

# 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)
	<b>WP 6/RARHA JA - Contact Info</b>	Person(s)	Person(s)	Person(s)
<b>MS</b>		Name: Affiliation: Work Area: Email: Telephone:	Name: Affiliation: Work Area: Email: Telephone:	Name: Affiliation: Work Area: Email: 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.



	10. Is your example of good practice embedded in a broader national/regional/local policy or action plan?								
<b>Development (including preparation, planning and core processes)</b>									
	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								
<b>Implementation</b>									
	15. Implementation of your example of good practice is/was								
	16. Target groups								
	17. Which communication channels were used								
	20. What supportive activities are/have been carried out?								
<b>Evaluation</b>									
	21. Who did the evaluation?								
	22. What has been measured / evaluated?								

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 evidence 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 <sup>1</sup> (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 comprehensible 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?

Yes /No

### Results:

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 = 28 MS + 4 EEA/EFTA= 32)	21	9	13
%/43	49 %	21 %	30 %
Cases total	43 (100%)		

## 5.4 Funding

	Cases with evidence base (n= 43)	Multi choice	E	P	S	A
	<b>Variable 6. Who funds/funded your example of good practice</b>	a. National/regional/local government b. Institution of education, public health and/or research c. Non-governmental organization d. Private sector company/organization e. Alcohol/ Catering industry f. Other resources	N	N	N	N, %
			E	P	S	A
<b>a</b>	<b>National/regional/local government</b>		16	9	10	35 56%
<b>b</b>	<b>Institution of education, public health and/or research</b>		3	2	3	8 12%
<b>c</b>	<b>Non-governmental organization</b>		5	2	0	7 11%
<b>d</b>	<b>Private sector company/organization</b>		1	2	0	3 5%
<b>e</b>	<b>Alcohol/ Catering industry</b>		0	1	0	1 2%
<b>f</b>	<b>Other resources</b>		3	3	3	9 14%
	<b>Total</b>		28	19	16	63 100 %
			E	P	S	A
Combinations	ab		1	1	1	3
	ac		3	0	0	3
	ad		0	1	0	1
	af		0	3	0	3
	abc		1	1	0	2
	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	E	P	S	A	
	<b>Variable</b> 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, %	
			E	P	S	A	
<b>a</b>	<b>Target groups</b>		10	6	5	21	13%
<b>b</b>	<b>Intermediate target groups</b>		15	6	12	33	21%
<b>c</b>	<b>Economic operators</b>		0	5	0	5	3%
<b>d</b>	<b>Government</b>		15	8	6	29	18%
<b>e</b>	<b>Funders</b>		5	4	1	10	6%
<b>f</b>	<b>Researchers</b>		13	7	8	28	18%
<b>g</b>	<b>Representatives of civil society (NGOs)</b>		5	5	5	15	10%
<b>h</b>	<b>Other</b>		7	5	5	17	11%
	<b>Total</b>		70	46	42	158	100%

## 5.6 Target groups

	Cases with evidence base (n= 43)	Multi choice	E	P	S	A	
	<b>Variable</b> 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 i. Women j. Men k. Families l. Drivers m. Party goers n. Vulnerable social groups o. Other	N	N	N	N, %	
			E	P	S	A	
a	<b>General population</b>		7	6	1	13	9%
b	<b>Children (before adolescence time)</b>		3	3	2	8	5,5 %
c	<b>Adolescents</b>		7	4	11	22	15 %
d	<b>Young adults</b>		11	4	0	15	10 %
e	<b>Adults</b>		7	5	1	13	9%
f	<b>Elderly population</b>		4	1	0	5	3,5 %
g	<b>Parents</b>		9	3	5	17	12 %
h	<b>Pregnant women</b>		4	1	0	5	3,5 %
i	<b>Women</b>		6	2	0	8	5,5 %
j	<b>Men</b>		6	2	0	8	5,5 %
k	<b>Families</b>		5	2	1	8	5,5 %
l	<b>Drivers</b>		2	3	0	5	3,5 %
m	<b>Party goers</b>		2	2	0	4	3%
n	<b>Vulnerable social groups</b>		8	2	1	11	7%
o	<b>Other</b>		1	3	0	4	3%
	<b>Total</b>		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	
<b>Total = 32 countries</b>	<b>19 (59%)</b>	<b>13 (41%)</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>43 (90%)</b>	<b>5 (10%)</b>

**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 interventions	School-based interventions
Austria 1		X	
Austria 2		X	
Austria 3	X		
Belgium			
Bulgaria	X		
Croatia 1	X		
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		
Luxembourg		X	
Malta			
Netherlands 1			X
Netherlands 2	X		
Norway 1		X	
Norway 2	X		
Norway 3			X
Poland 1	X		
Poland 2			X
Portugal 1			X
Portugal 2			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	

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		
Switzerland			
United Kingdom			
<b>SUM = (countries = 28 MS + 4 EEA/EFTA= 32</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>%/48</b>	<b>46 %</b>	<b>21 %</b>	<b>33 %</b>
<b>Cases total</b>	<b>48<sup>2</sup> (100%)</b>		

### 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**

---

<sup>2</sup> 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		X	
Italy 2	X		
Lithuania 1			X
Lithuania 2	X		
Luxembourg		X	
Netherlands 1			X
Netherlands 2	X		
Norway 1		X	
Norway 2	X		
Norway 3			X
Poland 1	X		
Poland 2			X
Portugal 1			X
Portugal 2			X
Portugal 3	X		
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		
<b>SUM = (countries = 28 MS + 4 EEA/EFTA= 32</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>%/43</b>	<b>49 %</b>	<b>21 %</b>	<b>30 %</b>
<b>Cases total</b>	<b>43 (100%)</b>		

(Table 4) Funding

	Cases with evidence base (n= 43)	Multi choice	E	P	S	A
	<b>Variable</b> 6. Who funds/funded your example of good practice	a. National/regional/local government b. Institution of education, public health and/or research c. Non-governmental organization d. Private sector company/organization e. Alcohol/ Catering industry f. Other resources	N	N	N	N, %
			E	P	S	A
<b>a</b>	<b>National/regional/local government</b>		16	9	10	35 56%
<b>b</b>	<b>Institution of education, public health and/or research</b>		3	2	3	8 12%
<b>c</b>	<b>Non-governmental organization</b>		5	2	0	7 11%
<b>d</b>	<b>Private sector company/organization</b>		1	2	0	3 5%
<b>e</b>	<b>Alcohol/ Catering industry</b>		0	1	0	1 2%
<b>f</b>	<b>Other resources</b>		3	3	3	9 14%
	<b>Total</b>		28	19	16	63 100 %
			E	P	S	A
Combinations	<b>ab</b>		1	1	1	3
	<b>ac</b>		3	0	0	3
	<b>ad</b>		0	1	0	1
	<b>af</b>		0	3	0	3
	<b>abc</b>		1	1	0	2
	<b>abf</b>		0	0	1	1
	<b>df</b>		1	0	0	1
	<b>acde</b>		0	1	0	1
	<b>MS</b>	<b>Answers</b>				
1	Austria 1	A				
2	Austria 2	A, c, d, e				
3	Austria 3	A				
4	Bulgaria	A, b				
5	Croatia 1	A				
6	Croatia 2	A, f				
7	Finland 1	d, f				
8	Finland 2	A, f				
9	Germany 1	A, c				
10	Germany 2	A, c				
11	Greece 1	A				
12	Greece 2	A				
13	Ireland 1	A				

14	Ireland 2	F	<b>Multi choice</b> a. National/regional/local government b. Institution of education, public health and/or research c. Non-governmental organization d. Private sector company/organization e. Alcohol/ Catering industry f. Other resources
15	Italy 1	A, f	
16	Italy 2	A	
17	Lithuania 1	F	
18	Lithuania 2	F	
19	Luxembourg	A, b, c	
20	Netherlands 1	A	
21	Netherlands 2	B	
22	Norway 1	A	
23	Norway 2	A	
24	Norway 3	A	
25	Poland 1	A	
26	Poland 2	A	
27	Portugal 1	A	
28	Portugal 2	F	
29	Portugal 3	C	
30	Portugal 4	B	
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.
	<b>Variable</b> 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, %
			E	P	S	A
<b>a</b>	<b>National</b>		12	7	7	26 40%
<b>b</b>	<b>Regional</b>		9	5	5	19 29%
<b>c</b>	<b>Local (municipality level)</b>		5	6	5	16 25%
<b>d</b>	<b>Other</b>		2	0	2	4 6%
	<b>Total</b>		28	18	19	65 100 %
			E	P	S	A
<b>Combinations</b>	<b>ab</b>		2	0	0	2
	<b>ac</b>		0	0	1	1
	<b>bc</b>		0	1	0	1
	<b>ad</b>		0	0	1	1
	<b>bd</b>		1	0	0	1
	<b>abc</b>		2	3	1	6
	<b>abcd</b>		0	1	1	2

	MS	Answers	
1	Austria 1	C	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Multi choice</b></p> a. National b. Regional c. Local (municipality level) d. Other
2	Austria 2	Bc	
3	Austria 3	B	
4	Bulgaria	B	
5	Croatia 1	Abc	
6	Croatia 2	A	
7	Finland 1	A	
8	Finland 2	Abc	
9	Germany 1	A	
10	Germany 2	B	
11	Greece 1	C	
12	Greece 2	B	
13	Ireland 1	C	
14	Ireland 2	A	
15	Italy 1	abc	
16	Italy 2	abc	
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	B	
37	Sweden 1	A	
38	Sweden 2	Ab	
39	Sweden 3	A	
40	Sweden 4	B	
41	Sweden 5	abc	
42	Sweden 6	Ab	
43	Sweden 7	B	

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

Cases with evidence base (n=			E	P	S	A
------------------------------	--	--	---	---	---	---

43)								
	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?							
				E	P	S	A	
<b>a</b>	<b>yes</b>			16	9	8	33	77 %
<b>b</b>	<b>no</b>			5	0	5	10	23 %
	<b>Total</b>			21	9	13	43	100 %
MS		Answer						
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 base (n= 43)		Multi choice	E	P	S	A	
	<b>Variable</b> 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, %	
			E	P	S	A	
<b>a</b>	<b>Target groups</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>b</b>	<b>Intermediate target groups</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>c</b>	<b>Economic operators</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>d</b>	<b>Government</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>e</b>	<b>Funders</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>f</b>	<b>Researchers</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>g</b>	<b>Representatives of civil society (NGOs)</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>h</b>	<b>Other</b>		<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11%</b>
	<b>Total</b>		<b>70</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100%</b>
	<b>MS</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Multi choice</b></p> a. Target groups b. Intermediate target groups c. Economic operators d. Government e. Funders f. Researchers g. Representatives of civil society (NGOs) h. Other				
1	Austria 1	abcdef					
2	Austria 2	abcdefgh					
3	Austria 3	bd					
4	Bulgaria	bd					
5	Croatia 1	abdg					
6	Croatia 2	bcdf					
7	Finland 1	befgh					
8	Finland 2	abcdfh					
9	Germany 1	afg					
10	Germany 2	af					
11	Greece 1	bh					
12	Greece 2	bdg					
13	Ireland 1	d					
14	Ireland 2	beh					
15	Italy 1	defgh					
16	Italy 2	ade fh					
17	Lithuania 1	bfh					
18	Lithuania 2	abdh					
19	Luxembourg	abdg					
20	Netherlands 1	abfh					
21	Netherlands 2	abdfh					
22	Norway 1	adgh					
23	Norway 2	abd					
24	Norway 3	bdfg					
25	Poland 1	bdef					
26	Poland 2	abdef					
27	Portugal 1	abdfgh					
28	Portugal 2	b					
29	Portugal 3	abdf					

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	
	<b>Variable</b> 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, %	
			E	P	S	A	
<b>a</b>	<b>Scientific evidence</b>		20	8	13	41	63 %
<b>b</b>	<b>Past experience</b>		9	5	7	21	32 %
<b>c</b>	<b>Other</b>		2	1	0	3	5%
	<b>Total</b>		31	14	20	65	100 %
<b>Combinations</b>	<b>ab</b>		7	5	7	19	
	<b>ac</b>		1	0	0	1	
	<b>Abc</b>		1	0	0	1	
	<b>MS</b>	<b>Answer</b>					
1	Austria 1	Ab	<b>Multi choice</b> a. Scientific evidence b. Past experience c. Other				
2	Austria 2	Ab					
3	Austria 3	Ab					
4	Bulgaria	A					
5	Croatia 1	A					
6	Croatia 2	C					
7	Finland 1	B					
8	Finland 2	Ab					
9	Germany 1	A					
10	Germany 2	A					
11	Greece 1	Ab					
12	Greece 2	Ab					
13	Ireland 1	A					
14	Ireland 2	Ac					
15	Italy 1	Ab					
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	

**(Table 9) Elements of planning**

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

	Abdij	1	
	Abcdi	1	
	Cdefgi	1	
	j	1	
	Bcdfgi	1	
	<b>MS</b>	<b>Answer</b>	
1	Austria 1	Acdefghi	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Multi choice</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Literature review and/or formative research</li> <li>b. Needs assessment</li> <li>c. Detailed plan of action</li> <li>d. Financial plan</li> <li>e. Human resource management plan</li> <li>f. Time schedule</li> <li>g. Partners agreement</li> <li>h. Communication plan</li> <li>i. Evaluation plan</li> <li>j. Other</li> </ul>
2	Austria 2	Abcdefghi	
3	Austria 3	Acdfgi	
4	Bulgaria	Abefi	
5	Croatia 1	Abdefgi	
6	Croatia 2	Abcdefghi	
7	Finland 1	Acdefghij	
8	Finland 2	Abcdefghi	
9	Germany 1	Abcdefghi	
10	Germany 2	Abcdefgi	
11	Greece 1	Abcfi	
12	Greece 2	Abcdefghij	
13	Ireland 1	Bc	
14	Ireland 2	Abcfghi	
15	Italy 1	Abfhi	
16	Italy 2	Abfhi	
17	Lithuania 1	Acdfgi	
18	Lithuania 2	Abe	
19	Luxembourg	Abcdefghi	
20	Netherlands 1	Abcdefghi	
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	Abcefgi	
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	Abcdi	
40	Sweden 4	Cdefgi	
41	Sweden 5	J	
42	Sweden 6	Abcdefgi	
43	Sweden 7	Bcdfgi	

(Table 10) Implementation time frame

Cases with evidence base (n= 43)		Multi choice <sup>3</sup>	E	P	S	A	
	<b>Variable</b> 15. Implementation of your example of good practice is/was	a. Continuous (integrated in the system) b. Periodic c. Single	N	N	N	N, %	
			E	P	S	A	
<b>a</b>	<b>Continuous (integrated in the system)</b>		12	5	10	27	69 %
<b>b</b>	<b>Periodic</b>		3	1	1	5	13 %
<b>c</b>	<b>Single</b>		4	1	2	7	18 %
	<b>Total</b>		19	7	13	39	100 %
			E	P	S	A	
Combi nation	<b>bc</b>		2	0	0	2	
	<b>ab</b>		0	1	0	1	
	<b>ac</b>		0	1	0	1	
	<b>MS</b>	<b>Answer</b>					
1	Austria 1	A	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Multi choice</b></p> <p>a. Continuous (integrated in the system) b. Periodic c. Single</p>				
2	Austria 2	A					
3	Austria 3	A					
4	Bulgaria	A					
5	Croatia 1	Bc					
6	Croatia 2	C					
7	Finland 1	A					
8	Finland 2	A					
9	Germany 1	A					
10	Germany 2	B					
11	Greece 1	A					
12	Greece 2	A					
13	Ireland 1	A					
14	Ireland 2	Bc					
15	Italy 1	Ab					
16	Italy 2	B					
17	Lithuania 1	A					
18	Lithuania 2	A					
19	Luxembourg	A					
20	Netherlands 1	A					
21	Netherlands 2	C					
22	Norway 1	B					
23	Norway 2	A					
24	Norway 3	A					
25	Poland 1	A					
26	Poland 2	A					
27	Portugal 1	A					
28	Portugal 2	A					
29	Portugal 3	C					
30	Portugal 4	C					
31	Portugal 8	A					
32	Slovenia 1	Ac					
33	Slovenia 2	A					
34	Slovenia 3	B					
35	Spain 1	A					
36	Spain 2	A					

<sup>3</sup> There was only one possible answer

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

(Table 11) Target groups

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

			%
<b>Combinations</b>	cde	1	
	abcdegijklmn	1	
	cdg	1	
	degijk	1	
	cden	1	
	elo	1	
	a	3	
	abcd	1	
	bgn	1	
	cgn	1	
	c	5	
	ce	1	
	abcdefghijklmn	1	
	abcdefghijklmn	1	
	o	2	
	cg	3	
	cdn	1	
	aeg	1	
	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		
	<b>MS</b>	<b>Answer</b>	
1	Austria 1	cde	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Multi choice</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. General population</li> <li>b. Children (before adolescence time)</li> <li>c. Adolescents</li> <li>d. Young adults</li> <li>e. Adults</li> <li>f. Elderly population</li> <li>g. Parents</li> <li>h. Pregnant women</li> <li>i. Women</li> <li>j. Men</li> <li>k. Families</li> <li>l. Drivers</li> <li>m. Party goers</li> <li>n. Vulnerable social groups</li> <li>o. Other</li> </ul>
2	Austria 2	abcdegijklmn	
3	Austria 3	cdg	
4	Bulgaria	degijk	
5	Croatia 1	cden	
6	Croatia 2	elo	
7	Finland 1	a	
8	Finland 2	abcd	
9	Germany 1	bgn	
10	Germany 2	cgn	
11	Greece 1	c	
12	Greece 2	ce	
13	Ireland 1	abcdefghijklmn	
14	Ireland 2	a	
15	Italy 1	abcdefghijklmn	
16	Italy 2	o	
17	Lithuania 1	cg	
18	Lithuania 2	cdn	
19	Luxembourg	aeg	
20	Netherlands 1	cg	
21	Netherlands 2	h	
22	Norway 1	o	



23	Norway 2	bgkn	
24	Norway 3	abcgk	
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

	<b>Cases with</b>	<b>Multi choice</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>A</b>
--	-------------------	---------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------

evidence base (n= 43)						
	<b>Variable</b> 17. Which communication channels were used	a. Television b. Radio c. Newspapers and magazines d. Billboards 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	N	N	N	N, %
			E	P	S	A
a	<b>Television</b>		2	7	1	10 4%
b	<b>Radio</b>		2	8	0	10 4%
c	<b>Newspapers and magazines</b>		5	8	3	16 6%
d	<b>Billboards</b>		0	5	0	5 2%
e	<b>Brochures/leaflet s/items</b>		13	9	8	30 11 %
f	<b>Telephone/mobil e</b>		5	2	1	8 3%
g	<b>Social media</b>		6	5	3	14 5%
h	<b>Website</b>		12	9	10	31 12 %
i	<b>E-mail</b>		9	8	6	23 9%
j	<b>Meetings/confere nces with experts/colleag ue s</b>		15	9	12	36 14 %
k	<b>Direct communication</b>		13	8	7	28 10 %
l	<b>Guidelines</b>		7	6	9	22 8%
m	<b>Scientific publications</b>		10	4	7	21 8%
n	<b>Other</b>		4	5	1	10 4%
	<b>Total</b>		103	93	68	264 100 %
	<b>MS</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Multi choice</b>			
1	Austria 1	abcdeghijkln	a. Television			
2	Austria 2	abcdeghijklmn	b. Radio			
3	Austria 3	fkn	c. Newspapers and magazines			
4	Bulgaria	efjklm	d. Billboards			
5	Croatia 1	kn	e. Brochures/leaflets/items			
6	Croatia 2	efhijki	f. Telephone/mobile			
7	Finland 1	efhijkn	g. Social media			
8	Finland 2	bcehijkmn	h. Website			
9	Germany 1	ehjm	i. E-mail			
10	Germany 2	ekm	j. Meetings/conferences with experts/colleagues			
11	Greece 1	ehjk	k. Direct communication			
12	Greece 2	acefijkl	l. Guidelines			
13	Ireland 1	ejk	m. Scientific publications			
14	Ireland 2	bcehik				
15	Italy 1	abceghijkln				

16	Italy 2	ghijkl	n. Other
17	Lithuania 1	ghijklm	
18	Lithuania 2	jl	
19	Luxembourg	abcdefghijklmn	
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	hijklmn	
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	abceghijklmn	
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**

	<b>Cases with evidence base</b>	<b>Multi choice</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>A</b>
--	---------------------------------	---------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------

<b>(n= 43)</b>						
<b>Variable</b>		a. Consultancy b. Supervision c. Training d. Team meetings e. Helpdesk f. None g. Other	N	N	N	N, %
			E	P	S	A
<b>a</b>	<b>Consultancy</b>		12	7	9	28 22%
<b>b</b>	<b>Supervision</b>		8	4	7	19 15%
<b>c</b>	<b>Training</b>		14	7	11	32 25%
<b>d</b>	<b>Team meetings</b>		13	8	11	32 25%
<b>e</b>	<b>Helpdesk</b>		2	3	3	8 6%
<b>f</b>	<b>None</b>		1	0	0	1 1%
<b>g</b>	<b>Other</b>		4	1	3	8 6%
	<b>Total</b>		<b>54</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>128</b> <b>100%</b>
<b>MS</b>	<b>Answer</b>					
1	Austria 1	Abcd	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Multi choice</b></p> a. Consultancy b. Supervision c. Training d. Team meetings e. Helpdesk f. None g. Other			
2	Austria 2	Acd				
3	Austria 3	A				
4	Bulgaria	bd				
5	Croatia 1	bfmg				
6	Croatia 2	abcd				
7	Finland 1	aceg				
8	Finland 2	abcdeg				
9	Germany 1	abcd				
10	Germany 2	acg				
11	Greece 1	dg				
12	Greece 2	bcde				
13	Ireland 1	acd				
14	Ireland 2	c				
15	Italy 1	abcde				
16	Italy 2	abcd				
17	Lithuania 1	acd				
18	Lithuania 2	c				
19	Luxembourg	cdh				
20	Netherlands 1	abcde				
21	Netherlands 2	abcd				
22	Norway 1	a				
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 2	acd				
34	Slovenia 3	c				
35	Spain 1	abcdg				

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 (n= 43)	Multi choice	E	P	S	A	
	<b>Variable</b> 21. Who did the evaluation?	a. An external party b. An internal party c. Both – internal and external parties	N	N	N	N,%	
			E	P	S	A	
<b>a</b>	<b>An external party</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>b</b>	<b>An internal party</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>c</b>	<b>Both – internal and external parties</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>38%</b>
	<b>Total</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>
	<b>MS</b>	<b>Answer</b>					
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	c					
16	Italy 2	c					
17	Lithuania 1	b					
18	Lithuania 2	b					
19	Luxembourg	a					
20	Netherlands 1	c					
21	Netherlands 2	b					
22	Norway 1	c					
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					

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	c
38	Sweden 2	b
39	Sweden 3	a
40	Sweden 4	a
41	Sweden 5	c
42	Sweden 6	c
43	Sweden 7	c

(Table 15) What has been measured/evaluated?

	Cases with evidence base (n= 43)	Multi choice	E	P	S	A	
	<b>Variable</b> 22. What has been measured/evaluated?	a. Process evaluation b. Evaluation of the impacts/effects/outcome c. Other	N	N	N	N, %	
<b>a</b>	<b>Process evaluation</b>		16	6	12	34	48 %
<b>b</b>	<b>Evaluation of the impacts/effects/outcome</b>		15	6	11	32	45 %
<b>c</b>	<b>Other</b>		3	2	0	5	7%
	<b>Total</b>		34	14	23	71	100 %
			<b>E</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>A</b>	
<b>Combinations</b>	<b>ab</b>		8	3	10	21	
	<b>ac</b>		0	2	0	2	
	<b>abc</b>		2	0	0	2	
	<b>MS</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Multi choice</b></p> a. Process evaluation b. Evaluation of the impacts/effects/outcome c. Other				
1	Austria 1	a					
2	Austria 2	ab					
3	Austria 3	abc					
4	Bulgaria	b					
5	Croatia 1	ab					
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	