neither did the majority of the EW Group members recognise other synergies. On the contrary, the existence and shared promotion of both initiatives seems to have created confusion among the target groups in a large number of countries.

Consequently, many European Week group members suggested to completely split up both initiatives, clearly distinguishing them also by focussing on different topics.

Conclusions

In our opinion, one of the main reasons for the absence of a clear synergy is the fact that the timetables of these two initiatives did not allow activities and projects to run in parallel.

A solution proposed by one European Week group member is to strengthen the synergy between both actions by running the SME Funding Scheme of year 1 on the topic of the European Week of year 2, making sure that all projects under the SME Funding Scheme would be finished before the EW of year 2 starts. This way, they could also compete for the Good Practice Award of year 2, while the Closing Event can be a shared one (e.g. combined with a conference about the results of the SME Funding Scheme).

Also another EW group member suggested that it would be better if the results of the projects funded under the SME Funding Scheme could be presented at the Closing Event of the European Week.

6. *EW 2001 vs. EW 2000 : a comparison*

In our evaluation report of the EW2000, we had identified the following main dimensions for the choice of a model for the organisation of a European Week:

- with or without co-funded projects
- with or without seed money for the Member States
- with or without Good practice Awards

We had formulated a recommendation for another model, which is being applied for the first time in 2002.

The table below characterises the 3 models used :

	2000	2001	2002
<i>Co-funded projects</i>	yes	No, But a separate scheme for SMEs with same theme as EW	No, But a separate scheme for SMEs with a different theme
<i>Seed money for the Member States</i>	No	No	Yes
<i>Good practice award scheme</i>	Yes (was not formally part of the EW)	Yes	Yes

Although it is still early to compare the 3 models, we have collected opinions on advantages and disadvantages of the various models.

FOPs and/or EW group members have a clear preference for the 2002 model.

Nine of the 15 countries expressed a clear preference even if the argumentation can be different. None of the countries preferred the 2000 or 2001 model. One country did not express a clear opinion, which is linked to the individual experience of the person interviewed (no hands-on experience with all models). Two countries came with another preference which would be a combination of the models 2000 and 2002 : project co-funding and seed money for the national organisation. For three countries, the choice of the model is perceived as not important, with as a consequence, no clear preference.

Reasons given for preferring 2002 (mentioned by most) :

- the good practice is part of the EW;
- it helps to obtain commitments at the national level;
- main aim is to be an awareness-raising campaign. Financing projects is less critical. Full coverage of and multiplier effects are the key.

Reasons given for preferring 2002, but not necessarily shared by a majority :

- project funding is considered something different to a campaign like the EW. It is preferred to be clearly separate;
- it is better to have a clear distinction between the EW and a call for project proposals;
- if the Agency imposes something, they should at least pay part of the cost;
- the selection of projects at the national level is too much of a burden and not really acceptable without funding;
- the 2002 model gives more responsibility to the national level (which is preferred);

- the 2002 model gives more certainty for the future. If project funding is used as seed money by the national level (like a few countries did in 2000) there is a bigger risk of lack of continuity.

Advantages of the 2002 model:

- circumvents the problem of the place of OSH on the political agenda. As in most countries OSH is low on this agenda, it is difficult to have even small funds to manage a EW. Receiving these funds from the EU level ensures that all countries can develop a minimum level of activity;
- it helps the FOP to trigger interest and attention from the higher levels, and even obtain additional national funds which would be more difficult to obtain otherwise.

Disadvantages of 2002 model:

- some administrations do not know how to handle the funds. The risk exists that it disappears in a general account, and the FOP does not have access;
- A very small group of countries do not need the seed money. They consider they can trigger the social partners to spend part of their resources.

Key point is clearly consistency over time in order to maintain a momentum: administrations take time to react and adapt. Working with networks and decentralised means many persons and their hierarchy need to be involved in decisions and preparation. Obtaining matching funds e.g. needs to be budgeted well in advance.

Comparative assessment of 2000 and 2001

- *Impacts*

It is near to impossible to estimate the influence of the model chosen on the impact. The overall impact of 2001 is significantly bigger than 2000. The main reasons are however :

- the learning effect;
- the influence of the theme.

This is valid for the overall impact of the awareness raising campaign (number of individual persons reached, number of different target groups and segments reached).

- *Good practice identification and promotion*

The impact of 2001 is quite certainly lower than 2000. This is linked to the absence of co-funded projects.

- *SME focus*

The SME focus was much less present in 2001 than in 2000. The explanation is:

- the absence of co-funded projects;
- the concentration of attention for SMEs through the SME Funding Scheme.

This does not mean there have not been activities concentrating on SMEs in the context of the Week. Involvement of SMEs is always more difficult to obtain than from public sector organisations or larger private sector companies. Still, many examples of SME-oriented activities have taken place in most if not all countries. The main difference we have noticed is management attention and focus.

- Confusion

Avoiding confusion among the different actions and messages is always a problem in this type of campaign where different instruments are used.

2001 was better than 2000 as regards the Good practice Awards Scheme. The full integration of the Good practice Awards Scheme in the Week has solved this problem.

There was however more confusion regarding the co-funding of projects, as there were projects funded under the SME Funding Scheme, not part of the Week, but still on the same theme.

- Timing

Time remains a problem, but there are clear improvements in terms of when decisions are taken and when material is available.

ANNEXES

Annex 1.

Checklist for organisers of activities as part of the EW 2001

This list of questions will be used as guideline during our telephone conversation. Not all questions might be relevant to your situation or activity. The purpose of this document is to show what the subject of the interview will be and to enable you to prepare yourself if you wish.

Background info

- Short description of the organisation (private vs. public, activities, size, set-up, target groups, objectives, etc.)
- Description of the activities organised in the context of the EW 2001 (type of activities, timeframe, scope and reach, partners in the project)
- How were the activities financed ? If total cost were 100 %, which shares are financed by whom (probe for sponsoring, subsidies, co-financing – by whom)

Preparation and implementation of the activities

- How did you know about the EW2001 ?
- Which were the main motivations/reasons for your organisation to organise activities in the context of the EW2001 ?
- How was the choice for this type of activity made ?
- Can you tell me which role the social partners (employers' organisation / employees' organisation) have played in the activities ?
- How were your contacts with the person who is at national level responsible for the organisation of the EW2001 (EW Working Group member and/or FOP) for your country ?
- What type of support did you expect from the national level versus from the European level (the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work) ?
- And what type of support did you actually get ? From whom ?
- What have been the advantages for your activities to be part of the EW 2001 ?

Promotional material

- Have you received any promotional material to be used in the context of the EW2001 to support your activities ?
 - *If yes : What did you receive ? How did you use it ? Opinions on material received*

Media coverage

- Did you obtain press coverage of your activities ? If yes, in which type of medium / publication ?
- What has been done by your organisation to attract this press attention ?
- What type of activity / event seemed to attract most attention from the media ?

Impacts of your activities and of the EW 2001 in general

- How would you describe the impacts of your activities ? (type of impact, on whom, inside vs. outside your organisation, etc.)
- How do you measure / follow up the results and impacts of your activities ?
- Have you, through the EW 2001, learned of other initiatives and methods to prevent accidents at work ? If yes, which and through which sources ?
- How would you describe the impact the EW2001 will have had overall in your country ?
- What, in your opinion, can be done / could have been done to boost this impact ? (+ probe by whom)

Your opinion on the concept of European Weeks

- Has your organisation previously participated in European Weeks ?
 - If yes : when, type of activities.
 - In how far has the experience with the EW2001 been different from your previous participation in a European Week ? (probe for aspects perceived as different : which ? what was better / worse ?)
- What can be improved in the organisation of the EW at national level ?
- What can be improved in the organisation of the EW at European level?
- Which are in your opinion the main strengths and weaknesses of a campaign like the European Week ?
- What is your opinion on the timetable of the European Week ?
- Do you have any suggestions as to possible themes for future European Weeks?
- Where lies the added value of organising such campaign at European level, rather than at national level ?

The award scheme and SME Funding Scheme

- Do you know the Good Practice Award Scheme, which is also organised by the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work ? (probe for source of this knowledge, possible interest in and opinion about this Scheme)
- Do you know the SME Funding Scheme, which is also an action set up and managed by the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work ? (probe for source of this knowledge, possible interest in and opinion about this Scheme)
- How can, in your opinion, the synergies between these initiatives be improved ?

Annex 2.

Checklist for Award winners

This list of questions will be used as guideline during our telephone conversation. Not all questions might be relevant to your situation or activity. The purpose of this document is to show what the subject of the interview will be and to enable you to prepare yourself if you wish.

- Short description of the organisation
- Short description of the award-winning project (which elements were innovative, ‘good practice’) ?

- How did you know about the Good Practice Awards Scheme ?
- Did you already know the EW2001 ?
- Which were the main motivations/reasons for your organisation to submit an application in answer to the call for Good Practice examples ?
- How did you experience the procedures / process for the Good Practice Awards Scheme ?
- Did you get any support for submitting your application ? (If yes, which support ? from whom ?)

- What has been the impact for your organisation of winning this Good Practice Award ? How important has it been ? (please give examples of concrete results)
- What has your organisation undertaken following this Award to communicate this fact to clients and others ? And what was the result ?
- Winning this Award : does it help to promote OSH (occupational safety and health) at company level ?
- Does it help to get (more) management attention for the matter ?
- Have you attended the Award Ceremony in Brussels ? If yes, how have you experienced this event ? (probe for press attention, contacts with others, learning effect through presentation of the other award-winning projects, etc.)

- Are there any other points you would like to mention about this Award or the Award Scheme in general ?