

Let it hAPYN



Reports of the kick-off event, steering and scientific committee meetings

Deliverable 10 – WP1



Title: Reports of the kick-off event, steering and scientific committee meetings

Edited by: Daša Kokole, APYN

Contributors: Veronika Jelen, Daša Kokole, and Rok Primožič, APYN

June 2016



Co-funded by
the Health Programme
of the European Union

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Table of Contents

Steering committee meetings 4

 1st Let it hAPYN Associate Partners' Meeting – kick off event 4

 2nd Let it hAPYN Steering committee meeting 24

 3rd Let it hAPYN Steering Committee meeting 26

 4th Let it hAPYN Steering Committee meeting 28

 5th Let it hAPYN Steering Committee meeting 32

 6th Let it hAPYN Steering committee meeting 39

 7th Let it hAPYN Steering Committee meeting 42

 8th Let it hAPYN Steering Committee meeting 48

Scientific committee meetings 52

 1st Scientific Committee meeting Let it hAPYN 52

 2nd Scientific Committee meeting Let it hAPYN 53

 3rd Scientific Committee meeting Let it hAPYN 54

 1st revised Let it hAPYN Scientific Committee meeting 59

 2nd revised Scientific committee meeting minutes 61

Other meetings 64

 Kick off meeting report with collaborative partners 64



Steering committee meetings

1st Let it hAPYN Associate Partners' Meeting – kick off event

6. – 7. May 2013, Luxembourg

Executive Agency for Health and Consumers DRB A3/042

6th may 2013

Present: Aleksandra Kaczmarek, Fieke Franken, Wim van Dalen, Mariann Skar, Matej Košir, Vlad Grosar, Jan Peloza, Daša Kokole, Veronika Jelen

Absent: /

1 session – 11.30 - 13.10

1.1 Intro

Guy Dargent - Scientific project officer (MD) at European Commission Executive Agency for Health and Consumers

1.2 General

Collaborating partners (beside main project partners): different types of organizing of youth:

- youth hubs
- youth clubs (can be our partners but not APYN members, because they are working with alcohol industry (although not in all EU countries). Slovenia – all of the youth centers have bars to generate their income.
- youth councils
- student unions
- other organizations...



**Wim ☒ Which of these organizations are we trying to win over, to have them on the top of the list - how to tackle problems effectively?*

*2010 – 27% of youth sports clubs using alcohol, 18% of religious groups. To-do: Jan finds more recent data about youth groups and alcohol.

*The situation with Active – we are not trying to work on emphasizing to abstain from alcohol use, but it's important to have them also included in the project.

1.3 General about Let it hAPYN – APYN (Jan Peloza)

Data related:

- 9.april 2013 – start of the project (month 1 – that's how we'll calculate months)
- timeline is loose – we can also finish before the set date

1.3.1 Main aim of the project

- To reach a better overview of good/ bad practices of alcohol intervention programs that are happening in youth organizations (YO) or that are applicable to YO in Europe.
- This will result in a better understanding of the youth sector and allow possible evidence-based best practices of alcohol interventions to be implemented in other YO.
- By including YO in the process, the project is giving a permanent added value to the whole youth sector.

1.3.2 General objectives

1. Better understanding of the harm caused by alcohol among organized and non-organized youth
2. Raise awareness among YO that alcohol is a harmful legal drug
3. Stimulate the initialization of new alcohol interventions programs with the right stakeholders (excluding the alcohol industry that has the legitimate interest to raise consumption levels to sell more products)
4. Empower YO by giving them tools (different evidence-based methodologies) how to work with alcohol intervention programs
5. Raise the percentage of alcohol interventions in YO that are evidence-based
6. Scientifically test good/ best alcohol intervention practices in YO
7. Produce materials that can be applicable also to other YO after the end of the project – making them youth friendly for future reference.

**Fieke: What's the actual difference between intervention and tools within the project activities?*

- *Interventions - actual activities to be carried out during the projects*
- *Tools will be made (and tested) to be used during the interventions/activities and are intended to be used also after the project ends by other organisations.*

1.3.3 Work packages (WP)

Horizontal work-packages

WP1  Coordination of the project – provided by APYN



WP2 7 Dissemination of the project – provided by Eurocare

WP3 7 Evaluation of the project – provided by Utrip

Vertical work-packages

WP4 7 Overview of evidence based alcohol interventions in/for youth organizations (YO) - provided by Utrip

WP5 7 Pilot-testing phase and adaptation of best practices en evidence based alcohol interventions in YO - provided by STAP

WP6 7 Review of existing alcohol legislation focusing on youth policy and suggestions for improvements – provided by APYN

WP7 7 Empowerment of YO through law enforcement – provided by STAP



1.3.4 Methods and means

Step 1: Secondary analyses & identification of good interventions/ practices

- report on the currently available evidence of effectiveness of alcohol interventions
- search of databases of alcohol-related interventions
- assessment of good practices
- preparation of strategies for the implementation of good practices in youth organizations.

Step 2: Toolkit preparation

- preparation of draft toolkits for different types of YO
- toolkits tested later

Step 3: Field studies/ pilot tests

- preparations of proposals for alcohol interventions in YO and strategies for implementation
- studies/pilot test preparation
- training on the studies/ pilot test implementation and evaluation
- implementation of the studies/ pilot tests

Step 4: Dissemination

- preparation of a dissemination plan
- dissemination of project results among networks of partners

1.3.5 Expected outcomes

- By empowering the youth sector in Europe, the project will contribute to better-informed YP and YO that will understand that alcohol is not an ordinary

commodity

- With the overview of evidence-based best practices in YO and the adapted methods and tools to the reality of specific YO, the youth and NGO sector will get tools to be used in different environments
- With the trained individuals among the partners, the YO will become key players in establishing more comprehensive alcohol policies through a multi-stakeholder approach
- By publishing manuals, toolkits and using other dissemination methods, the project will enrich the NGO sector with fresh and evidence-based innovative approaches to support healthy choices and enhance life skills of YP

2 session – 14.00 - 16.00

2.1 Presentation of WP4 – Utrip (Matej Košir)

Collect good practices - what YO should do to prevent bad practices

2.1.1 Aims:

- to develop an inventory of evidence-based alcohol intervention programs and other practices focusing on young people (depending on the type of organization we're dealing with)
- a review of international literature (both academic and grey)
- to identify effective models adopted to prevent and reduce alcohol related harm among young people.

*Alcohol use ☐ alcohol related harm ☐ misuse (term used by industry)

- a mapping of youth organizations in Europe (structured questionnaire) ☐ regarding their involvement in evidence based alcohol practice by type of

organizations (youth organizations, youth clubs, youth councils, students unions or other organizations for young people) and level of young people's participation.

- search of several databases and key websites related to alcohol consumption among young people
- national profile analysis (on the basis of the most recent data and information published in databases of WHO and EC)
- Search for existing studies, research articles, assessments or evaluations of practices in their countries (report to the WP leader)
- a structured review of the literature and other resources on different practices
- a comprehensive report (including literature review)
- separate toolkits for different types of organizations involved, combined into one manual.

2.1.2 Connection of WP4 with other WPs

- Key measures of alcohol policies focusing on young people that have been identified will be examined in other WPs.
- These will include good and bad (ineffective) practices and the existing knowledge about the possibilities for implementation of best practices in youth organisations.

2.1.3 Key interventions involving YP/YO – starting point

- Mystery shopping /over serving
- Advocacy/media advocacy
- Peer education/peer training
- Information/awareness campaigns
- Parents interventions (?) – a new idea to be evolved later on

2.2 Working packages in general



After the state analysis ☑ trainings provided for participants ☑ outcome: toolkits for national trainings in at least 7 EU countries. Subcontracting organizations in order to spend a sum of money on activities they were trained for – contract for carrying out of certain activities.

- They will be given money for a local training in their home country, coordinator from each country gaining knowledge on how to do a project and how to do a law enforcement activity back home – at the training. We train them how to do trainings and interventions (they would train 10 people) and law enforcement activities.

In line with law enforcement activity in these countries is also a checkout of the national situation on the topic.

**Fieke: It is important not only sending emails to the people regarding our activities, goals and aims but most of all find a way to contact them really closely.*

- Process evaluation will be done throughout all the meetings – Utrip measures throughout the project. It is on us. Changing systems, changing environment etc. should not be tested by external evaluator
- Final evaluation meeting – money is planned. Could be also used as a 3rd meeting (to get some feedback from trained people).
- External evaluation – what additional value can be brought by an external evaluator? Can serve as a mirror to the outcome of the activities.

**Daša: what are we evaluating? What WE are doing or what trained people are doing?*

We will also do a part of outcome evaluation. And to evaluate an impact of the project to law enforcement, etc.

2.3 Financial aspect of Let it hAPYN (Klara Kasnyk, Financial manager -



Executive Agency for Health and Consumers)

2.3.1 General information

- Duration – 9th of April 2013 – 8th April 2016, 2 months only for preparation of the final report – costs CAN be included.
- 1 interim report – covers first 14 months (+ 2 months for preparation)
- Interim Payment – November 2014, Final Payment – may 2016
- All the cost should be generated by 4 partners
- EC contribution = reimbursement of costs. Estimate is only a guideline, at the end EC needs real costs of the project.



o Under-expenditure ☒ they pay according to the % agreed

o Over-expenditure ☒ maximum amount is paid.

2.3.2 Financial cycle

☒

- ☒ Pre-financing payments are made to beneficiaries.
- ☒ Continuous money flow, in certain time money also inflows.
- ☒ Payment scheme: 40% + 30% + Balance

Total cost of the reporting period is compared to pre-financing

2.3.3 Amendment

- Leaving/new beneficiaries, change of administrative details

- Extension of duration
- Change of technical annex

- Budget transfer between cost categories exceeding 20% of receiving budget line within a beneficiary's budget.
- Change of the legal representative/bank account

2.3.4 Cost

Non-eligible costs

- Debt and debt services
- Exchange losses

Staff

- Staff defined by employment contract



- Subcontracting = consultants, self-employed, experts, etc.

Travel & subsistence allowance

- Only for staff assigned for the action
- Keep presence list of meetings – get it signed by participants

- Subsistence = accommodation + daily allowance
- Mission of 38 hours = daily allowance of 2 days. In case of flight +4hours, in case of train +2 hours

Equipment

- Is registered as an asset in the books

Other costs

- Translations, reproduction, audits
- Conference fees
- ...

All activities of the action shall fall within the duration of the project:

- prior the duration: kick-off meetings
- after the duration: service contracts, activities related to preparation of the report



Hotel accommodation (partners' meetings) goes to the general APYN budget. We find an accommodation and pay for it. Draft change in the budget and send it as an amendment. After 1st interim report we will see about other changes and can add them later to other amendment.

7th May, 2013

Present: Aleksandra Kaczmarek, Fieke Franken, Matej Košir, Vlad Grosar, Jan Peloza, Daša Kokole, Veronika Jelen

Absent: Wim Van Dalen, Mariann Skar

3 Session – 9.20 - 12.00

3.1 Debating on per diems and subsistence allowance

Per diems: conference funding from outside (Bursa) – no costs for us.

☐☐1st☐option – cancel 14k contribution

☐☐2nd☐option – 14k could be used for travel and per diems, but still need to find 8k☐contributions. Instead of 93 EUR and instead of 232 EUR people get 60% of that ☐ 150 EUR. The difference (40%) they find on their own.

**What about the conference? Organized in the 31st month.*

We have the possibility to have 2 conferences, 2014 for free (Bursa) and 2016. 1st conference could be used for even wider dissemination of the knowledge – combining it with training for trainers. One training event is perhaps not going to be enough. The goal is to get four days of training instead of two days. Regarding personal hours within organizing more events than preliminary agreed – we should see how much time is spent on coordination in general (for each partner).

Some the money for subsistence allowance (a third) is used for that certain purpose, two thirds for something else.

3.2 Setting the milestones and the timeline

3.2.1 WP4 - Utrip

4.1	4.4
Inventarisation of YO	Overview of existing tools, methods
4.2	4.3
Overview - bad/good/best practices	Experience of implementation process

4.4 – used for us to prepare trainings. Outcome: manual or toolkit – made in a descriptive way (raw data to be provided by Utrip)

1st report

- inventarisation of the YO
- search for bad/good/best practices
- define which practices have been used by YO
- after that searching experience from these points on.

2nd report

- good/best practices
- methods and tools to implement these practices
- suggestions about good/best practices to be used in these kind of YO.
 - o STAP is then translating these kinds of practices into more detailed, practical information (more about “How”).

3.2.2 WP5 - STAP

5.4	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.4
			Intervention	
State analysis	Producing a toolkit	Training for Project leaders	implemented in 7 countries	State analysis
nr.1	(Utrip)			nr.2

Toolkit

- 1st version in 5.1
- 2nd version after the implementation in 7 countries
- Final version: to be yet decided whether before the state analysis nr.2 or after the state analysis nr.2.

3.2.3 WP6 – APYN

Activities take place parallel to WP5 and WP7.

***6.2 General part** ☑ training participants how to do law analysis at home. But since there are so many different types of law regarding alcohol we should consider giving them more strict guidelines.

****6.3 7 national consultations** ☑ People were presented the laws by the national coordinator (a person who was trained - they learn about the law, we do an input on global and local strategy). National groups consist in two people – one working as a project leader, second working as a trainer (**could be also two people from different organizations – still to be discussed along the way*). During their national consultations they each come up with suggestions for improvements on the policy. National coordinator checks how relevant and realistic the findings are.

For being in touch all the time with national coordinators it is also possible to assign mentors to each national group. To be discussed along the way.

3.2.4 WP7 - STAP

7.1 part 1	7.2	7.3	7.4	7.5	7.1 part 2
Overview study	Prepared materials (toolkit*)	Training for Trainers	Implementation in 7 countries	Assessment of the results**	Overview study

*Toolkit:

- Toolkit for TtT – for our own future trainings



- Toolkit for trainers – raw documents on how to train people
- Toolkit for trainers, toolkit for activists – translating the toolkit for activists is in domain of trainers’ decision whether to use it in English or their mother language.

** European report – global and local impact, results of the field studies.

3.2.5 WP3 – Evaluation of the project (UTRIP)

- Evaluate process at first – every six months. Every 2nd one should include the easiest part of evaluation. Where are we going, what have we achieved?
- Good to evaluate each steering committee – although not in the action plan.
- Evaluate trainings in cooperation with work package leaders (they know exactly what will happen and what is there to evaluate).
- Conference – in collaboration with Eurocare.
- **Aim:** to improve things in the process.
- Web form should be prepared for sending to participants of certain activities.
- Rating with how far we can go with specific objectives. To see the dynamics of believing in the project and its effect (personal opinion about capability, etc. – discussing our perception of capability).
- Evaluation of the process and of the internal outcomes.
- External evaluation – find a subcontractor to have them on meetings at least once a year.
 - o Evaluating external outcomes – what is the use for YO, some impact evaluation – level of mobilization, level of doing some effective intervention.
 - o State analysis is our internal outcome of the evaluation.
 - o We leave the 7.500 EUR of budget and by later agreement we decide on what and how the money will be spent (travel costs and work).
 - o 7.1, but 5.4 also?



3.2.6 WP2 – Eurocare

*Eurocare in charge of:

- project presentation leaflet
- newsletter – maximum twice a year, APYN arranges with the designer, Eurocare sends raw texts. The first newsletter goes out after the webpage is done
- mailing list
- webpage
- social media account

All the raw texts before printing are sent to APYN’s designer.

3.3 Dr Dirk Meusel, Executive Agency for Health and Consumers

- To summarize previous similar projects on the field of alcohol
- Bad/good practices – EMCDDA. Define what are we considering as a good practice. Examples. To have clear criteria. EDDRA database.
- Evaluation crucial. Hard arguments, a lot of data to be included in the report. Money has to be well spent.
- Following the grand agreement is crucial, changes to the project need to be declared.
- Amendments regard changes in the budget.

3.4 Milestones

- 1st report by December 2013
- 2nd report upon our comments by February
- 2 weeks time to comment the report



- all the milestones are set to the middle of the month, time for commenting until the end of the month
- one month prior to the deadline ☑ time for all the partners to let the others know in case they will not be able to do their work in time.
- 2nd meeting – end of February/beginning of March 2014 (Ljubljana maybe)
- 13th month – WP5, WP6, WP7 start
- 16th/17th month ☑ training to happen – july/august 2014 + 3rd meeting of the steering comitee (combined into one event)

- national consultations happen until 20th month (the latest 21st month). Then they are given time to do the intervention and field studies until 25th month. (the latest 26th month)
- State analysis (5.4) done prior to the training (in one year time) between 13th and 15th month and then repeated after 26th month.
- Overview study (7.1) should be done anytime in the next upcoming year – start as soon as possible
- external evaluator – should try to analyze collected information (Matej finds one) by the end of the year. So information should be collected by the end of October/November.
- Oct/Nov – inventarisation of YO can be done

- 6th or 7th month - A survey and inventarisation should be in action (7.1 phase 1 – results are collected by the 9th month) - interviews
- *7.1 phase 1 – asks leaders, 7.1 phase 2 – asks activists*
- APYN prepares a logo and other related issues. Eurocare does the content of the leaflet.
 - o Dissemination
 - by the 30th month carried out, final conference (2.2) between nov/dec/jan/feb 2015/2016. Agreed mostly on December, 33rd month.

3.4.1 Setting dates for the meetings



Steering comitee - associate partners' meeting ☐ we decide when is going to be held Scientific comitee – named Daša, Fieke, Matej ☐ we decide when is going to be held Evaluation meetings ☐ one of each collaborating partners present

- 6th meeting – within the final conference



4 Bursa, Turkey – Kick-off meeting with collaborating partners

16th May

- 2 hours – Let it hAPYN presentation (Jan)
- 1 hour – hopes and fears (Utrip)
- 1 hour – General guidelines for successful cooperation (Vlad, Daša, Aleksandra)

Move some of the presentations to 16th and GA moved to earlier day.

Prepare the guidelines for handing over reports, travel costs (Veronika)

Where do we go from here?

- Micro planning of working packages – 2-3 pages - protocol
- active mailing list: lihapyn@apyn.org
- newsletter (Eurocare) – maximum twice a year, APYN arranges with the designer, Eurocare sends raw texts. The first newsletter goes out after the webpage is done.



2nd Let it hAPYN Steering committee meeting

Ljubljana, 12th and 13th February, 2014

Minutes of the meeting

Meeting location:

No Excuse Office, Celovška 185, 1000 Ljubljana

Present: Jan Peloza, Daša Kokole, Vlad Grosar (APYN), Matej Košir, Sanela Talić (Inštitut Utrip), Fieke Franken, Jeroen de Greff (STAP), Mariann Skar (Eurocare)

Agenda:

Presentation of the evaluation reports by Matej Košir

Going through the action plan

Going through the budget

Working on the questionnaire

Evaluation

To do's

- 1st interim report is due end of June; by then we have to spend at least 70% of the prefinancing
 - o After approving the new budget, partners send the expenses up to now and prepares list of prospective expenditures
 - o In case we dont get to 70%, Jan asks to extend the deadline for the 1st interim report to be extended until after september (after the trainig we should have enough expenses) – by the end of March

Let it hAPYN



- APYN EB/secretariat decides on the Let it hAPYN leaflets and what they will be used for
- Matej prepares external evaluation suggestions by end of February
- Matej prepares table of content for the reports – mid March
- Training will be held 2nd week of September in the Netherlands – project partners go back home and check their dates and agree on the final time via email
- Since the research is still ongoing, partners send out promotional e-mails to additional countries which weren't represented yet in the research

**3rd Let it hAPYN Steering Committee meeting
Minutes**

STAP Office

Goeman Borgesiuslaan 77 | 3515 ET | Utrecht | The Netherlands

10th April 2014 10.00 – 12.30

Present: Jan Peloza (APYN), Daša Kokole (APYN), Fieke Franken (STAP), Wim van Dalen (STAP), Jeroen de Greff (STAP)

Minutes:

Draft agreed agenda of the September meeting:

	6th September	7th September	8th September		9th September	10th September	11th September
morning	Arrivals	General Assembly	Beginners' training	Advanced introduction training	3 parallel workshops	3 parallel workshops	Departures
afternoon			Plenary session				
evening							

Regarding accommodation:

- Fieke asked the hostel in Amsterdam if it is possible to come with 50 people and stay only at small rooms (we prefer rooms with 2 or 4 people, with a maximum of 6 people at one room – it is. If we only use rooms for 2 or 4 people this will be 31,70 per night including breakfast.



- Fieke looked for some youth hostels in Utrecht, but there are not much options, and they do not have really cheap offers.

Regarding meeting rooms:

- Fieke also found a really cheap place in the city of Amsterdam for the training (+/-5 minutes walking from the hostel) that is available from Monday to Wednesday - the costs will be around 1.000 for 3 rooms for 3 days (excluding food and drinks).
- The appointment there will be on 12th May

To do:

- Fieke sends a first draft of the first announcement for the invitation to the trainings this week (hopefully tomorrow).
- The announcements will be send out by end of June/beginning of July



4th Let it hAPYN Steering Committee meeting
Eurocare office, Brussels, 5th November 2014

10.00 - 14.00

Present: Wim van Dalen (STAP), Matej Košir (UTRIP), Fieke Franken (STAP), Nils Garnes (Eurocare), Daša Kokole (APYN), Jan Pelozza (APYN) , Mariann Skar (Eurocare)

Agenda

1. Agreeing on the agenda
2. Look back for the last 19 months
3. Evaluation of Amsterdam
4. Expected deliverables
5. Upcoming activities - Agree on the calls
6. Financial and content reporting
7. Budget changes - in EC review
8. 2nd EAPYC in Bursa
9. AOB

Related to the action plan:

WP 1:

As scientific committee meetings were taking place at the same time as steering committee meetings, we should print additional signature lists for those meetings for those who attended it to sign.

APYN produces midterm report by 20th November and asks partners for input when needed

WP 2:



Everybody sends any reports they have to Eurocare, so they can be put on the Let it hAPYN website.

On social media accounts - #lihapyn is to be used as much as possible (also during the EAPYC)

APYN takes care of producing (conceiving and designing) project presentation leaflet – 1 A4 of project presentation and 1 A4 for presentation of call proposals, so it can be used for promotion of the Call for projects

Some project presentation leaflets are printed for the 6th EAPC.

APYN discuss on its EB meeting about how we can incorporate the LiH newsletter in our newsletter.

WP 3:

Daša sends to Matej all the materials for the evaluation so he can Amsterdam evaluation and APYN forwards it on. Matej sends the final report out mid-January

Regarding the external evaluation: Matej prepares a detailed call for a contractor for external evaluation (plus the timeline) – by 5.12 for us to comment on it – we comment by 20th December so its sent it out before Christmas - mainly to trusted partners in Eastern Europe.

WP 4:

Matej writes a concept for the point 4.3 and sends it into comment by next week, so we don't do double work.

WP 5 and 7:

Prepare the toolkits:



- How to do evidence based interventions in youth organisations
- How to do field studies and law enforcement in youth organisations

STAP thinks about how to divide the topics so it's most appropriate (introductory toolkit, marketing toolkit, law enforcement toolkit) and about the target groups for each of the toolkits (eg. beginners for project development + intermediate for researchers)

Toolkits, at least drafts should be prepared as soon as possible:

- STAP prepares the concept for toolkits and texts and writes the first draft by 5th January
- APYN is going to see how it can be youth friendly and comments on it
- STAP adapts it and the final draft version is out by 1st February to be used for people making the projects

After this, participants will evaluate the usefulness of the toolkits and the final version will be done in September

By June we should start the editorial team, to which we can invite some young people.

In the beginning it's better to have more information; we can shorten it up later based on young people's needs and preferences.

WP 6:

APYN prepares the reports as agreed.

Reporting:

- Mid-term reporting should be done by 20th November
- Jan looks into requirements for reporting (both content and financial) and lets the partners know what they can help with by 13th November



- What can be done now is general report about the training by the workshops from Amsterdam by STAP and APYN (Jan sends examples of similar reports)

Jan sends out the Budget again.

Upcoming activities:

Sending out the calls for projects

APYN prepares concept for the call, in which we look for organisations for both the projects, research and national consultations. The concept should be prepared by 25th November and discussed in Brussels before or during the 6th EAPC, and is sent out before the EAPYC conference in December. Implementation of the project starts between 1st February and 30th June – lasts until 30 September.

- We are aiming at 7 countries with each of the fields – ideally 1 country 3 fields
- We have good options with: Slovenia, Lithuania, Turkey, Romania, Croatia, Portugal



5th Let it hAPYN Steering Committee meeting Minutes

STAP Office

Goeman Borgesiuslaan 77 | 3515 ET | Utrecht | The Netherlands

5.3.2015 9.30 – 17.30

1. Evaluation

Matej Košir from Institute Utrip presented the results of evaluation (PDF version attached) and few agreements were made on basis of that:

- The survey is sent out also to collaborating partners, with deadline of 20th March (Utrip corrects the survey in a way that it is appropriate for the collaborating partners - so without the working packages)
- In order to enhance communication among partners, APYN will send internal updates at the beginning of every month (what is going on in different working packages)- and project partners themselves can send anything they feel should be shared with others to be included in that e-mail
- APYN should share a Dropbox folder with all the necessary documents to all the partners, the Dropbox should be regularly updated so project partners have access to all the documents
- For the next interim report, APYN works with the partners in order for them to send reports on their working package enough in advance

2. The work according to working packages

Agreements on certain WPs were the following:

WP1:



- The steering committee meetings should be announced further in advance for project partners to be able to incorporate it into their schedules. The suggested dates for the next meetings are:
 - o 8th June 2015, London (before the Eurocare GA)
 - o October 2015 – either around Global Alcohol Policy Conference in Edinburgh (taking place 7-9th October) or around EUSPR meeting in Ljubljana (taking place 22-24th October) – still to be determined
- The scientific committee meetings will take place at those times if needed, otherwise the scientific committee will be in touch predominantly over email

WP2:

- APYN and Eurocare will work together on improving the webpage
 - o APYN will send in reports of the project meetings to be uploaded
 - o APYN will send in reports on meetings in specific countries (when implementing the projects)
 - o APYN will send newsletters to Eurocare to upload
 - o The deliverables will be uploaded online as soon as they are finalized
- At the end of the project, APYN will promote the deliverables most relevant to young people in a youth friendly website
- When it comes to EAPYC at the end of the project, APYN will be in charge of its organisation in early 2016; Eurocare will help with producing report of the conference

WP3:

- The process evaluation is adapted for collaborating organisations by Utrip and sent out by APYN by 9th March with deadline until 22nd March, so Utrip has time to prepare the report (Process evaluation of the Deliverable 1) until end of March



- The process evaluation of trainings is prepared by Utrip; STAP and then APYN look through it and then give comments so it will be suitable for people who attended the trainings; at the same time comments are given on how to design the process evaluation of the projects implementation (as not all the elements will be able to be used in the both occasions).The comments are done in the week between 9-13th March so the questionnaire can be finalized and sent out latest second half of March
- Utrip starts the process for commissioning the external evaluator – by translating the calls in English

WP4

- The WP has been finished. There were some comments from the partners on what could be improved, as well as from the project coordinator.

WP5:

- For the Toolkit for project leaders we agreed that partners can send the comments by 13th of March (each can do it in a separate document) and then on basis of comments the final document will be produced by 31st of March so it can be used when starting to work with organisations in April
- As for the report of the Training for project leaders, STAP will send the enhanced report on the training by 1st of June
- Project implementation is done by APYN through Boost my project – sends reports of separate meetings to STAP to collate and prepare a report; STAP expresses wish to be involved if there are some especially promising initiatives taking place
- After use, collaborating partners will evaluate the toolkit and STAP will improve it based on their comments

WP7:

- For the internal policies in YO research, research questionnaire has been produced by STAP and APYN and will be disseminated among APYN member organisations in



2nd half of March and in April (the results will be collected by the end of April and the report will be done by 1st June (STAP is in charge of that)

- STAP sends finished toolkit for training for trainers, as well as the toolkit for trainers and by 13th of March in order to be commented on by the other project partners, then sends the final version by 31st March in order to be used from April on
- STAP will send the enhanced report on the training on the field studies by 1st of June
- STAP will take care of assessment of field studies in conjunction with APYN – to be agreed on later

WP6:

- Eurocare sends to APYN report and database of current alcohol laws in Europe to be used as literature for the alcohol laws report
- APYN produces the report by mid-April and works on disseminating the survey
- APYN works with organisations who want to organise national consultations

3. Update on Boost my project initiative

- In December, APYN sent out call to organisations which want to participate in one of the three initiatives, supported by Let it hAPYN project: evidence-based project implementation, carrying out field research or organising national consultations.
- All in all 21 different organisations responded for the calls by end of January; some of them willing to do more than one initiative
- APYN will get in touch with those organisations as soon as possible in March to arrange Skype calls with them in order to discuss what exactly each of the organisations will do
- The projects will begin April the earliest and last until end of October the latest (November as back up time)



4. Information from call with the project officer :

- The list of collaborating partners does not need to be officially amended – we can add the new collaborating partners without a problem
- In case collaborating partner is from a country outside Europe (both for travel to our events and also for travel to their countries), email needs to be sent to the project officer with appropriate justification and be confirmed from EC side
- The confirmation for the change of budget request is still in progress and we will be notified as soon as there will be some information available. If we decide to do things in the meantime according to the new budget and that will not be accepted, it is our responsibility if the amended budget won't be accepted
- When it comes to waiting for the external evaluation results, it is OK if we can progress with the project as we planned to, so we don't have to stop the process. When the recommendations and the suggestions from the evaluators come in through, we are advised to follow them
- The results of the external evaluation should be done not later than 20th March, and then if needed the project officer would like to meet with project coordinator in Luxembourg – feasible potential dates are 25th and 26th March
- The project can be extended for maximum 6 months, with no additional costs being able to incur at that time. We have 2 months to hand in the final report after the end of the project.
- When it comes to D1 improvement, there are mostly things regarding the methodology that should be clarified, as a lot methodology is not described enough in detail for being able to replicate the study. We as project partners consortium should align though on what is our opinion on the deliverable.
- There is no 100% information whether the call for external evaluator should be in English or it can be in Slovenian, but the opinion is that it is unfair advantage if we only put it in Slovenian so the recommendation would be to translate in English.

Let it hAPYN 



- The deliverables do not have to be merged in one if they consist of separate parts – the reports can be produced separately



Summary of next steps/deadlines

ASAP:

- We should have a final word if 8th June in London is OK as a meeting date
- UTRIP commissions external evaluator
- UTRIP adapts the survey so it can be sent out to collaborating partners
- Eurocare sends to APYN report and database of current alcohol laws in Europe to be used as literature for the alcohol laws report
- Partners comment on STAP's draft toolkits so they can be finalized

By 31st of March

- Utrip sends the report on Process evaluation of the Deliverable 1
- STAP sends final versions of toolkits for WP5 and WP7

By 30th of April

- APYN finalizes the report on alcohol laws in Europe and their effectiveness

By 1st of June:

- STAP sends in reports on Trainings
- STAP finalizes the report on internal policies in YO
- Utrip sends in process evaluation reports of Trainings

8th of June, latest – 2nd interim report is sent

Ongoing:

- APYN collaborating with Eurocare on webpage and sending out newsletters
- APYN producing reports of project meetings



6th Let it hAPYN Steering committee meeting

Eurocare Office, Brussels, 7.5. 2015,

9.00 – 16.00

Present: *Wim van Dalen (STAP), Mariann Skar and Aleksandra Kaczmarek (Eurocare), Jan Pelosa and Daša Kokole (APYN)*

Agenda:

- Situation with Utrip's resignation and next steps
- Going through the deliverables and checking the progress
- Interim reporting

Situation with UTRIP's resignation and next steps

APYN explains they met with Matej and what were the agreements there. All the agreements that were presented at the meeting are available in the separate document.

Jan prepares a new budget in line with all the new information (also from Utrip, when they send it all the necessary information) – how the money will be divided between partners now.

Deliverables progress

- Deliverable 1: Utrip is supposed to send it by 15h – after that STAP will be taking over to finalize it. When Utrip sends it, APYN checks if all the EC comments were taken into account. STAP then goes through it and sees what can be done with the time we have. In case we don't receive anything from Matej until 15th, the rest of consortium takes the D1 over and work with the D1 as we have it now (the last version)



- Reports on the trainings: STAP will send it by 15th May
- Implementation plan for the »Boost my project« initiative: Jan sends the plan based on the applications by 22nd May (including which organisations from which countries participate in which initiative, risk analysis etc)
 - o Eurocare introduces to APYN a French youth organisation who was interested in working on alcohol to get in touch
 - o After the organisation send in detailed applications, the consortium gives feedback in order for them to improve it
- Report on alcohol laws: APYN is working on it, when it is done, it is possible to send it to CNAPA representatives from all the countries in order to check the accuracy
- APYN is also working on the new webpage, FB page and newsletter (with help of Eurocare if needed)
- Manual: UTRIP sends table of contents by 15th May
- Evaluation: APYN checks through the revised evaluation plan and suggests who could do what and if anything needs to be further revised, then work is divided between all three partners with STAP being the leading partner as they have the most expertise
- External evaluation: we cancel the current call (APYN drafts the email, UTRIP sends it out) and lower the amount of money (in the change of budget) and say everything will be paid for in the end
 - o Commission rules are : if up to 5000 eur, there need to be at least two bids
 - o The current applicants are asked if they still want to apply and what can they do for the lower amount of money
 - o Otherwise, we do not need an open call and we do not need to pay in advance
- New scientific committee: Jan is contacting the experts we selected, Daša will coordinate its work
- Additionally, Wim's idea is to ask RARHA WP for the assessment list of good practices; this can help us with evaluation and assessment and producing the manual



The list of all of the deliverables/documents to be handed in with the next report are attached in the excel document.

Interim reporting:

- APYN sends the draft report for the WP work to be filled in as soon as possible, the partners send it back by 25th of May; on 29th the final version is sent to partners for final check
- The report with all the deliverables will be handed in by 4th of June

Additional information from call with Paola:

- She is out of office from 18th May to 19th June, for any emergencies we can contact Dirk Muesel
- When assigning tasks between partners, it is good we have in mind that the WP3 needs to have clear and formal leader, to which all the money goes
- We are advised to really check everything before circulating things with the Agency (all the documentation)
- In case we decide to extend the project because of the conference, written extension request needs to be sent to the Agency

In the next meeting in London on 8th of June, we will discuss the Memorandum of understanding between the partners, so we have it for the last year of the project. Also, on the next meeting, the next steps in the project will be discussed more in detail.

Conference (APYN + Eurocare)

- The 3rd EAPYC would take place just before 7th EAPC (for which Eurocare would apply anyway); for young people there wouldn't be more than 100 eur fee
- The optimal date for us would be between 15th May and 15 June (although June would be less good for young people as they have exams then), but not later than 30th of June



- Jan meets up with Vesna Kerstin Petrič from MoH of Slovenia to propose our ideas and dates on Monday, 11.5

Proposed timeline of the conference:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Arrival day	EAPYC	EAPYC	EAPYC	EAPYC	EAPC	EAPC	GA APYN/Eurocare

7th Let it hAPYN Steering Committee meeting

London, 8th of June 2015, 9.30 – 14.15 BST

Present: *Jan Pelozza, Daša Kokole, Rok Primožič (all APYN), Wim van Dalen, Fieke Franken (both STAP), Mariann Skar, Aleksandra Kaczmarek (both Eurocare)*

Jan opens the meeting at 9.30 and welcomes the participants. He also formally notified the project partners that the fourth partner, Inštitut Utrip, has withdrawn from the project due to their organisational and financial difficulties.

1. Update on the interim report

Daša informs the participant that the 2nd interim report was submitted to the CHAFEA and shortly presents the main points.

The Committee discussed the evaluation and possible future steps for the Deliverable 1 – the literature overview and survey on good and bad practices of alcohol interventions in youth organisations. The evaluation of the 1st interim report has stated that this deliverable would need to be improved, and while Utrip has provided the improved version, not all



comments were included. As the Committee agreed that there is not much additional time that could be spent on revising the report, it was agreed that there will be some changes in the format of how the results are presented. It was also agreed that some additional approaches to alcohol interventions will be added to the final report.

It was also agreed that the current version will be presented to the Scientific committee and based on their comments and suggestions improved if needed.

Jan has informed the Committee that APYN has established a new website for the LiH project, however it is still operating at the temporary address (www.hapyn.apyn.eu) as the original address was not transferred to APYN yet. Before submitting the 2nd interim report, APYN has also established a new Facebook page for LiH.

As Inštitut Utrip has withdrawn from the project, some other partner will have to take over the WP3. In the 2nd interim report, we have included several evaluations according to the revised evaluation plan: evaluations of the meetings, training in Amsterdam and EAPYC.

There were also several publications that were annexes to the interim report: Survey on alcohol interventions; 2 training manuals; Report on alcohol laws in EU countries; Survey on internal Youth organisations alcohol policies.

There were some problems with regards to the time period for the 1st interim report, which has also resulted in a negative evaluation. This time the time period was clearer and the report was submitted on time, however it was noted that it would be good to have more feedback from the partners.

APYN has also improved the coordination activities on the project, and Daša will follow-up on the agreed tasks and issues. The project has come to the implementation phase, where it



will be important to monitor and support youth organisations that will be implementing the projects on the ground.

2. Boost my project implementation

Jan presented the implementation plan for the different activities in the Boost my project.

There are 4 different overall activities that will be implemented:

- 6 selected alcohol interventions in youth organizations in line with the characteristics of its environments (WP5);
- 7 national pilot consultations to suggest improvements of existing national regulations and how to improve compliance of these regulations in the future with respective »National Youth Manifestos« in each of the participating countries (WP6);
- 7 field studies about the compliance with existing alcohol laws (WP7)
- 7 stakeholder discussions.

There are different organisations that will be implementing them; some will implement all 4 activities, some fewer.

The Committee discussed the main goals of the activities, which are diverse and don't only focus on the changes within the organisations. The activities should also contribute to the change in the knowledge and attitudes of the involved young people, they should have effect on the youth organisations (internal policies), so they will contribute to change both in involved young people and in organisations themselves.

Jan also presented the Committee with an overview of the current developments. He has been in contact with all the organisations that were chosen for the Boost my project, and they are currently in the process of submitting a detailed action plan for their activities. There were different kinds of organisations chosen: membership youth organisations,



national youth councils as well as organisations for youth (youth centres etc.) and other organisations. The activities that will be implemented will vary, as different organisations have different possibilities for implementation. So far, there was an agreement on dates with the Slovenian organisations, EPSA and EMSA, while we are still waiting for replies from the others.

The Committee then discussed how to involve other partners better in the Boost my project ideas, and it was agreed that STAP would help with the evaluation of impact, whereas Eurocare will take care of the dissemination of national consultations.

The committee discussed the evaluation of the impact of the activities, and agreed that there should be pre- and post-measuring, and not only numerical measures, but also some stories and qualitative feedback. At the final conference there should be focus groups with the project leaders in order to assess the changes. It was agreed that there should be an evaluation at the beginning, during and after the activities and that it should evaluate the impact on the project leaders, participants and participating organisations.

It was agreed that the evaluation plan for the Boost my project will be prepared until the end of June (adapted from the existing overall evaluation plan. Daša will prepare more detailed structure and approximate timeline of the activities until 18th of June, and STAP and Scientific Committee will comment on the plan until end of June. STAP will prepare the questionnaire/evaluation procedure after they receive the details of the projects from APYN until the beginning of July (3.7.). Details should be sent to participating organisations until 15th of July.

3. Next steps

WP 1 – Coordination



The planned next meetings of the Steering committee are:

- Edinburgh, 5th of October 2015 (most likely Scientific committee meeting)
- Ljubljana, 21st of October 2015

Additionally, there will be a Skype meeting taking place in the Summer based on a doodle date

WP 2:

WP 3: revised evaluation plan and how the tasks will be divided

STAP will take care of this working package from this meeting on. They will prepare the guidelines for the External evaluator on what needs to be monitored and evaluated, and send them to project partners for comments.

The existing deliverables will be sent to the Scientific Committee for quality assurance and will be revised before finalisation based on their comments.

6. Revised budget

Rok has presented the proposed changes to the budget that are due to the fact that some tasks have been re-allocated and the withdrawal of one of the project partners. The revised version will be submitted to CHAFEA for approval as soon as possible.

7. Timeline until the end of the project

It was agreed that Rok will prepare a revised Gantt diagram of activities for the whole project, based on the new action plan. The deadline for the diagram is 31st of July.

STAP will prepare templates for the evaluation and reporting of the activities in the



framework of the Boost my project until the beginning of July. APYN will disseminate it to the participating organisations.

Summary (main agreements and to do's):

- At the moment we wait with improving the D1 until we get back the EC and Scientific committee's comments. The results of the research should almost surely be revised
- Eurocare is in touch with APYN regarding transfer of the website domain
- Evaluation plan for the Boost my project will be prepared until the end of June (adapted from the existing overall evaluation plan. Daša will prepare more detailed structure and approximate timeline of the activities until 18th of June, and STAP and Scientific Committee will comment on the plan until end of June. STAP will prepare the questionnaire/evaluation procedure after they receive the details of the projects from APYN until the beginning of July (3.7.). Details should be sent to participating organisations until 15th of July.
- STAP also prepares guidelines for the External evaluator on what needs to be monitored and evaluated, and send them to project partners for comments.
- Rok will prepare a revised Gantt diagram of activities for the whole project, based on the new action plan. The deadline for the diagram is 31st of July.
- APYN agrees on internal matters, such as preparing reports for the collaborating partners and more detailed implementation plan of the boost my project initiatives



8th Let it hAPYN Steering Committee meeting

Eurocare office, 27.1.2016

Present: Wim van Dalen (STAP), Mariann Skar (Eurocare), Jan Peloza (APYN), Daša Kokole (APYN)

General updates about the project:

We are still waiting for the feedback regarding budget amendments. We are also waiting for feedback regarding project extension – APYN keeps the other two partners in loop when any feedback is received.

Rok has attended meeting organised by CHAFEA regarding financial reporting. Partners can expect further instructions regarding financial reporting based on that workshop and general recommendations from CHAFEA in March. WE would like to start with sorting out the reporting before the actual end of the project, so not everything is done last minute.

Discussion by work packages

WP1:

- Partners agree that no further physical meetings need to be convened for the steering committee; we keep in touch over Skype or if we are all at the same place for some other event
- Partners are willing to help with the reporting as much as they can

WP 2:

APYN board has prepared provisional schedule for the conference:



	12th	13th	14th	15th	16th	17th	18th
Morning	Arrivals	Get to know each-other	Parallel sessions	Workshop	Closing plenary	APYN GA	LiH Evaluation meeting
Afternoon			Workshop				

That would mean the partners (STAP, Eurocare) would join on 13th and 14th morning – for the plenary session and parallel sessions.

The conference will be elaborated upon by APYN. Participants are in the process of selection and the other partners will be updated when there is more information.

Manual on best practices will be prepared by the conference and is being coordinated by Jan.

Stakeholder meetings will take place in the spring; Jan is in charge of coordination.

WP 3:

Process evaluation will be carried out along with getting feedback from reporting – Daša will be in charge of communicating with the project coordinators.

APYN is in charge of preparing final evaluation meeting for associate partners, which will take place on 18th May and will include everybody that participated in the project in any way.

External evaluation:

- We should get in touch with external evaluator and discuss further actions:

- We offer him events which he could join as part of his task: examples are EAPYC and one of the National consultations. Likewise, we ask about what contact with participants he wants to have (for any questionnaires)). Daša coordinates with Wim regarding that.
- Evaluator should also be informed about the possibility of extending the project and adapt the timeline to that.

WP5:

List of current evidence based projects taking place:

Country	Name	Organisation	Type of intervention
Romania	Anca Iorgulescu	Peace Revolution	Peer developed initiative
Slovenia	Matej Likar	MC Ajdovscina	Policy change
Slovenia	Lucija Pečlin	No excuse Slovenia	Mystery shopping
Slovenia	Jelena Vukmir	MC Nova Gorica	School based interactive programmes
Lithuania	Nijole Gostautaite	Mental health initiative	Advocacy /media campaign
Lithuania	Lukas Galkus	Limsa	Internal policy

Daša is in charge of collecting reports as different initiatives are mentored by different APYN board members. Reports will be shared with the other partners as well. We aim to have all the reports by end of April.

A revision of toolkits needs to be made based on comments by scientific committee and potential comments of youth users. APYN – Daša collects feedbacks from the participants by



mid-March and forwards it to Wim in order to revise the toolkits (provisionally by end of April).

WP6:

Daša is in charge of revising the Alcohol Laws report based on Scientific committee suggestion of appraising certain youth-related policies to assess the youth friendliness of policies in certain countries. Also, the survey will be further disseminated in order to get youth views on EU alcohol strategy.

Daša and Rok are in charge of coordination and preparation of the protocol for the national consultation and for help with implementation in various countries. The main outcome of the national consultations will be to get youth suggestions for improvements of their national alcohol policy.

WP7:

List of current researches taking place:

Country	Name	Organisation	Type of research
Malta	Charlene Debrincat	Gozo Youth Council	Mystery shopping
Lithuania	Lukas Galkus	LiMSA	Advertising monitoring
Romania	Diana Sabo	DEIS	Mystery shopping
Slovenia	Daša Kokole	No Excuse Slovenia	Advertising monitoring
Croatia	Nina Lukić	Croatian Dental students organisation	Other research – attitudes to drinking
Italy	Silvia Angelicchio	Cesavo	Other research – prevalence of

Netherlands can also help as they are currently involved with price research – Daša is in contact with Wim regarding reporting.

For the toolkits revision, same thing applies as for toolkits in WP5.

Scientific committee meetings

1st Scientific Committee meeting Let it hAPYN

APYN office

Celovška 185 | 1000 | Ljubljana | Slovenia

12th February 2014 9.00 – 11.00

Present: Jan Peloz, Daša Kokole (APYN), Matej Košir (Inštitut Utrip), Fieke Franken (STAP),

The scientific committee meeting and discussion was aimed mostly at presentation of the current work of Utrip, who presented preliminary results of the research of mapping the alcohol prevention projects across Europe. Additionally, the preliminary results of literature review were presented. The presentation can be found in attachment .

There were no major comments on the contents of presentation, except that it should be discussed afterwards on the steering committee meeting how to increase the number of organisations participating in research.



2nd Scientific Committee meeting Let it hAPYN

Minutes

STAP Office

Goeman Borgesiuslaan 77 | 3515 ET | Utrecht | The Netherlands

10th April 2014 13.00 – 14.30

Present: Daša Kokole (APYN), Fieke Franken (STAP), Wim van Dalen (STAP)

The meeting concerned the content programme of the training in Amsterdam. The agreements were:

- First day of the training will be common for all three trainings in order for all the participants to start with the same common knowledge – we look into possibility of having a beginner and advanced version of it.
- It will cover basics of alcohol and alcohol policy, teambuilding games, external speaker. Fieke will make a more concrete suggestion
- Daša will look into possibilities for splitting into groups and make suggestion on how this could be done in the most appropriate way
- STAP checks for suggestion for an external speaker from a local environment
- Each of the partners prepares draft programme for their own training by end of June
- There shouldn't be too many presentations in one day – we should ensure it is interesting for young people (all three days)
- We should have in mind to make them prepare as concrete plans as possible already during the event (incorporate it in the programme)
- Think about financing during the program. We can explain the call for money during the training. If they apply they can use the money after the training.
- The invitation to the training is sent to collaborating partners and to people who have filled in the questionnaire



3rd Scientific Committee meeting Let it hAPYN Minutes

STAP Office

Goeman Borgesiuslaan 77 | 3515 ET | Utrecht | The Netherlands

4th March 2015, 14.00 – 17.00

Present: *Daša Kokole (APYN), Fieke Franken (STAP)*

The meeting concerned mainly preparation of materials for the Overview of the internal alcohol policies of the collaborating partners. The results of the meeting are the questionnaires attached below.

It was then agreed the questionnaires are finalized by both partners (both still review the questionnaire and agree on the final version) and APYN is responsible for dissemination among the collaborating partners' organisations.

Overview of internal alcohol policies of the members: questions for organisations

Condition: member of the board or having a leading role in the organisation, in the organisation at least for a year. The person can consult others if not sure about the answers

Does your organisation have any internal policies regarding alcohol?

1. Yes
2. No

If yes:

- Is the organisation's internal alcohol policy connected to (yes no):
 - Alcohol use
 - Alcohol serving
 - Alcohol selling
 - Other



- Can you explain the content of the policy?
- Is the policy
 - o formal (written down)
 - o informal (norms)
 - o other
- What was the reason behind establishing the alcohol policy?
- What percentage of your members know about the policy?
- What percentage of your members adhere to the policy?
- How do the members get to know about this policy?
- To what extent members support the organisation's policy? 1 – 5
- Do you have any sanctions for members who don't adhere to the rules?
 - o Yes no (explain your answer)

If no:

- o Why don't you have any internal policy regarding alcohol?
- o Did you ever consider having it?
 - o Yes no – if yes, explain
- o Do you think the organisation would benefit from having alcohol internal policy?
 - o Yes no - Please explain the answer.
- o If you said yes, which areas would you focus on:
 - o Alcohol use
 - o Alcohol serving
 - o Alcohol selling
 - o Other

For both:

- What is the attitude your organisation generally has towards alcohol?

1 – Very negative 2. Predominantly negative 3 – both negative and positive 4 – predominately positive 5 – very positive 6 - N/A



Please explain your answer

- Has the organisation ever provided alcohol for the activities?
 - For most or all of the activities
 - For some of the activities
 - Just couple of times, for minority of activities
 - Never
- In what occasions is alcohol provided? (yes/no)
 - Formal events
 - Informal gatherings
 - Parties organised by the organisation
 - Working weekends
 - Week long activities
 - Teambuilding purposes
 - Other
- How does the organisation obtain the alcohol that is provided to the participants?
 - Buying
 - Fundraising
 - Having it donated
 - Other
- Have you ever collaborated in any way with alcohol industry?
 - Yes no
 - Please explain (in what way, when, how often).
- Have you ever had any troubles related to alcohol at your organisation events/activities?
 - Yes No
 - If yes, explain

Did any of the below stated occurrences happen at the events of the organisation in the last year (yes no)



- a minor consuming alcohol at the event/activity
- having a minor getting drunk at the event/activity
- having a member throwing up at the organisation activity due to alcohol
- having to call an ambulance because somebody got excessively drunk at an event/activity
- having a member aggressive/violent to other members under the influence alcohol
- members not being able to take part in the activities because of excessive drinking the night before

Online survey for the members

Age, gender

Organization - list of organisations

The level of activity in the organization

-I'm formally a member, but do not participate in activities

- Member, sometimes participate in activities

- Member regularly participate in activities

- Actively help in organizing activities

- Member of the Board / Executive Board

Does your organization have an internal policy regarding alcohol? YES NO I dont know

If yes: how much do you agree with the internal rules regarding alcohol 1 – 5

If no: do you think your organisation would need internal policy? Yes no – I don't know

Do you think that alcohol is a drug? YES NO

Questions	Scoring system				
	0	1	2	3	4
How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?	Never	Monthly or less	2 - 4 times per month	2 - 3 times per week	4+ times per week
How many units of alcohol do you drink on a typical day when you are drinking?	1 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 6	7 - 9	10+
How often have you had 6 or more units if female, or 8 or more if male, on a single occasion in the last year?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily

Please rate your agreement with those statements from 1 – Completely disagree to 5 – completely agree

Youth organizations are an important factor in establishing drinking habits among their members.

The younger members of our organization look up to older members when it comes to drinking (or not drinking) alcohol.

In the organisation I do not feel any pressure about drinking alcohol.

In the context of the activities / activities of the organization I already got heavily drunk.

I already got heavily drunk with the members of the organization outside organization activities

I can not imagine social activities in our organisation without alcohol.



1st revised Let it hAPYN Scientific Committee meeting

London, 8th of June 2015, 14.30 – 15.30 BST

Present: Jan Peloza, Daša Kokole, Rok Primožič (all APYN), Wim van Dalen and Fieke Franken (STAP), Katherine Brown, Peter Rice, Robert Pezzolezi (via Skype), Lidia Segura Garcia (via Skype)

Jan opens the meeting and welcomes the participants. He explains that the composition of the Committee was enlarged, as the project partners have agreed that the project would benefit from the additional outside perspective.

1. Presentation of the Let it hAPYN projects, its goals and results achieved so far

Daša shortly presented the projects and main deliverables that were achieved so far. The committee discussed the goals and aims of the project. Katherine has commented that the project idea was interesting and that there needs to be more effort put on including and empowering the youth organisations in the discussion about alcohol policy. Peter inquired whether the projects partners have contacted any youth researchers that work on the topic. Lidia has pointed out the challenge in attracting youth organisations to the policy debates in Catalonia, as there are not many of them that are working on alcohol policy. Robert has compared the situation in Europe to the American one. He commented that the usual interventions take place in the setting of educational institutions, but that the youth organisations are not often actors in these processes. The challenge he sees is how to balance the empowerment of youth organisations to work on this field while still maintaining the scientific approach to alcohol interventions.

Daša additionally explained that the LiH project is not only about alcohol policy, but also about the research to support those policies and different alcohol interventions.



2. Tasks of the Scientific Committee and next meetings

Daša shortly explained what are the expectations from the members of the Scientific Committee. She pointed out that there are several deliverables that would need to be commented upon, but that not all members have to comment on all of them. The comments should be done over the summer, which members assessed as doable. All the current deliverables will be sent to the committee, and Daša will highlight the main publications that would need to be commented upon first.

The Committee has discussed the possible dates for a face-to-face meeting, which is planned to happen during the GAPA conference. The 5th of October in the afternoon is the most optimal possibility so far. The exact dates and details will be communicated over e-mail.

Summary and main agreements:

- Members of SC will receive the currently prepared documents by e-mail, and will be able to choose which documents they would like to comment upon. It would be the most optimal if each member would choose at least two documents to comment upon and if those would be divided evenly among the SC members. Deadline for choosing the documents is end of June, and to send in comments is end of August.
- The date for the next SC meeting, which will take place in person in Edinburgh is 5th October in the afternoon, more precise times will be communicated closer to the date.



2nd revised Scientific committee meeting minutes

Present: Lidia Segura, Katherine Brown, Wim van Dalen, Daša Kokole

Purpose of the meeting was to comment on some of the products that were produced so far in the Let it hAPYN project. The comments of the SC members are aggregated below for each of the products separately.

a) Report on the alcohol laws in EU countries

- Can be very useful, not just as an information resource for young people but also as an advocacy tool (if elaborated upon)
- One thing than can be amended is the new Scottish law from 2014: lowering the driving BAC limit to 0,5 promiles; also it should be made clear when the information was updated the last time
- Report could be enhanced in next steps to be used as an advocacy tool: the idea was to make an overview of countries with different degrees of »youth friendly policies« to show inequalities of youth protection in different European countries; as an example this report was put forward: <http://www.ias.org.uk/News/2015/13-November-2015-UK-Governments-alcohol-policies-weaker-than-devolved-nations.aspx>
- Based on that, the next steps could be to create a scorecard and rate the countries in order to use this report as an advocacy tool; The strength of the report can be to show to what extent youth friendly the alcohol policies are in various countries
- Suggestion is also to connect with experts from Amphora and Alice Rap projects who worked on policies ratings (eg. Esa Ostenberg)

b) Handbook “How to implement an effective intervention to prevent alcohol related harm?”



- When it comes to examples of possible projects on pages 21-23, suggestion was made to replace short and broad suggestions for putting in smaller amount of good practices but presented more in detail – perhaps describe the activities based on the steps outlined in the previous chapters of the handbook
- In the final version of the handbook those examples could be drawn from projects that were carried out in scope of Let it hAPYN’s Boost my project initiative
- When it comes to health effects, some more facts could be added; such as that 1 in 4 deaths among young people is attributable to alcohol related causes; mouth and throat cancer can be added when describing the effect of alcohol on cancer; in general more information on relation of alcohol and adolescent brain can be drawn from this report: <http://www.ias.org.uk/What-we-do/Publication-archive/Alcohol-Alert/November-2014/New-SHAAP-report-focusses-on-alcohol-and-brain-damage-in-teenagers.aspx>

c) Report “Engagement of youth organisations in prevention interventions in the field of alcohol policy”

- What the report lacks is emphasis on how little has actually being done on the field of mobilisation on alcohol related issues; only 64 out of all approached organisations participated in the survey; the analysis of this fact should be more critical - why so little response?
- This document could be used to show how much more needs to be done in terms of mobilisation of civil society; both in adult and youth spheres; these gaps should be presented in report – it should be pointed out what the sector is lacking and that more needs to be done.



d) Handbook for Youth research for Compliance with Alcohol Age Limits and with Alcohol Marketing Regulations

- There are two main chapters: mystery shopping and advertising monitoring. Since the second chapter is primarily focused on answering the question »How to monitor advertising«, first chapter should also be similar in structure (eg. »How to monitor compliance with alcohol age limits«) and mystery shopping should be presented as the one possible method.
- Another useful link for this topic:
<http://www.ias.org.uk/uploads/pdf/IAS%20reports/Eurocare%20report%20on%20age%20limits%202014.pdf>



Other meetings

Kick off meeting report with collaborative partners

16th May 2013, Bursa, Turkey

On 16th of May, Kick off meeting for Let it hAPYN project took place in Bursa, Turkey. The main of the meeting was to present the project, its aims and objectives to all project partners.

Representatives from almost all participating youth organisations gathered to be introduced to the project. On the meeting, the project with it's aims and objectives was presented, as well as the associate and collaborative partners and the project's timeline. Representatives also participated in the session on expectations and fears and established some guidelines for successful communication among partners (see appendix). There was also presentation of the other projects, connected to Let it hAPYN project, for example APYN Triangle project and Regional European Alcohol Policy Youth Conference.

The agenda covered:

- Presentation of the project, its aims and objectives
- Presentation of the associated and collaborating partners
- Expectations and fears by participants
- Presentation of the timeline of the project
- Projects connected to the Let it hAPYN project

In the days following the kick off meeting, APYN General assembly took place, which meant representatives had more time for networking and setting common ground for the project's successful future.



The presentation of the project is available on:

http://prezi.com/kpgboziee_m/?utm_campaign=share&utm_medium=copy&rc=ex0share

Appendix:

1) List of fears and expectations as expressed by the project partners

Expectations:

- Creating new international project on reducing alcohol harm
- Offer platform and give support to youth- stakeholders
- Sensibilization of partners towards to goals
- Exchange of best practices and experiences
- Effective interventions to be implemented worldwide
- New contacts between countries
- Developing new projects to promote harms of alcohol abuse
- Learning experience – developing research, practical legislative knowledge
- Socializing – make new friends, learn about alcohol realities
- Get new experiences in alcohol field
- Leisure time
- Do something with good results
- Having wider impact than alcohol
- Raising awareness on alcohol problem/policy
- See what's effective and what is not
- Toolkit very useful and easy to adopt in every country + would be used
- Increased capacity of apyn and apyn organisations
- Implementation and recognizing of tooling around yourope –
- Increase visibility of apyn and members
- Concrete changes and achievements at the end of the project

Fears:



- Missing the opportunities due to lack of information
- Reaching the common objective might be difficult because of variety of perspectives
- People refuse to cooperate on this topic
- We fail – increase the consumption
- Failing to develop tools to reach different groups of young adults
- To fail to engage with the socially excluded young people
- Project having no impact at all
- Not managing to adopt the projects to different cultural social religious norms
- Problems in communication (language barriers)
- Not implementing plans
- Too much information to take in (esp. Newcomers)
- People losing interest in the project (too much presentations etc)
- We will develop a toolkit that won't be used because of cultural differences
- Too much conversation, too little action
- How will communication between organisations go
- Different organisations must work equally on the plan – ownership
- Having unclear timelines and deadlines – too short
- Having unclear guidelines for collecting best practices
- Other partners having lack of time for this project
- People changing – sustainability not ensured

2) Guidelines for successful communication

- Emails and email headlines should be clear and informative
- Channel has to be accessible to all
- Face to face communication is preferable, when that is not possible, Skype should have priority over e-mail
- One should not assume others know what one's thinking



- When tasks are divided, its important that people confirm understanding of what they have to do
- When somebody is not able to reply, they should put out of office message
- Communication should be targeted to right people
- Don't spam people with things that are not really needed
- When arranging meetings, keep in mind different timezones of different participants
- Dropbox or a webpage should be established for all the information