RARHA WP6, Good practice Toolkit – Survey Report (collection of examples)

1. Collection of Member States (EU/EEA/EFTA) contact person information (MSCPI)

First phase of Intervention information collection represented the search for professionals experienced in alcohol related harm reduction interventions. Moreover, we searched for professionals that have a good overview and knowledge on interventions in their country, to provide reliable data at country level. We have prepared a table to sort MS person's contact information entitled: *Good Practices in Alcohol Related Harm Reduction: Collection of Member States Contact Persons to Provide Information on Good Practices Executed at Country Level.* The table was organised in a way that allowed for quick overview of MS contact persons working in particular intervention area (Early interventions, Public awareness campaigns, School-based Interventions) – see below or attachment nr.?:

Member state	WP6 Associated partners (or CP)	Good Practice in the area of School-based programs	Good Practice in the area of Public awareness programmes	Good Practice in the area of Early intervention services (including brief advices)
	WP 6/RARHA JA - Contact Info	Person(s)	Person(s)	Person(s)
MS		Name:	Name:	Name:
		Affiliation:	Affiliation:	Affiliation:
		Work Area:	Work Area:	Work Area:
		Email:	Email:	Email:
		Telephone:	Telephone:	Telephone:

Firstly, a request for MSCPI was sent out to all WP6 partners via email. Some MSCPI was successfully collected at this stage. Secondly, we sent out requests for MSCPI to all RARHA partners and collected more information. In the third round of collection of information we asked the RARHA coordinator (SICAD) to support us detect MSCPI for countries that were not involved in RARHA or we couldn't find a contact information. With SICAD's support and checking CNAPA membership, we identified almost all MSCPI needed. Fourth round of collection included internet search for national health organisations (e.g. Ministries of health, health institutes etc.). Emails were sent to them, when no reply, several telephone calls were made to identify the needed MSCPI. In the end we had a complete list of MSCPI (EU/EEA/EFTA) and were able to send out requests for fulfilling the Good practice intervention questionnaire.

2. Sending out the questionnaire and reminders:

An email letter requesting information on interventions was send out in December 2014 to every MSCP separately together with attached questionnaire in PDF form. A deadline to send back the fulfilled questionnaires was set. Because the response in the given time frame was poor, we had to continuously send out reminders to MSCP that didn't reply to our request. Additionally several telephone calls to identified MSCP were made, asking them to send the information needed and if they have had any issues with answering the questionnaire. In deed some had technical issues with the PDF form of the questionnaire, so we consequently sent them a Word.doc form of the questionnaire. The reminder process was time consuming due to MSCP unresponsiveness or out of office issues, and resulted in a significant delay regarding the WP6 timeline. The collection phase ended in April 2015. We managed to collect information on interventions from almost all EU/EFTA/EEA countries. For few countries, we didn't manage to collect any data. This was mainly because MSCP reported that their interventions did not meet the eligibility criteria defined in the questionnaire.

3. Data entry, data check

An Excel table was prepared for data entry with multiple choice answers inclusive. All Collected data (except open-ended answers) were entered into the table and double checked for entry errors. An additional table with evidence base cases was prepared for statistical analysis.

4. Analysis

Once the table with data was prepared, we conducted statistical analysis of several aspects of collected interventions. We counted frequencies of variables following the below plan:

4.1 Descriptive statistics – Frequencies (n, %)

- Collected cases and proportions of all collected cases/Collected cases per country/Unresponsive countries
- Cases per three intervention areas
- Cases with evidence base
- Cases with evidence base (both marks). (Denominator 1) (variable overview):

Table 1:	Descriptive statistics – Frequencies (n, %)								
Denominator 1 Cases with	Sample size n?	Ear	ly I.		hool I.	Publi	c I.	Al	1 I.
evidence base (both marks)	Question nr.	n %		n	%	N	%	n	%
	Basic Facts								
	6. Who funds/funded your example of good practice								
	7. What is/was the level of implementation of your example of good practice								

	10. Is your example of good practice embedded in a broader national/regional/local policy or action plan?				
Development	(including preparation, planning and core processes)				
	12. Which of these stakeholders were involved in the development of your example of good practice				
	13. Please describe the logic model (the rationale or logical framework) of your example of good practice				
	14. Elements of planning				
	Implementation				
	15. Implementation of your example of good practice is/was				
	16. Target groups				
	10. Target groups				
	17. Which communication channels were used				
	17. Which communication channels were used 20. What supportive activities are/have been				
	17. Which communication channels were used 20. What supportive activities are/have been carried out?				

Additionally a table with multiple possible answer was attached to this table. For the tables see annex 1.

4.2 Description of Interventions:

Collection of open-ended answers and other edited descriptions of interventions was prepared in a separate section – description to follow (e.g. Name of the intervention, short description, references, etc.) Questions: 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34. + contact details.

5. Results

All results are presented in Annex 1 of this report. Below we present selected features of collected intervention information.

5.1 Collected cases and proportions of all collected cases = 48

Country (countries - EU MS + EEA/EFTA= 32	Countries responded	Non- response countries	Nr. of cases per country (Cumulative cases)	Cases with eviden ce base	Cases without evidence base
Total = 32 countries	19 (59%)	13 (41%)	48	43 (90%)	5 (10%)

5.2 Collected intervention areas cumulative and proportions of all collected cases (Q5) (Early Interventions/Public awareness interventions/School-based interventions)

Country	Early interventions	Public awareness/education interventions	School-based interventions
SUM = (countries = 28 MS + 4 EEA/EFTA= 32	22	10	15
%/48	46 %	21 %	33 %
Cases total		48 1 (100%)	

5.2 Cases with evidence base per intervention area

Following Evidence base (quick scan) was required for the intervention to be included in further analysis:

Are all of the following elements described in such detail that the methodology is comprehendible and transferable, allowing for some estimate of effectiveness?

- Objectives
- Target group
- Approach
- Prerequisites for implementation
- Participants' satisfaction

Yes/No

Does the intervention build on a well-founded programme theory or is it based on generally accepted and evidence-based theories?

. .	/ 7	
Vec	/ N	\sim
1 00	/ 1 3	.,

Results:

¹ Lichtenstein did not provide any further data on their intervention following the instructions (no evidence base case of intervention).

Country	Early interventions	Public awareness/education interventions	School-based interventions
SUM = (countries	21	9	13
= 28 MS + 4			
EEA/EFTA= 32			
%/43	49 %	21 %	30 %
Cases total		43 (100%)	

5.4 Funding

	Cases with	Multi choice	E	P	S		A
	evidence base	3.3.1.1.					
	(n=43)						
	Variable	a. National/regional/local government	N	N	N	N	, %
	6. Who	b. Institution of education, public					
	funds/funded	health and/or research					
	your example of	c. Non-governmental organization					
	good practice	d. Private sector					
		company/organization					
		e. Alcohol/ Catering industry					
		f. Other resources	Б	D	C		<u> </u>
			Е	P	S		A
a	National/regio		16	9	10	35	56%
	nal/local						
_	government						
b	Institution of		3	2	3	8	12%
	education,						
	public health						
	and/or						
	research		_				440/
c	Non-		5	2	0	7	11%
	governmental						
	organization		4	2		2	70/
d	Private sector		1	2	0	3	5%
	company/orga						
_	nization Alcohol/		0	1	0	1	2%
e			U	1	U	1	2%
	Catering						
f	industry Other		3	3	3	9	14%
1			3	3	3	9	1470
	resources Total		28	19	16	63	100
	1 Utai		20	17	10	05	%
			Е	P	S		A
	ab		1	1	1		3
	ac		3	0	0		3
Combinations	ad		0	1	0		1
nati	af		0	3	0		3
nbi	abc		1	1	0		2
Cor	abf		0	0	1		1
	df		1	0	0		1
	acde		0	1	0		1

5.5 Stakeholder involvement in the development phase

	Cases with evidence base (n= 43)	Multi choice	Е	P	S	F	A
	Variable 12. Which of these stakeholders were involved in the development of your example of good practice	a. Target groups b. Intermediate target groups c. Economic operators d. Government e. Funders f. Researchers g. Representatives of civil society (NGOs) h. Other	N	N	N	N,	%
			Е	P	S	A	A
a	Target groups		10	6	5	21	13 %
b	Intermediate target groups		15	6	12	33	21 %
c	Economic operators		0	5	0	5	3%
d	Government		15	8	6	29	18 %
e	Funders		5	4	1	10	6%
f	Researchers		13	7	8	28	18 %
g	Representatives of civil society (NGOs)		5	5	5	15	10 %
h	Other		7	5	5	17	11 %
	Total		70	46	42	158	100 %

5.6 Target groups

	Cases with	Multi choice	E	P	S	A	4
	evidence base (n= 43)						
	Variable 16. Target groups	a. General population b. Children (before adolescence time) c. Adolescents d. Young adults e. Adults f. Elderly population g. Parents h. Pregnant women	N	N	N	N,	%
		i. Women j. Men k. Families l. Drivers m. Party goers n. Vulnerable social groups o. Other					
			Е	P	S		4
a	General population		7	6	1	13	9%
b	Children (before adolescence time)		3	3	2	8	5,5 %
С	Adolescents		7	4	11	22	15 %
d	Young adults		11	4	0	15	10 %
e	Adults		7	5	1	13	9%
f	Elderly population		4	1	0	5	3,5 %
g	Parents		9	3	5	17	12 %
h	Pregnant women		4	1	0	5	3,5 %
i	Women		6	2	0	8	5,5 %
j	Men		6	2	0	8	5,5 %
k	Families		5	2	1	8	5,5 %
1	Drivers		2	3	0	5	3,5 %
m	Party goers		2	2	0	4	3%
n	Vulnerable social groups		8	2	1	11	7%
o	Other		1	3	0	4	3%
	Total		82	41	22	146	100 %

6. Conclusions - Highlights

After meeting the Eligibility criteria (evidence base) following featured results were presented out of the Collection of good practice examples aimed to reduce alcohol related harm:

Questionnaire for Collecting the Good Practices was sent in Dec. 2014, the collection phase ended in April 2015.

- from 32 countries, 48 cases were collected, 43 with evidence base (quick scan)
- 56 % of interventions were founded from national/regional/local government (multiple-choice question)
- Implementation: mostly implemented on national level (35 %), followed by implementation on national, regional and local level together (19 %)
- 69 % of the interventions were integrated in the system (the implementation is continuous)
- the collected interventions targeted predominately adolescents (22 cases), parents (17 cases), young adults (15 cases) and adults and general population (13 cases both)
- Collected interventions were evaluated mainly as Process evaluation (48%), Impacts/effects/outcome evaluation (45%). 21 interventions were evaluated using both methods of evaluation.

ANNEX 1

RARHA-WP6 Good practice Toolkit – Collection of GP Examples in EU MS, EEA/EFTA

1. Descriptive statistics – Frequencies (n, %)

- 1.1 Collected cases and proportions of all collected cases/Collected cases per country/Unresponsive countries
- 1.2 Cases per intervention area
- 1.3 Cases with evidence base

1.1 (Table 1) Collected cases and proportions of all collected cases = 48

Country (countries - EU MS + EEA/EFTA= 32	Countries responded	Non- response countries	Nr. of cases per country	Cases with evidence base	Cases without evidence base
Austria	X		3	3	
Belgium		X	0	0	
Bulgaria	X		1	1	
Croatia	X		2	2	
Cyprus	X		1	0	1
Czech Republic		X	0	0	
Denmark		X	0	0	
Estonia		X	0	0	
Finland	X		2	2	
France		X	0	0	
Germany	X		2	2	
Greece	X		2	2	
Hungary		X	0	0	
Iceland		X	0	0	
Ireland	X		2	2	
Italy	X		2	2	
Latvia		X	0	0	
Liechtenstein	X		1	0	1
Lithuania	X		2	2	
Luxembourg	X		1	1	
Malta		X	0	0	
Netherlands	X		2	2	
Norway	X		3	3	
Poland	X		2	2	
Portugal	X		8	5	3
Romania		X	0	0	
Slovakia		X	0	0	
Slovenia	X		3	3	
Spain	X		2	2	
Sweden	X		7	7	
Switzerland		X	0	0	
United Kingdom		X	0	0	
Total = 32 countries	19 (59%)	13 (41%)	48	43 (90%)	5 (10%)

1.2 (Table 2) Collected intervention areas cumulative and proportions of all collected cases (Early Interventions/Public awareness interventions/School-based interventions)

Country	Early interventions	Public awareness/education	School-based
A 1		interventions	interventions
Austria 1		X	
Austria 2	N/	X	
Austria 3	X		
Belgium	N/		
Bulgaria	X		
Croatia 1	X	77	
Croatia 2		X	
Cyprus		X	
Czech Republic			
Denmark			
Estonia			
Finland 1	X		
Finland 2		X	
France			
Germany 1	X		
Germany 2	X		
Greece 1			X
Greece 2			X
Hungary			
Iceland			
Ireland 1	X		
Ireland 2	X		
Italy 1		X	
Italy 2	X		
Latvia			
Liechtenstein			
Lithuania 1			X
Lithuania 2	X		71
Luxembourg	A	X	
Malta		A	
Netherlands 1			X
Netherlands 2	X		Λ
Norway 1	Λ	X	
•	X	Λ	
Norway 2	Λ		v
Norway 3	V		X
Poland 1	X		v
Poland 2			X
Portugal 1		<u> </u>	X
Portugal 2	37		X
Portugal 3	X		
Portugal 4			X
Portugal 5			X
Portugal 6	X		
Portugal 7			X
Portugal 8	X		
Romania			
Slovakia			
Slovenia 1		X	
Slovenia 2		X	

Sweden 7	X		
Sweden 7 Switzerland	X		
Sweden 6	X		
Sweden 5			X
Sweden 4			X
	Α		V
Sweden 3	X		
Sweden 2	X		
Sweden 1	X	·	
Spain 2	X		
Spain 1			X
Slovenia 3			X

1.3 Cases with evidence base – tables:

Legend:

MS = Member state & EEA/EFTA countries

E = **Early interventions**

S = School-based interventions

P = Public awareness/education interventions

A = All interventions together

² Lichtenstein did not provide any further data on their intervention following the questionnaire instructions (no evidence base case of intervention).

(Table 3) Cases with evidence base per intervention area

MS	Early interventions	Public awareness/education interventions	School-based interventions
Austria 1		X	
Austria 2		X	
Austria 3	X		
Bulgaria	X		
Croatia 1	X		
Croatia 2		X	
Finland 1	X		
Finland 2		X	
Germany 1	X		
Germany 2	X		
Greece 1			X
Greece 2			X
Ireland 1	X		
Ireland 2	X		
Italy 1	11	X	+
Italy 2	X	71	
Lithuania 1	TA TA		X
Lithuania 2	X		71
Luxembourg	A	X	
Netherlands 1		A	X
Netherlands 2	X		Λ
Norway 1	Λ	X	
•	X	A	
Norway 2	Λ		X
Norway 3	V		Λ
Poland 1	X		V
Poland 2			X
Portugal 1			X
Portugal 2	77		X
Portugal 3	X		77
Portugal 4			X
Portugal 8	X		
Slovenia 1		X	
Slovenia 2		X	
Slovenia 3			X
Spain 1			X
Spain 2	X		
Sweden 1	X		
Sweden 2	X		
Sweden 3	X		
Sweden 4			X
Sweden 5			X
Sweden 6	X		
Sweden 7	X		
SUM = (countries	21	9	13
= 28 MS + 4			
EEA/EFTA=32			
%/43	49 %	21 %	30 %
Cases total		43 (100%)	

(Table 4) Funding

	Cases with	Multi choice	E	P	S		A
	evidence base	William Choice	L	-	S		11
	(n=43)						
	Variable	a. National/regional/local government	N	N	N	N	, %
	6. Who	b. Institution of education, public					,
	funds/funded	health and/or research					
	your example of	c. Non-governmental organization					
	good practice	d. Private sector					
		company/organization					
		e. Alcohol/ Catering industry					
		f. Other resources		_			
			Е	P	S		A
a	National/regio		16	9	10	35	56%
	nal/local						
b	government Institution of		3	2	3	8	12%
D	education,		3		3	o	1270
	public health						
	and/or						
	research						
С	Non-		5	2	0	7	11%
	governmental			_		,	1170
	organization						
d	Private sector		1	2	0	3	5%
4	company/orga		•	_			370
	nization						
e	Alcohol/		0	1	0	1	2%
	Catering					_	_, -
	industry						
f	Other		3	3	3	9	14%
	resources		,				
	Total		28	19	16	63	100
			-	D	G		%
			Е	P	S		A
	ab		1	1	1		3
ø	ac		3	0	0		3
ations	ad		0	1	0		1
ina	af		0	3	0		3
Combin	abc		1	1	0		2
ŭ	abf		0	0	1		1
	df		1	0	0		1
	acde MS	Апстионе	0	1	0		1
1	Austria 1	Answers A					
2	Austria 2	A, c, d, e					
3	Austria 3	A, c, d, e					
4	Bulgaria	A, b					
5	Croatia 1	A, U					
6	Croatia 2	A, f					
7	Finland 1	d, f					
8	Finland 2	A, f					
9	Germany 1	A, 1 A, c					
10	Germany 2	A, c					
11	Greece 1	A					
12	Greece 2	A					
13	Ireland 1	A					
13	ii Cianu i	Λ					

14	Ireland 2	F	
15	Italy 1	A, f	
16	Italy 2	A	Multi choice
17	Lithuania 1	F	a. National/regional/local
18	Lithuania 2	F	government
19	Luxembourg	A, b, c	b. Institution of education, public
20	Netherlands 1	A	health and/or research
21	Netherlands 2	В	c. Non-governmental organization
22	Norway 1	A	d. Private sector
23	Norway 2	A	company/organization
24	Norway 3	A	e. Alcohol/ Catering industry f. Other resources
25	Poland 1	A	1. Other resources
26	Poland 2	A	
27	Portugal 1	A	
28	Portugal 2	F	
29	Portugal 3	C	
30	Portugal 4	В	
31	Portugal 8	A, b, c	
32	Slovenia 1	A, d	
33	Slovenia 2	A, b	
34	Slovenia 3	A	
35	Spain 1	A, b, f	
36	Spain 2	A	
37	Sweden 1	A	
38	Sweden 2	A	
39	Sweden 3	A, c	
40	Sweden 4	A	
41	Sweden 5	A, b	
42	Sweden 6	A	
43	Sweden 7	A	

(Table 5) Level of implementation

	Cases with evidence base (n= 43)	Multi choice	E	P	S	All	I.
	Variable 7. What is/was the level of implementation of your example of good practice	a. National b. Regional c. Local (municipality level) d. Other	N	N	N	N, 9	%
			Е	P	S	A	
a	National		12	7	7	26	40%
b	Regional		9	5	5	19	29%
c	Local (municipality level)		5	6	5	16	25%
d	Other		2	0	2	4	6%
	Total		28	18	19	65	100
							%
			E	P	S	A	
	ab		2	0	0	2	
S	ac		0	0	1	1	
ıtio	bc		0	1	0	1	
bing	ad		0	0	1	1	
Combinations	bd		1	0	0	1	
Č	abc		2	3	1	6	
	abcd		0	1	1	2	

	MS	Answers	
1	Austria 1	С	
2	Austria 2	Вс	1
3	Austria 3	В	1
4	Bulgaria	В	1
5	Croatia 1	Abc	1
6	Croatia 2	A]
7	Finland 1	A]
8	Finland 2	Abc	
9	Germany 1	A	
10	Germany 2	В	
11	Greece 1	С	Multi choice
12	Greece 2	В	a. National
13	Ireland 1	С	b. Regional
14	Ireland 2	A	c. Local (municipality level)
15	Italy 1	abc	d. Other
16	Italy 2	abc	u. other
17	Lithuania 1	A	
18	Lithuania 2	D	
19	Luxembourg	abc	
20	Netherlands 1	Ac	
21	Netherlands 2	A	
22	Norway 1	abc	
23	Norway 2	A	
24	Norway 3	D	
25	Poland 1	A	
26	Poland 2	A	
27	Portugal 1	abc	
28	Portugal 2	A	
29	Portugal 3	C	
30	Portugal 4	D	
31	Portugal 8	C	
32	Slovenia 1	A	-
33	Slovenia 2	A	
34	Slovenia 3	A	
35	Spain 1	Bc	
36	Spain 2	В	-
37	Sweden 1	A	-
38	Sweden 2	Ab	-
39	Sweden 3	A	-
40	Sweden 4	В	-
41	Sweden 5	abc	-
42	Sweden 6	Ab	-
43	Sweden 7	В	

(Table 6) Inclusion into a broader national/regional/ local policy or action plan

Cases with evidence base (n=		E	P	S	A

	42)							
	43)		•	N.T.	N.I.	N	N.T.	0/
	Variable	a. yes	b. no	N	N	N	N,	%
	10. Is your example of good							
	practice embedded in a broader							
	national/regional/ local policy or							
	action plan?			Е	D	S		٨
	7100				P 9	8		A 77
a	yes			16	9	0	33	77 %
b	no			5	0	5	10	23
	10						10	%
	Total			21	9	13	43	100
								%
	MS	Ans	swer					
1	Austria 1	X						
2	Austria 2	X						
3	Austria 3	X						
4	Bulgaria		X					
5	Croatia 1	X						
6	Croatia 2	X						
7	Finland 1	X						
8	Finland 2	X						
9	Germany 1	X						
10	Germany 2		X					
11	Greece 1	X						
12	Greece 2	X						
13	Ireland 1	X						
14	Ireland 2	X						
15	Italy 1	X						
16	Italy 2	X						
17	Lithuania 1		X					
18	Lithuania 2		X					
19	Luxembourg	X						
20	Netherlands 1	X						
21	Netherlands 2		X					
22	Norway 1	X						
23	Norway 2	X						
24	Norway 3	X						
25	Poland 1	X						
26	Poland 2		X					
27	Portugal 1	X						
28	Portugal 2	X						
29	Portugal 3		X					
30	Portugal 4		X					
31	Portugal 8	X						
32	Slovenia 1	X						
33	Slovenia 2	X						
34	Slovenia 3		X					
35	Spain 1		X					
36	Spain 2	X						
37	Sweden 1	X						
38	Sweden 2	X						
39	Sweden 3	X						
40	Sweden 4	X						
41	Sweden 5	X						
42	Sweden 6	X						
43	Sweden 7	X						

(Table 7) Stakeholder involvement in the development phase

	Cases with evidence	Multi choice	E	P	S	l A	4
	base (n= 43)						
	Variable 12. Which of these stakeholders were involved in the development of your example of good practice	a. Target groups b. Intermediate target groups c. Economic operators d. Government e. Funders f. Researchers g. Representatives of civil society (NGOs) h. Other	N	N	N	N, %	
			Е	P	S	F	4
a	Target groups		10	6	5	21	13 %
b	Intermediate target groups		15	6	12	33	21 %
С	Economic operators		0	5	0	5	3%
d	Government		15	8	6	29	18 %
e	Funders		5	4	1	10	6%
f	Researchers		13	7	8	28	18 %
g	Representatives of civil		5	5	5	15	10
h	society (NGOs) Other		7	5	5	17	% 11
n	Other		/	3	3	1/	%
	Total		70	46	42	158	100
	MS	Answer					70
1	Austria 1	abcdef					
2	Austria 2	abcdefgh					
3	Austria 3	bd	_				
4	Bulgaria	bd					
5	Croatia 1	abdg	4	M	ulti cho	ico	
6	Croatia 2	bcdf	a Tar	get gro		lice	
7	Finland 1	befgh				et grou	ns
9	Finland 2 Germany 1	abcdfh afg			operat		P~
10	Germany 2	aig af		vernme			
11	Greece 1	bh	e. Fur				
12	Greece 2	bdg		earche			
13	Ireland 1	d			atives o	of civil	
14	Ireland 2	beh	societ h. Oth	y (NG	OS)		
15	Italy 1	defgh	11. Ott	101			
16	Italy 2	adefh					
17	Lithuania 1	bfh					
18	Lithuania 2	abdh	4				
19 20	Luxembourg	abdg	4				
20	Netherlands 1 Netherlands 2	abfh abdfh	+				
22	Norway 1	adgh	†				
23	Norway 2	abd	1				
24	Norway 3	bdfg	1				
25	Poland 1	bdef	1				
	1 Olana 1		_				
26	Poland 2	abdef					
26 27	Poland 2 Portugal 1						
26	Poland 2	abdef					

30	Portugal 4	abf
31	Portugal 8	bdgh
32	Slovenia 1	fh
33	Slovenia 2	abcdefg
34	Slovenia 3	bdfg
35	Spain 1	b
36	Spain 2	abdf
37	Sweden 1	bdef
38	Sweden 2	fg
39	Sweden 3	bf
40	Sweden 4	abdfg
41	Sweden 5	h
42	Sweden 6	abdfh
43	Sweden 7	df

(Table 8) Rationale or logical framework of Good Practice

	Cases with evidence base (n= 43)	Multi choice	E	P	S		A
	Variable 13. Please describe the logic model (the rationale or logical framework) of your example of good practice	a. Scientific evidence b. Past experience c. Other	N	N	N	N,	, %
	practice		Е	P	S		A
a	Scientific evidence		20	8	13	41	63
	<u> </u>						%
b	Past experience		9	5	7	21	32 %
c	Other		2	1	0	3	5%
	Total		31	14	20	65	100 %
	ab		7	5	7	1	19
ns	ac		1	0	0	1	
Combinations	Abc		1	0	0		1
	MS	Answer					
1	Austria 1	Ab					
2	Austria 2	Ab					
3	Austria 3	Ab					
4	Bulgaria	A					
5	Croatia 1	A					
6	Croatia 2	C					
7	Finland 1	В					
8	Finland 2	Ab					
9	Germany 1	A					
10	Germany 2	A					
11	Greece 1	Ab		Mıı	lti cho	ice	
12	Greece 2	Ab		1 11U			
13	Ireland 1	A	- 2	. Scien	tific ev	ridenc	e
14	Ireland 2	Ac	` ا	b. Pas			-
15	Italy 1	Ab			. Other		
16	Italy 2	Ab					
17	Lithuania 1	A					

18	Lithuania 2	Ab	
19	Luxembourg	A	
20	Netherlands 1	Ab	
21	Netherlands 2	Ab	
22	Norway 1	Ab	
23	Norway 2	Ab	
24	Norway 3	Ab	
25	Poland 1	A	
26	Poland 2	A	
27	Portugal 1	Ab	
28	Portugal 2	A	
29	Portugal 3	Abc	
30	Portugal 4	Ab	
31	Portugal 8	Ab	
32	Slovenia 1	A	
33	Slovenia 2	A	
34	Slovenia 3	Ab	
35	Spain 1	A	
36	Spain 2	A	
37	Sweden 1	A	
38	Sweden 2	A	
39	Sweden 3	A	
40	Sweden 4	A	
41	Sweden 5	A	
42	Sweden 6	Ab	
43	Sweden 7	A	

	Cases with	Multi choice	E	P	S		1
	evidence base	With Choice	II.	1	3	1	1
	(n=43)						
	Variable	a. Literature review and/or formative	N	N	N	N,	%
	14. Elements of	research				_	
	planning	b. Needs assessment					
		c. Detailed plan of action					
		d. Financial plan					
		e. Human resource management plan f. Time schedule					
		g. Partners agreement					
		h. Communication plan					
		i. Evaluation plan					
		j. Other					
			Е	P	S		A
a	Literature		18	9	11	38	13
	review and/or						%
	formative						
L.	research Needs		18	7	10	35	12
b	assessment		18	/	10	33	12 %
c	Detailed plan of		15	8	12	35	12
	action		13	0	12	33	%
d	Financial plan		13	8	8	29	10
	.						%
e	Human resource		13	7	10	30	10
	management						%
_	plan			-			
f	Time schedule		16	9	11	36	12
_	Partners		13	6	10	29	% 9%
g	agreement		13	0	10	29	9%
h	Communication		8	9	6	23	8%
	plan						070
i	Evaluation plan		17	9	11	37	12
	_						%
j	Other		3	0	3	6	2%
	Total		116	63	81	260	100
			Б	n	C		%
	A adafah:	1	E	P	S	I	ł
	Acdefghi Abcdefghi	1 12	3	5	4	1	2
	Acdfgi	2	J	J	-	1	
	Abefi	1					
	Abdefgi	1	•				
	Acdefghij	1					
	Abcdefgi	2					
	Abcfi	1					
	Abcdefghij	2					
	Bc	1					
	Abcfghi	1					
	Abfhi	2					
	Abe	2					
	Acdfhi	1 1					
ons	Cdfg Abcdefgh	1					
nati	Abcefi	1					
Combinations	Abcefghi	1					
Co	Abcdefhi	1	•				
	1	1					

	A 1 1	1	T
	Abdij	1	
	Abcdi	1	
	Cdefgi	1	
	j	1	
	Bcdfgi	1	
	MS	Answer	
1	Austria 1	Acdefghi	
2	Austria 2	Abcdefghi	
3	Austria 3	Acdfgi	
4	Bulgaria	Abefi	
5	Croatia 1	Abdefgi	
6	Croatia 2	Abcdefghi	
7	Finland 1	Acdefghij	35.10.1
8	Finland 2	Abcdefghi	Multi choice
9	Germany 1	Abcdefghi	a. Literature review and/or
10	Germany 2	Abcdefgi	formative research
11	Greece 1	Abcfi	b. Needs assessment c. Detailed plan of action
12	Greece 2	Abcdefghij	d. Financial plan
13	Ireland 1	Bc	e. Human resource management
14	Ireland 2	Abcfghi	plan
15	Italy 1	Abfhi	f. Time schedule
16	Italy 2	Abfhi	g. Partners agreement
17	Lithuania 1	Acdfgi	h. Communication plan
18	Lithuania 2	Abe	i. Evaluation plan
19	Luxembourg	Abcdefghi	j. Other
20	Netherlands 1	Abcdefghi	j. Giller
21	Netherlands 2	Abcdefghi	
22	Norway 1	Acdfhi	
23	Norway 2	Cdfg	
24	Norway 3	Abcdefgh	
25	Poland 1	Abcefi	
26	Poland 2	Abcefgi	
27	Portugal 1	Abcefgi	
28	Portugal 2	Abcei	
29	Portugal 3	Abe	
30	Portugal 4	Abcdefghi	
31	Portugal 8	Abcefghi	
32	Slovenia 1	Abcdefhi	
33	Slovenia 2	Abcdefghi	
34	Slovenia 3	Abcdefghi	
35	Spain 1	Abcdefghi	
36	Spain 2	Abcdefghi	
37	Sweden 1	Abcdefghij	
38	Sweden 2	Abdij	
39	Sweden 3	Abedi	
40	Sweden 4	Cdefgi	
41	Sweden 5	J	
42	Sweden 6	Abcdefgi	
43	Sweden 7	Bedfgi	
	~ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	500151	l .

			I -				
	Cases with evidence base (n= 43)	Multi choice ³	E	P	S		A
	Variable	a. Continuous (integrated in	N	N	N	N	, %
	15. Implementation of your	the system)	11	11	11	119	, , ,
	example of good practice	b. Periodic					
	is/was	c. Single					
	2	8	Е	P	S		A
a	Continuous (integrated in		12	5	10	27	69
'	the system)					'	%
b	Periodic		3	1	1	5	13 %
c	Single		4	1	2	7	18 %
	Total		19	7	13	39	100 %
			E	P	S		A
. <u>.</u>	bc		2	0	0		2
Combi	ab		0	1	0		1
0 1	ac		0	1	0		1
	MS	Answer					
1	Austria 1	A					
2	Austria 2	A	_	3.5	1 1		
3	Austria 3	A	_	Mu	lti cho	ice	
4	Bulgaria	A			- C-4-	41	1
5	Croatia 1	Bc		ntinuou	is (inte	grated	ıın
6	Croatia 2	C	b. Per	stem)			
7	Finland 1	A	c. Sin				
8	Finland 2	A	C. Sili	gie			
9	Germany 1	A					
10	Germany 2	В	4				
11	Greece 1	A	4				
12	Greece 2	A	4				
13	Ireland 1	A	_				
14	Ireland 2	Bc	_				
15	Italy 1	Ab	_				
16	Italy 2	В	_				
17	Lithuania 1	A	_				
18	Lithuania 2	A	1				
19 20	Luxembourg Netherlands 1	A A	1				
21	Netherlands 2	C	1				
22	Norway 1	В	1				
23	Norway 2	A	1				
24	Norway 3	A	1				
25	Poland 1	A	1				
26	Poland 2	A	1				
27	Portugal 1	A	1				
28	Portugal 2	A	1				
29	Portugal 3	C	1				
30	Portugal 4	C	1				
31	Portugal 8	A	1				
32	Slovenia 1	Ac	1				
33	Slovenia 2	A	1				
34	Slovenia 3	В	1				
35	Spain 1	A	1				
36	Spain 2	A	1				
	- p	·					

_

³ There was only one possible answer

37	Sweden 1	A	
38	Sweden 2	С	
39	Sweden 3	С	
40	Sweden 4	С	
41	Sweden 5	A	
42	Sweden 6	A	
43	Sweden 7	В	

(Table 11) Target groups

	Cases with	Multi choice	E	P	S	l A	A
	evidence base						
	(n=43)						
	Variable	a. General population	N	N	N	N,	%
	16. Target groups	b. Children (before adolescence time)					
		c. Adolescents					
		d. Young adults					
		e. Adults					
		f. Elderly population					
		g. Parents					
		h. Pregnant women					
		i. Women					
		j. Men k. Families					
		1. Drivers					
		m. Party goers					
		n. Vulnerable social groups					
		o. Other					
		o. omer	Е	P	S	F	A
a	General		7	6	1	13	9%
	population		_	_			
b	Children (before		3	3	2	8	5,5
	adolescence						%
	time)		_				1.5
c	Adolescents		7	4	11	22	15 %
d	Young adults		11	4	0	15	10
u	1 oung addits		11	7	U	13	%
e	Adults		7	5	1	13	9%
f	Elderly		4	1	0	5	3,5
	population						%
g	Parents		9	3	5	17	12
							%
h	Pregnant women		4	1	0	5	3,5
<u> </u>			_				%
i	Women		6	2	0	8	5,5
	3.6			_			%
j	Men		6	2	0	8	5,5
1,	Eamilias		F	2	1	o	% 5.5
k	Families		5	2	1	8	5,5 %
1	Drivers		2	3	0	5	3,5
1	Dilveis			3	"	3	3,5 %
m	Party goers		2	2	0	4	3%
n	Vulnerable		8	2	1	11	7%
	social groups						
0	Other		1	3	0	4	3%
	Total		82	41	22	146	100

			0/0
	cde	1	
	abcdegijklmn	1	
	cdg	1	
	degijk	1	
	cden	1	
	elo	1	
,	a	3	
,	abcd	1	
	bgn	1	
	cgn	1	
	c	5	
	ce	1	
	adefghijklmn	1	
	abcdefghijklmn	1	
	0	2	
ion	cg	3	
nat	cdn	1	
Combinations	aeg	1	
S	h	1	
	bgkn	1	
	abcgk	1	
	bcg	1	
	cn	1	
	en	1	
	adefgijkln	1	
	ao	1	
	cg	1	
	adefhij	1	
	adefij	1	
	cd	2	
	g	1	
	aeghk	1	
	dijm	1	
	MS	Answer	
1	Austria 1	cde	
2	Austria 2	abcdegijklmn	
3	Austria 3	cdg	
4	Bulgaria	degijk	Multi choice
5	Croatia 1	cden	
6	Croatia 2	elo	a. General population
7	Finland 1	a	b. Children (before adolescence time)
8	Finland 2	abcd	c. Adolescents
9	Germany 1	bgn	d. Young adults
10	Germany 2	cgn	e. Adults
11	Greece 1	c	f. Elderly population
12	Greece 2	ce	g. Parents
13	Ireland 1	adefghijklmn	h. Pregnant women
14	Ireland 2	a	i. Women
15	Italy 1	abcdefghijklmn	j. Men
16	Italy 2	0	k. Families
17	Lithuania 1	cg	1. Drivers
18	Lithuania 2	cdn	m. Party goers
19	Luxembourg	aeg	n. Vulnerable social groups o. Other
20	Netherlands 1	cg	O. Ouici
21	Netherlands 2	h	
22	Norway 1	0	

23	Norway 2	bgkn
24	Norway 3	abegk
25	Poland 1	bcg
26	Poland 2	b
27	Portugal 1	cn
28	Portugal 2	c
29	Portugal 3	en
30	Portugal 4	c
31	Portugal 8	adefgijkln
32	Slovenia 1	a
33	Slovenia 2	ao
34	Slovenia 3	cg
35	Spain 1	c
36	Spain 2	adefhij
37	Sweden 1	adefij
38	Sweden 2	cd
39	Sweden 3	cd
40	Sweden 4	c
41	Sweden 5	g
42	Sweden 6	aeghk
43	Sweden 7	dijm

(Table 12) Communication channels

	Cases with	Multi choice	E	P	S	A
--	------------	--------------	---	---	---	---

	evidence base							
	(n=43)							
	Variable	a. Television	N	N	N	N,	%	
	17.Which	b. Radio						
	communication	c. Newspapers and magazines						
	channels were	d. Billboards						
	used	e. Brochures/leaflets/items						
		f. Telephone/mobile						
		g. Social media						
		h. Website						
		i. E-mail						
		j. Meetings/conferences with experts/colleagues						
		k. Direct communication						
		l. Guidelines						
		m. Scientific publications						
		n. Other						
			Е	P	S	A	4	
a	Television		2	7	1	10	4%	
b	Radio		2	8	0	10	4%	
С	Newspapers and		5	8	3	16	6%	
.1	magazines		0	-	0	_	20/	
d	Billboards Brochures/leaflet		13	5	8	5 30	2% 11	
e	s/items		13	9	ð	30	%	
f	Telephone/mobil		5	2	1	8	3%	
1	e			_	1	0	3 70	
g	Social media		6	5	3	14	5%	
g h	Website		12	9	10	31	12	
							%	
i	E-mail		9	8	6	23	9%	
j	Meetings/confere		15	9	12	36	14	
	nces with						%	
	experts/colleague							
k	S Direct		13	8	7	28	10	
K	communication		13	o	′	20	%	
1	Guidelines		7	6	9	22	8%	
m	Scientific		10	4	7	21	8%	
	publications			-	•		0,0	
n	Other		4	5	1	10	4%	
	Total		103	93	68	264	100	
							%	
	MS	Answer		3.5	1	•		
1	Austria 1	abcdeghijkln	_ Tal	MI evision	ulti cho	oice		
3	Austria 2 Austria 3	abcdeghijklmn fkn			l			
4	Bulgaria	efjklm	b. Radio					
5	Croatia 1	kn		c. Newspapers and magazines d. Billboards				
6	Croatia 2	efhijki		e. Brochures/leaflets/items				
7	Finland 1	efhijkn	f. Telephone/mobile					
8	Finland 2	bcehijkmn		cial me	dia			
9	Germany 1	ehjm	h. We					
10	Germany 2	ekm	i. E-n				:41.	
11	Greece 1	ehjk				nces w	ıtn	
12	Greece 2	acefijkl		ts/colle	agues nmunic	eation		
13	Ireland 1	ejk		delines		anon		
14	Ireland 2	bcehik			public	ations		
15	Italy 1	abceghijkln			1			

16	Italy 2	ghijkl	n. Other
17	Lithuania 1	ghijklm	
18	Lithuania 2	jl	
19	Luxembourg	abcdefhijklmn	
20	Netherlands 1	ehijlm	
21	Netherlands 2	ceghijklm	
22	Norway 1	abcdeghijk	
23	Norway 2	eghi	
24	Norway 3	eghim	
25	Poland 1	ejm	
26	Poland 2	cehijklm	
27	Portugal 1	hjklmn	
28	Portugal 2	jk	
29	Portugal 3	gi	
30	Portugal 4	jlm	
31	Portugal 8	fijk	
32	Slovenia 1	abcdehjl	
33	Slovenia 2	abceghijkmn	
34	Slovenia 3	eghijklm	
35	Spain 1	chj	
36	Spain 2	cehijklm	
37	Sweden 1	abceghjklmn	
38	Sweden 2	hjm	
39	Sweden 3	ghjm	
40	Sweden 4	ehjl	
41	Sweden 5	ehjl	
42	Sweden 6	acefhijlm	
43	Sweden 7	ehjk	

(Table 13) Supportive activities

Cases with evidence base	Multi choice	E	P	S	A

	(n= 43)						
	Variable	a. Consultancy	N	N	N	N,	%
	20. What supportive	b. Supervision					
	activities are/have been	c. Training					
	carried out?	d. Team meetings					
		e. Helpdesk					
		f. None					
		g. Other					
			Е	P	S	A	A
a	Consultancy		12	7	9	28	22
							%
b	Supervision		8	4	7	19	15
	•			1	'		%
c	Training		14	7	11	32	25
					, i		%
d	Team meetings		13	8	11	32	25
							%
e	Helpdesk		2	3	3	8	6%
f	None		1	0	0	1	1%
g	Other		4	1	3	8	6%
	Total		54	30	44	128	100
							%
	MS	Answer					
1	Austria 1	Abcd					
2	Austria 2	Acd					
3	Austria 3	A			ulti cho	ice	
4	Bulgaria	bd		nsultan			
5	Croatia 1	bfg		pervisio	on		
6	Croatia 2	abcd	c. Tra				
7	Finland 1	aceg		am mee	etings		
8	Finland 2	abcdeg		lpdesk			
9	Germany 1	abcd	f. No				
10	Germany 2	acg	g. Otl	ner			
11	Greece 1	dg					
12	Greece 2	bcde					
13	Ireland 1	acd					
14	Ireland 2	c					
15	Italy 1	abcde					
16	Italy 2	abcd	\dashv				
17	Lithuania 1		\dashv				
18		acd	\dashv				
18	Lithuania 2	c cdh	\dashv				
20	Luxembourg		\dashv				
	Netherlands 1	abcde	-				
21	Netherlands 2	abcd	-				
22	Norway 1	a abad	\dashv				
23	Norway 2	abcd	_				
24	Norway 3	acde	_				
25	Poland 1	ad	_				
26	Poland 2	abcd	_				
27	Portugal 1	abcd	_				
28	Portugal 2	bc	_				
29	Portugal 3	cd	_				
30	Portugal 4	ad	_				
31	Portugal 8	d	_				
32							
	Slovenia 1	d					
33	Slovenia 1 Slovenia 2	d acd					

36	Spain 2	abcde	
37	Sweden 1	abcd	
38	Sweden 2	g	
39	Sweden 3	d	
40	Sweden 4	acd	
41	Sweden 5	abcd	
42	Sweden 6	acd	
43	Sweden 7	c	

(Table 14) Who did the evaluation?

	Cases with evidence base	Multi choice	E	P	S		A
	(n=43)						
	Variable	a. An external party	N	N	N	I	N,%
	21. Who did the	b. An internal party					
	evaluation?	c. Both – internal and external					
		parties					
			Е	P	S		A
a	An external		3	3	1	7	17%
	party						
b	An internal party		9	3	7	19	45%
С	Both – internal		8	3	5	16	38%
	and external						
	parties						
	Total		20	9	13	42	100%
	MS	Answer		•		•	
1	Austria 1	a					
2	Austria 2	a					
3	Austria 3	a					
4	Bulgaria	c					
5	Croatia 1	b					
6	Croatia 2	c					
7	Finland 1	c					
8	Finland 2	b					
9	Germany 1	c					
10	Germany 2	b					
11	Greece 1	c					
12	Greece 2	b					
13	Ireland 1	b					
14	Ireland 2	b					
15	Italy 1	С					
16	Italy 2	c					
17	Lithuania 1	b					
18	Lithuania 2	b					
19	Luxembourg	a	_				
20	Netherlands 1	c					
21	Netherlands 2	b	4				
22	Norway 1	c	4				
23	Norway 2	a					
24	Norway 3	c	-				
25	Poland 1	b	-				
26	Poland 2	b					
27	Portugal 1	b	-				
28	Portugal 2	b	_				
29	Portugal 3	missing					

2.0	- 11	
30	Portugal 4	b
31	Portugal 8	c
32	Slovenia 1	b
33	Slovenia 2	b
34	Slovenia 3	c
35	Spain 1	b
36	Spain 2	b
37	Sweden 1	С
38	Sweden 2	b
39	Sweden 3	a
40	Sweden 4	a
41	Sweden 5	c
42	Sweden 6	c
43	Sweden 7	С

(Table 15) What has been measured/evaluated?

	Cases with evidence base (n= 43)	Multi choice	Е	P	S	A	
	Variable 22. What has been measured/ evaluated?	a. Process evaluation b. Evaluation of the impacts/effects/outcome c. Other	N	N	N	N,	%
a	Process evaluation		16	6	12	34	48 %
b	Evaluation of the impacts/effects/ outcome		15	6	11	32	45 %
c	Other		3	2	0	5	7%
	Total		34	14	23	71	100 %
			E	P	S	A	1
7.0	ab		8	3	10	2	
Ous	ac		2	2	0	2	
Combinations	abc		_	0	, and the second	_	
	MS	Answer					
1	Austria 1	a					
2	Austria 2	ab		Multi	i choice		
3	Austria 3	abc	_				
4	Bulgaria	b		s evaluation	. / 00		
5	Croatia 1	ab	b. Evaluation of the impacts/effects/outcome c. Other				
6	Croatia 2	b					
7	Finland 1	abc					
8	Finland 2	ab					
9	Germany 1	ab					
10	Germany 2	ab					
11	Greece 1	ab					
12	Greece 2	a					
13	Ireland 1	a					
14	Ireland 2	a					
15	Italy 1	ac	-				
16	Italy 2	abc					

17	Lithuania 1	ab	
18	Lithuania 2	a	
19	Luxembourg	b	
20	Netherlands 1	ab	
21	Netherlands 2	ab	
22	Norway 1	ab	
23	Norway 2	a	
24	Norway 3	ab	
25	Poland 1	ab	
26	Poland 2	ab	
27	Portugal 1	ab	
28	Portugal 2	ab	
29	Portugal 3	missing	
30	Portugal 4	ab	
31	Portugal 8	b	
32	Slovenia 1	b	
33	Slovenia 2	a	
34	Slovenia 3	ab	
35	Spain 1	ab	
36	Spain 2	ab	
37	Sweden 1	ab	
38	Sweden 2	b	
39	Sweden 3	b	
40	Sweden 4	a	
41	Sweden 5	b	
42	Sweden 6	ab	
43	Sweden 7	a	