



FOCUS ON YOUTH
FOOTBALL & ALCOHOL

CHAFEA Grant Nr: ID 738 157 FYFA

Deliverable 1.2 D5

Relevant Partner Meetings



Work package 1

Main Partners

European Alcohol Policy Alliance



Scottish Health Action on Alcohol Problems



Ehkaiseva Päihdetyö ehyt ry Forebyggande
Rusmedelsarbete ehyt rf



Polish State Agency for Prevention of
Alcohol-related Problems (PARPA), Poland



Fundatia Romtens



Vereniging voor Alcohol-en andere
Drugproblemen



Istituto Superiore di Sanita



International Youth Health Organization
(YHO)



Title: Deliverable 1.2 D 5 Relevant Partner Meetings

Author (s): Sandra Tricas Sauras/Aleksandra Kaczmarek/Mariann Skar

Date: 20th August 2020

Address: Rue Archimede 17, 1000 Brussels, Belgium



Co-funded by
the Health Programme
of the European Union



This document has been prepared by the authors on behalf of the FYFA Work Package 1 “Coordination of the project” and is a result of the FYFA project.

The FYFA project has been financed by the European Commission’s –3rd Health Programme – HP-PJ-2016. For more information and the electronic version of the document, see: <https://www.fyfaproject.eu/>

FYFA WORK PACKAGE 1 WORKING TEAM

European Alcohol Policy Alliance (Eurocare)

Mariann Skar, Aleksandra Kaczmarek, Sandra Tricas-Sauras,

International Youth Health Organization (YHO)

Urša Šetina, Lukas Galkus

Fundatia Romtens (Romtens), Romania

Ioana Precup

Scottish Health Action on Alcohol Problems (SHAAP) - Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Eric Carlin, Briege Nugent

Istituto Superiore di Sanità (ISS), Italy

Emanuele Scafato, Claudia Gandin

Vereniging voor Alcohol en andere Drugproblemen vzw (VAD), Belgium

Ellen Coghe, Jochen Schrooten

Ehkäisevä päihdetyö (EHYT), Finland

Leena Sipinen

Polish State Agency for Prevention of Alcohol-related Problems (PARPA), Poland

Katarzyna Okulicz, Jolanta Terlikowska



Table of Content

FYFA Relevant Partner Meetings	5
Overview Relevant Partner meetings	7
1. Management meetings.....	10
2. Skype calls	10
Appendix	11
FYFA Kick Off meeting Luxembourg 4 th and 5 th September 2017	11
Management meeting minutes 9th March 2018, Rome	22
Management meeting minutes 22 nd November 2018 Edinburgh	30
Management meeting minutes, Warsaw 20 th May 2019	35
Response to consolidated report after meeting 27.11 Luxembourg	39
Management meeting minutes, Brussels 31 st January 2020	41



FYFA Relevant Partner Meetings

Project Rationale

Young people who drink alcohol have an enhanced risk of immediate and longer-term health and social harms. Harmful use of alcohol has been linked to more than 200 diseases and causes of injury and is a large economic and social burden on societies. Underage drinking and heavy episodic drinking of alcohol is of concern in Europe because of its impact on health and welfare of the population. A review of evidence as part of the Focus on Youth, Football and Alcohol (F.Y.F.A) Project shows that alcohol use by young people has been linked to short terms risks such as black outs, risky sexual behaviour, truancy and an adverse impact on mental health. Some of the long-term risks to drinking alcohol can be the effects on brain development, liver disease, alcohol dependence, and mortality.

The F.Y.F.A project aims to identify best practices in prevention of alcohol related harm in sport settings. We hope to contribute towards reducing alcohol related harm with a special focus on underage drinking. We aim at generating good practices targeting the reduction of heavy episodic drinking among young people and developing guidelines on this matter for youth sport clubs across Europe.

A multimethod design is used for this comprehensive project with main strands focusing on international, national, and local levels. This project reviews policies and practices relating to young people, alcohol, and international sport, to gather evidence of best practices. Also, interviews are conducted at specific timepoints. Local sports stakeholders and young people are interviewed, and communication materials will be produced on alcohol policy and early intervention. A video summarising the results of young peoples', attitudes, and behaviours towards alcohol and what they would consider to be effective practices will be produced and disseminated.

F.Y.F.A actively promotes the exchange of knowledge and good practices between and within European countries, to raise awareness of alcohol related harm amongst policymakers and citizens.

Methodology and Objectives

The comprehensive structure chosen is organized into nine main strands (Working Packages). Three working packages (WPs) are horizontal (coordination, dissemination, and evaluation) dealing with general operational aspects of the project. The content-oriented WPs are:

WP₄ Review of international policies and practices related to alcohol, young people, marketing and football.



WP5 Review of national policies and practices related to alcohol, young people, marketing, and football in six Member States (MS).

WP6 Review of local policies and practices related to alcohol, young people, marketing, and football in six MS.

WP7 Research with eight young people (four men and four women) aged 13-15 in each of the six MS.

WP8 Production of a video summarising key themes from young people's interviews (two men two women) in three MS (Finland, Poland, and UK).

WP9 Exchange of knowledge and good practice by supporting capacity building and networking with the aim of raising awareness among key policy and decision makers and preparing recommendations for sport clubs.

The duration of the F.Y.F.A project is 36 months, and a total of eight main partners are involved, namely: the European Alcohol Policy Alliance, International Youth Health Organization, EHYT, ISS, PARPA, ROMTENS, SHAAP and VAD.

Additionally, fifteen collaborating stakeholders (from eight different countries) are associated, and three international expert institutions collaborate towards a positive outcome of this research. The collaborating stakeholders are: Temperance Movement (Estonia), Alcohol Action Ireland (Ireland), Institute of Alcohol Studies (UK), Monash University (Australia), Alcohol and Society (Denmark), ACTIS (Norway), Sociodrogalcohol (Spain), Centre for Healthy Hungary (Hungary), German Centre on Addiction Issues (Germany), the Dutch Institute for Alcohol Policy (The Netherlands), Lithuanian National Tobacco and Alcohol Coalition (Lithuania), Eurocare Italy (Italy), IOGT-NTO (Sweden), Addiction Info Switzerland (Switzerland), Turkish Green Crescent Society (Turkey) and the International Federation Blue Cross.

The scope and purpose of this deliverable is to hold an international conference on alcohol, sport and youth launching the project video where the FYFA project findings and recommendations will be shared and discussed.

1. To bring together scientists, alcohol and health experts, decision makers to build capacity to improve health.
2. Promote networking and coalition building between and within the European countries.
3. Promote and disseminate the most up to date knowledge in the field of alcohol policy.
4. Present cost-effective interventions in the area of alcohol policy that would benefit the sustainability of health systems in Member States.



6. Ensure alcohol policy is high on the agenda for the political leadership within the European Institutions.

Overview Relevant Partner meetings

Management and Coordination of FYFA consisted of:

- a) project co-ordinator and management team (work package leaders). At the Kick Off meeting the partners decided that the steering committee would be integrated into the work of the management team.
- b) project partners
- c) collaborating partners.

The management is striving towards being transparent and inclusive. The implementation of the FYFA project was monitored by the management team.

Project management structure:

The management structure of FYFA comprised a co-ordination team involving three levels of action in the project:

- a) project co-ordinator and management team. At the Kick off meeting in Luxembourg in September 2017 it was decided that the steering committee would be integrated into the management team.
- b) project partners
- c) collaborating partners.

The project management ensured a good dialogue between the partners. The management was based on the principles of rapid, direct and open communication, mediation and consensus. Operational decisions were the responsibility of WP Leaders, while day to day management at the project level was be the responsibility of the Project coordinator and the management team. To ensure effective dialogue and exchange of information with relevant Commission policymakers, regular meetings, briefings and informal contact took place between FYFA and relevant Commission Services.

Co-ordinator and Project Management team

Eurocare has a strong track record of working in European projects, especially with the Health Programme. Eurocare's staff were particularly committed to follow up the different stages of



the project and paid special attention to the financial management. The project management was responsible for:

- Providing leadership and strategic guidance to all project activities
- Ensure Consortium agreement is formalising the project management structure and the rights and obligations of partners within the consortium
- Overall management, technical and administrative coordination of the project
- Proposing changes in the strategic development of the project
- Accomplishment of all project obligations vis a vis the European Commission including financial, contractual and other management issues and submission of project deliverables and acting as intermediary between partners and the EC
- Implementation and control of quality assurance procedures
- Risk management should the need arise
- Calling, informing and chairing meetings and providing reports and minutes
- Ensuring action points decided upon at such meeting are fully met

Management Team (MT) was comprised of Eurocare project co-ordinator and the other workpackage leaders. The MT served as the co-ordination committee of the project and as the highest decision-making body in the project. The MT will meet at 6 months intervals to ensure adequate communication and development of the project, but fluent communication existed throughout the whole project. The initial Kick off meeting took place on the 4-5 September (year 1) and the MT agreed on a detailed work schedule.

The MT ensured that all partners provided continued support to the project and follow-up with the developments of the work in each WP. The MT was be responsible for:

- Content decisions related to the work packages
- Strategic outlook and policy perspective of the project
- Major changes in the work plan to be submitted to the EC for approval
- Review, quality check and approval of project deliverables and other outputs of public relevance
- Any ethical or gender issues that arises in the project

Work package leaders have overseen the project progress for each WP team and ensured continued communication with the project coordinator and the MT, being responsible for the deliverables of the project and adherence to the agreed work schedule.

Project communication and reporting - a joint communication strategy between the MT members was be set up by email, so all content and management issues arising during the project were known to all members. WP leaders reported to the MT team regularly by email and /or skype every two - three months providing an update of progress. Progress reports off all WPs were sent every six months and put together by the co-ordinator. Those were



distributed to all project members, as much as feasible, distributed one week prior to MT meetings.

Decision making processes - the management structure proposed ensures that decision making is stimulated by the project co-ordinator and discussed with the MT. This structure also supports the identification of problems or conflicts and the management structure can help resolve any problems at the earliest point possible using joint decision making when needed. The arrangement will be included in the Consortium Agreement.

Follow up of interim evaluation. At the management meeting in Warsaw the interim evaluation was presented orally. The report followed later in the summer. Project partners were not satisfied with the transparency of the decision-making process and that some partners received more slack on deadlines and quality of work than others from the coordinator. There was also an understanding that not all partners were engaged with all elements of the project. As a follow up of the internal evaluation a special skype meeting was organised, and it was agreed to meet face to face with all partners to discuss the way forward and how to improve the coordination and deliverables of the FYFA project. Due to partners previous commitments it was impossible to find a date to meet before the 31st January 2020. At this meeting both the internal organisation and the final deliverables at the conference was discussed. This management meeting was a follow up of the CHAFA external evaluation meeting on the 27.11.2019.

Based on the changes proposed by the associated partners Eurocare will in the final year;

- Ensure a better enforcement of the deadlines with monthly update
- Ensure work package leaders agree with the timing.
- Provide each month a summary with the state of the project: where we are, task and milestones for the respective month vs. where we are, etc.”
- Communication of information by each partner in a structured way as it has been mentioned that WP leaders tend “to send instructions or data intended for other partners in an already existing email thread, concerning some other question or other WP (for example, the next online meeting)” which makes it “time-consuming to find this information at a later time.”

There has been discussion on the use of basecamp or other tools to gather drafts and information about the project, however project partners decided in the Kickoff meeting to base the exchange of information on emails. There have also been discussions on use of other communication tools than skype – however, it has with intervals been decided by the partners to continue to use skype and in the final months Zoom.



1. Management meetings

The Kickoff meeting was held in Luxembourg at the CHAFEA premises on the 4-5 September 2017.

The second management meeting was held in Rome at the ISS premises on the 9 March 2018.

The third management meeting was held on the 22 November 2018 in connection with the 8th European Alcohol Policy Conference in Edinburgh at the SHAAP premises.

The fourth management meeting was held in Warsaw on the 20 May in connection with the Expert meeting on the 21 May 2019. It was organised by PARPA.

On the 27 November CHAFEA organised an external evaluation meeting at the CHAFEA premises with all partners present or by video call.

The sixth management meeting was held in Brussels on the 31st January 2020. At this meeting both the internal organisation and the final deliverables at the conference were discussed.

All minutes of the meetings are in the Annex

2. Skype calls

During the first year there has been three skype calls on the 13 December 2017, 1 February and 13 June 2018. In addition, there have been numerous email exchanges with regular updates from the coordination team and between partners.

During the second year there have been three skype calls on the 12 September 2018, 17 January and 26 March 2019. In addition, there have been numerous email exchanges and calls with regular updates from the coordination team and between partners. On average one email per month has been sent to all partners, in addition there are numerous individual email exchanges between the project leader and each partner – a quick search found more than 350 emails just in the second reporting period.

During the third year there was the following skype or Zoom calls on the 3 October 2019, 28 November 2019, 16 January, 30 March, 27 April, 15 May, 26 May 2020. During this period the final deliverables were discussed and the final conference/webinar on the 28 May 2020.

All minutes from the skype meetings are available upon request.



Appendix

FYFA Kick Off meeting Luxembourg 4th and 5th September 2017

Minutes

Location: CHAFEA Videoconference DRB E2,
European Commission, Consumers, Health, Agriculture and Food Executive Agency
12, Rue Guillaume Kroll, L-1182 Luxembourg

Participants

Name	Organisation
Eric Carlin	Scottish Health Action on Alcohol Problems (SHAAP)
Theodor Haratau	Romtens
Johan Jongbloet	Vereniging voor Alcohol-en Andere Drugproblemen vzw (VAD)
Kathleen Locus	
Scafato Emanuele	Istituto Superiore di Sanità (ISS)
Gandin Claudia	
Lukas Galkus	Alcohol Policy Youth Network (APYN)
Urša Šetina	
Jolanta Terlikowska	The State Agency for Prevention of Alcohol-Related Problems (PARPA)
Mariusz Morawski	
Leena Sipinen	



Tuomas Tenkanen	Finnish Association for Substance Abuse Prevention (EHYT)
Mariann Skar	European Alcohol Policy Alliance (Eurocare)
Wilfried Kamphausen	
Helder Fernandes	
Paul Lauwers	
Aleksandra Kaczmarek	
In attendance	
Dirk Meusel	European Commission, Consumers, Health, Agriculture and Food Executive Agency (CHAFEA)
Artur Furtado	European Commission, DG SANTE, C4
Valgerdur Gunnarsdottir	European Commission, DG SANTE, C4

Welcome

DM from CHAFEA welcomed all participants and presented the mission and activity of CHAFEA, also providing a brief history of the agency. DG SANTE was preparing and adopting the annual programme, priorities for funding. CHAFEA mandate was to prepare and manage the grant, from call for proposal, inviting external evaluators, making the ranking, writing evaluation summary reports, signature of the grant agreements, issuing the payments to engaging in the dissemination activities. CHAFEA was running 250 projects in health area alone. DM would be the contact person for the project.

DM introduced new Head of Unit – Renata Maroni. She welcomed all participants to Luxembourg, wishing the project fruitful cooperation and success.

Update on policy developments and priorities from DG SANTE

DG SANTE Deputy Head of Unit, C4 (nutrition, alcohol, physical activity) thanked participants for coming and touched upon few topics in terms of alcohol policy.

He outlined the general context, where work on alcohol is in the state of flux. AF pointed out that his Unit was trying to the best of their capabilities, to use the time of change to get something positive, this is mainly concerning the suspended European Alcohol and Health Forum (EAHF). He highlighted that in the current political climate there will be no new EU



Alcohol Strategy. However, he believed that the main areas of work remained valid. He pointed out the RARHA Joint Action, Action Plan on Youth and Heavy and Episodic Binge Drinking, which had been recently prolonged till 2020. AF outlined that the 'Christmas tree' approach of different policies for all different diseases, was taking too much resources and a lot of pressure from all sorts of sides. European Commission (EC) is changing to more horizontal approach, more economies of scale, at the same time reminding the Member States (MS) that health lies within their area of responsibility. If MS wish so, they could an take action on many policy approaches related to alcohol related harm. EC would be helping MS to reach the WHO targets that they have signed up to.

AF noted that the EC realises that horizontal chronic diseases approach might leave out specificities of alcohol related harm such as for instance drink driving. To that end, the work of Committee on National Alcohol Policy and Action (CNAPA) will be supplementary of the work of the recently established Steering Group on Promotion and Prevention, which composes of higher-level representatives from public health authorities. This Steering Group will be gathering best practices, asked to evaluate best practices and go one step beyond, certain political level, providing additional resources for implementation. Resources for prevention will follow this political approach of the MS. MS will identify which areas they want to work on for the future, these areas will merit more attention and resources. AF highlighted that this approach is putting back responsibility on MS, where it should be.

In terms of the ongoing initiatives, AF draw attention to efforts for simplification of Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), where there are some policy coherence problems between health and CAP policy i.e. wine promotional funds.

He mentioned the ongoing revision of Audio-visual Media Services Directive (AVMSD), which touches upon issue of alcohol marketing. In this context, CNAPA could potentially work on voluntary marketing codes.

Lastly, AF noted the excise duties and revision of two Directives, which touch on cross-border trade of alcohol for personal use.

In 2017-2018 EC will continue 1 million EUR support to MS, taking into consideration CNAPA opinion. The aim of the forthcoming tenders will be not to leave open gaps and be supportive of MS.

On the state of CNAPA and the EU Alcohol and Health Forum, AF noted that they are important audiences for the work developed in the FYFA project.

C4 has tried to use time of change to develop new way of working for the EAHF; for a long time, the EAHF was not operational and it is still not operational. However, it is hoped it will resume in November 2017 with new level of ambition and rigour. AF acknowledged that in the past the EAHF has been perceived as seal of approval to activities that are not as relevant as they should be.



The new proposed structure composing of two chambers, was presented to the economic operators and till 22nd September they must provide their answer to the EC. It is hoped that critical mass that would allow the group to work again.

The next CNAPA meeting is postponed, it will take place probably after the Estonian conference on alcohol in Tallinn.

AF highlighted that as soon as project has results that could be of interest to CNAPA, they should be presented. He also pointed out that the topics of youth drinking are relevant for the Action Plan and the Strategy, hence the work of this project is highly valued.

Goals and general layout of FYFA, Mariann Skar, project Coordinator

MS welcomed all the participants and thanked everyone for coming. She outlined the objectives, aims, work packages (WP) of the project. She emphasised her enthusiasm for the project in gathering new information in area that has not been touched upon before: young people and sport clubs. It is a very practical project 'hands-on' which should be easily used and spread across the EU.

EC procedures and administration, Dirk Meusel, CHAFA

DM provided a detailed power point presentation of the EC procedure and administration (please consult the meeting papers).

DM mentioned projects which could be of relevance for FYFA due to their similar nature or topic.

- Healthy Ageing Supported by Internet and the Community (HASIC) www.hasicproject.eu

Looking into older people 65+ how to promote better healthy diets to alcohol consumption and social participation, peer- to-peer as well as internet platform, mixture of different tools, how to make elderly people more confident in those topic areas., online platform getting used for getting advice

- Joint Action on Reducing Alcohol Related Harm (RARHA) www.rarha.eu

Strengthening the monitoring of drinking patterns and alcohol related harm across EU countries. Good practice principles in the use of drinking guidelines to reduce alcohol related harm.

- Raising awareness and action-research on Heavy Episodic Drinking among low income youth and young adults in Southern Europe (ALLCOOL)
- STAD in Europe (SIE) www.stadineurope.eu



Reducing binge drinking and its negative consequences, through restricting the availability of alcohol in different drinking environments, based on the STAD (Stockholm prevents alcohol and drug problems) approach.

- Local Strategies to Reduce Underage and Heavy Episodic Drinking (Localize-IT) www.localize-it.eu

Aims at strengthening municipalities in their capacity to reduce underage and heavy episodic drinking. Coordinated and custom-fit local alcohol strategies will be developed, implemented and evaluated for two municipalities each in AT, BE, CY, CZ, DE, EL, IT, NL, LU, PT and SK.

DM continued by presenting the procedures and outlining what is new in grant management and reporting. Procedures are changed and simplified:

- The main mechanism is electronic system for all
- Each partner can extend list of people, contacts to what they see in the participants portal
- Budgetary transfer freedom, costs necessary to implement the project; budget transfer threshold does not exist anymore. There is freedom within the project group to decide otherwise. Cost can move
- BUT Subcontracting needs an amendment (every change)
- Obligatory to make consortium agreement. CHAFEA does not want to see it, pure agreement between project partners

DM informed that pre-financing payment for FYFA has been paid.

Coordinator will be distributing 30% that gives cash float to start working in the month of September.

After 12 months, technical reporting and **financial reporting**; each partner reports the costs. Financial signatory submits financial report to coordinator who is checking against agreement-sending back for amendments or approving. Finally, coordinator submits to CHAFEA. In the meantime, if one partner is late, the whole project can submit even without one partner. Month 14 is the ultimate deadline (latest for submitting real assessment of the cost). However, all the costs that are not recorded might then be recorded at the end month (24). All costs linked to the project i.e. invoices should state the project name (Project FYFA). Calculating reasonable calculation of costs (depreciation), has to be justified in a coherent manner. Reporting for staff, fully working towards the project would be as full cost. However, for staff working partly on the project monthly time sheets are required. CHAFEA will provide a template for time sheets. Coordinator submits periodic reporting, both financial and technical reports.

Continuous reporting in the participants portal, allows **upload of deliverables** at any time. The electronic character allows for not sending more paper copies of deliverables and reports.



Coordinator is uploading deliverables as pdfs. At the latest at month 13, coordinator should upload deliverables. Submitted deliverable is a final product, it should be first approved by all partners in the group, only coordinator can deliver the final product.

Changing schedules for deliverables would mean changes in technical annex, referring also to due date of deliverables. For changes justifications have to be given, project would then receive an amendment. For later submission, usually in 99% of cases, amendment is granted.

It is advisable that most deliverables should be public. CHAFEA is working on a new project database (in the cloud) that should encompass all projects and their deliverables. HealthINI.EU the project website could be also held there.

When uploading deliverables, it is required to provide a little description, so that each deliverable can be used as a stand-alone tool/document. Short background/setting the scene of the project (in what context deliverables was created).

In terms of **funding references**, standard disclaimer has to be provided on the inside of the title page

For the **dissemination**, it is advised to be as much as possible active in dissemination work. It is responsibility of the whole project group, if the project shall have an impact, then it should be widely disseminated. CHAFEA open for help and support for instance the Health Policy Platform can be utilised for dissemination of press releases, news. Similarly, DG SANTE newsletter and website can be tools for dissemination. It is also advised to keep an ongoing record of dissemination activities.

Amendments can only include changes that do not put into question the funding decision i.e. methods and means should not be changed.

Changes of partnerships i.e. organisations merging, splitting up, will be treated on case by case basis. All amendments are done in participants portal, coordinator creates amendment putting in changes, system highlights for approval. Changes in collaborating partners and changes in leadership, only need any amendment if it changes character of the project. Budget does not require amendments.

In the terms of **subcontracting**, if organisation has rules, it can follow its own procurement rules. If it does not have the, it must be a transparent procedure clearly outlined.

It was clarified that there is no additional budget for translations and all project partners will provide materials in English. Translations will be done in-house by project partners.

It was agreed that MS will be sending alert to all project partners once deliverables have been uploaded to the participants portal.

Action: MS to obtain timesheet template from CHAFEA.



Second Day

Consortium agreement

MS reminded participants that consortium agreement was sent in advance of the meeting. MS will re-send consortium agreement following the Kick-off meeting. Organisations will have two working weeks (from the time of the kick-off meeting) to comment on the content and request changes (in track-changes)

MS emphasised that if any stage of the project any partner discovers, they cannot deliver, they have obligation to inform MS (Coordinator) immediately.

Action: MS to resend consortium agreement

Management Group

It was agreed that the Management and Steering Group will merge and compose of work package leaders and Coordinator.

Advisory Group

It was agreed to appoint an Advisory Group which will compose of few selected experts, each work package leader will identify expert within their work package (if deemed appropriate). Advisory Group members will not be remunerated, but if possible their travel costs will be covered. It was agreed that Advisory Group by peer-reviewing the process and project outcomes would strengthen the project and its evaluation. It was highlighted that one has to respect the deadlines much more, if one sends deliverables to external partners. On average deliverable would have to be finished at least two weeks before the deadline provided in the project outline, to allow time for amendments.

For the project three experts will be identified, they will review 3 reports and the guidelines.

Action: All project partners to send through suggested Advisors for the project.

Communication

It was agreed that communication throughout the project will be via e-mail. Every two months management Group will have catch-up skype calls. A physical meeting will take place before the interim reporting. It is the responsibility of all partners to be available.

MS will be sending alerts via e-mail once documents are uploaded to participants portal.

MS will set up dates for calls and meeting, they will be firstly consulted via Doodle.

It has been remarked that for the interim report there seems to be confusion regarding the dates. MS will clarify the dates; this will be sent together with the above-mentioned outline of timeline.



Action: MS sending Doodle with proposed meeting dates. This will be followed by revised timeline composing of: deliverables deadlines, call dates, meeting dates of the Management Group.

Logo

It was agreed that logo would look at sports related image, not purely football. Although, the focus on the local level will be on football this would be not the case for international and national level reviews. Some ideas given where of legs kicking the bottle, theme of Olympic rings.

Action: MS will send around draft logo for partners approval and outline of the website.

WP2 Dissemination - APYN/ Eurocare

APYN outlined the dissemination work package, within 3 months a draft communication plan will be delivered. It was highlighted that all partners are contributing to the dissemination efforts.

Communication plan will also have indicators used for evaluation i.e. outreach goal, number of printed materials etc.

Final communication plan will be provided in month 6.

Eurocare will be responsible for the website and project leaflet by month 3.

By month 7 APYN will be delivering social media accounts, Facebook, LinkedIn, Researchgate. Project infographics will follow as a result of project's deliverables to be shared to target groups. It was highlighted that this work package requires more work at the beginning and then continuous follow up.

Tools such as Health Policy Platform, DG SANTE newsletter will also be utilised.

EC mentioned that 8th European Alcohol Policy Conference (8EAPC) will also promote the project within its programme or side event.

Action: EC will also follow up the European Healthy stadia conference series, to strive to secure a speaking space.

Action: EC will inform the project partners how FYFA can be incorporated into 8EAPC, also Management group meeting will take place.

Action: All partners will investigate whether there would be champion footballer from their country, willing to support the project.

WP3 Evaluation - Romtens

TH delivered a power point presentation, outlining initial thoughts about evaluation

European Commission has already changed type of evaluation, I criteria issued by CNAPA some of these criteria using in output evaluation to judge assess models of good practice. For FYFA evaluation it should be checked what can be overlapping and used.



TH highlighted that peer-reviewers will enhance credibility of the evaluation.

Interim evaluation might be more difficult, as this is a new project group.

A big amount of monitoring can be now done with participants portal. TH noted that usually dissemination, is big chunk of evaluation. He advised to have Google Analytics built within the website and use Mailchimp for newsletters.

For output evaluation, indicators given in the project proposal will be used. The five reports will be analysed, judging the quality and if they make sense to the end user, if they are useful enough for the target group.

Action: ES will send the RARHA evaluation

Action: TH will revise his presentation; following presentations from other project partners. This final presentation will be shared with MS.

WP4 Review of international policies - SHAAP

EC outlined the scope of the review, investigating what interventions are likely to be effective, what is happening, what policies are in place.

Firstly, protocol will be produced for the whole project group (by end of month two). The project group will be consulted on it.

EC noted that it will also be looking at: gender issues, disabled sports, amateur sporting contests.

WP5 Review of national policies - ISS

ES said that it is important to ensure no fragmentation of WPs and to establish a common view what is feasible in terms of activities, practices.

If project develops a good and easily accessible common methodology, then it could be envisaged that some of the associated partners could conduct interviews at national level (in more than original 6 countries)

Review will be of grey literature. It was noted that depending on the national context, project might have to involve other disciplines than football to ensure female participation.

It was highlighted that all WPs have to be aligned, as some international level policies could have impact on national level. Similarly, in terms of stakeholders engaged we should not be sending multiple requests for interviews/surveys.

To avoid overlaps all identified stakeholders will be shared among project partners and international level will be feeding into national surveys.

It was reminded to the participants that age group identified in the project proposal will be 13-15.



WP6 Review of local policies - VAD

JJ delivered a power point presentation. He highlighted that although month 11 is the deadline, it is strongly encouraged to secure local project partners as soon as possible.

It was noted that a mixture of local small clubs, clubs linked to premier leagues and school sports clubs would be the best. Clubs will be selected on the basis that they have an element of alcohol sponsorship in place (percentage cut on the beer sold, stadium advertisements etc.)

This WP will be only looking at written policies. Through this WP partners will be also exploring clubs' needs, giving them tools, making an assessment how they can contribute to prevention efforts.

In terms of this WP expectations (outcomes), it will be sensitising component.

WP7 Research young people – EHYT

EHYT delivered a power point presentation. It highlighted that for this project it will strive for the Finish Olympic Committee support.

It was confirmed that 48 interviews will be conducted all together, not 56.

Videos will be in Finland, UK (Scotland) Italy.

It was agreed that interviews will be decided depending on the local context.

EHYT highlighted that it will start work on the project in 2018, due to staff arrangements. However, in the meantime it will fulfil its obligations as a partner in Steering Group e-mail exchanges, calls and meetings.

Proposed timeline for WP7:

Interviews	August 2018
Interviews conducted	February 2019
Video recording	February 2019
Report	July 2019

WP8 Video - SHAAP

EC informed that this piece of work will be subcontracted to an agency with which he has worked previously on youth research. Script will be consulted on with project partners.

WP9 Exchange of knowledge - PARPA

PARPA delivered power point presentation highlighting their questions.

WP9 objective are close to WP2. PARPA requested a clarification of who is responsible for the final conference, whether it would be Eurocare or PARPA.



PARPA inquired whether it would be possible to have more time for production of guidelines. It was clarified that guidelines are not meant to be a long document but brief (suggested length 2-4 pages) for organisations to easily use.

It was also noted that as project content will be uploaded the guidelines can be written simultaneously. PARPA asked partners to receive content by M21

Conference should take place within the project, mid-June.

Draft guidelines should be ready at least a month before the final guidelines to allow for peer-review.

PARPA asked for advice on how to deal with staff transfers.

Action: MS to clarify with DM how to make transfer of staff in the participants portal.

Action: It was reiterated that MS will look into timescales, deliverable deadlines, meeting and calls and send updated timeline.

Miscellaneous

In terms for protocols, they should not be too elaborate.

All power point presentations will be shared with project partners via e-mail.

Action: MS to send example of good practice protocols that could be used for FYFA

Action: MS sending template format for reporting for FYFA.

Action: MS send all presentations to project partners

Summary of actions

Task	Responsible	By date
Obtain timesheet template from CHAFEA	MS Eurocare	06.10.2017
Resend consortium agreement	MS Eurocare	18.09.2017
Comment on consortium agreement	All	26.09.2017
Send through suggested Advisors for the project	All	29.09.2017
Sending Doodle with proposed meeting dates	MS Eurocare	18.09.2017
Commenting on meeting dates	All	25.09.2017



Send updated timelines: deliverable deadlines, meeting and calls	MS Eurocare	29.09.2017
Send examples of good practice protocols		06.10.2017
Send around draft logo and outline of the website	MS Eurocare	06.10.2017
Approval of the logo and website outline	All	13.10.2017
Inform the project partners how FYFA can be incorporated into 8EAPC	EC SHAAP	30.11.2017
Investigate champion footballer to support the project	All	07.01.2018
ES send the RARHA evaluation	ES ISS	06.10.2017
Revise presentations, following WP presentations, send final	TH Romtens	06.10.2017
Clarify with DM re: transfer of staff in the participants portal	MS Eurocare	06.10.2017
Sending template format for reporting for FYFA	MS Eurocare	06.10.2017
Send all presentations to project partners	MS	18.09.2017

Management meeting minutes 9th March 2018, Rome

09:00 - 16:00

Participants	
Name	Organisation
Urša Šetina	APYN
Lukas Galkus	
Eric Carlin	SHAAP
Emanuele Scafato	ISS
Claudia Gandin	
Astrid De Schutter	VAD



Johan Jongbloet	
Leena Sipinen	EHYT
Katarzyna Okulicz	PARPA
Mariusz Morawski	
Jolanta Terlikowska	
Theodor Haratau	Romtens
Johanna Gripenberg	STAD
Mariann Skar	Eurocare
Aleksandra Kaczmarek	
Apologies	
Name	
Daniel Doc	Romtens
Ioana Precup	
Victoria Troy	SHAAP
Tuomas Tenkanen	EHYT

1) Welcome and introductions

ES welcomed everyone in Rome and to the meeting and informed about the logistics of the meeting.

MS thanked all project partners for coming as well as Johana for coming from STAD. Exchange of information between FYFA and STAD project, early in the life cycle of FYFA, will allow for timely exchange of good practice.

2) Approval of Agenda

Draft agenda was approved.

3) Approval of the minutes of the skype meeting 1 February 2018

Minutes of the last skype meeting were agreed.

4) STAD project on football and alcohol by Johanna Gripenberg, Centrum för Psykiatrforskning, Stockholm Läns Sjukvårdsområde/ Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm

JG gave 30 minutes presentation, which was followed by discussion. JG presented background to the organisation and their success in night-time settings projects. The main aim of the organisation is to bring the gap between science and practice with majority of the interventions being community based. Among work done in the past were:

- Secondary prevention within healthcare system, focusing on alcohol prevention
- Reach out to children of substance parents through web interventions
- Alcohol and drug prevention at youth clinics, mainly young girls attending health clinics, mainly sexual health

STAD project was focusing on alcohol and nightlife, baseline goal was to examine if serving to intoxicated people was a problem. Tools used were: community mobilisation, policy change, involvement of licencing boards, involvement of police etc.



It was a multi-component intervention, including training for nightlife staff, monitoring (test purchasing by actors) and enforcement.

Project results were a statistically important improvement:

- Refusal rates of alcohol service to underage, from 55% in 1996 to 93% in 2013
- Refusal to intoxicated 5% in 1996 to 77% in 2016
- 29% reduction in police reported violence.

Cost effectiveness analysis indicates that project is a good investment, for every 1EUR spent 39EUROS were saved.

Participants found the project very impressive in its results. However, it was noted that success was a result of a number of factors and spill over effect was also observed.

Results from the project are published and available on the <http://stadineurope.eu/> website.

Based on the successful nightlife prevention programme, STAD aimed at duplicating these results in the football setting - Football UTAN, FYLLA.

The target group were Swedish premier league matches, the message was Football without intoxication. Project recruited 3 big football teams in Stockholm. Project was run in cooperation with IQ- subsidiary from Swedish retail monopoly.

Actors acting as drinking a lot of alcohol were trying to:

- Purchase alcohol outside the stadium in outlets nearby; refusal rate was 68%
- Enter the stadium, out of 70 attempts only 9 times they were refused entrance
- Purchase alcohol inside the stadium, refusal rate 32% (out of 176 attempts)

It was noted that differences existed in staff training for outlets outside stadium and inside. Additional staff selling alcohol inside were usually younger.

Public opinion indicated broad support for actions to diminish intoxication in football settings - 65% of (3000 random sample) stating atmosphere would be much better if amount of obviously intoxicated people was reduced.

The baseline data showcased the need for action in the area. It was considered as a safety problem. The three clubs involved were part of the steering action group and took full ownership of the project.

Following the baseline, two-day trainings were organised and web-based tool. 1200 staff was trained. This was meshed with alcohol policy workshop, PR and media activities. The overall aim was to change culture around football events. An important component of the project was media advocacy and presenting back to media, increasing public awareness to obtain support. Project gathered over 300 media coverages. Two commercials were produced, sensitizing to the issue of different behavioural standards for football matches; how one behaves at football match how it is so out of place in other settings.

Follow-up measurements:



Average BAC level 0.63 baseline

- In 2016 it was 0.61
- In 2017 it was 0.57

Proportion of people with high BAC levels (that was one of the main focus areas)

- In 2015 10%
- In 2016 9 %
- In 2017 6%

Serving of alcohol

- Outside denial rose from 68% to 73%
- Refusal at the entrance from 13% to 33%
- Refusal of inside serving to intoxicated people from 32% to 57%

Project succeeded in reduction in average BAC level and increased denials of serving to intoxicated people.

Project website in Swedish is <http://fotbollutanfylla.se/>

During the discussion, several points were raised:

- The need for hard data on number sustaining the claim that taking action on heavily intoxicated spectators, is a smart business decision. Apart from anecdotal evidence of club managers, numbers and statistics would be very beneficial.
- FYFA project should take a good practice, that should be added to the toolkit, that needs assessment of the clubs should be part of policy recommendations.
- It was noted that security as the 'selling point' of the project was very timely and good approach. Throughout the project STAD did not give recommendations to the clubs not to take alcohol sponsorship money but pointed out to the difficulties with associating alcohol so closely with football.

JG expressed willingness to share protocols, baseline studies published and information that could be beneficial to FYFA.

5) Updates from workpackages

WP 1 Coordination - Eurocare

Looking at the timelines questions was put to all the project partners if final conference could be moved to mid-June 2019. As this was likely to increase attendance.

All WP leaders agreed that project timeline will be moved by two months.

Eurocare will disseminate updated project timeline.

Next meeting management meeting will take place during the European Alcohol Policy conference in Edinburgh - 22nd November.

MS presented the draft protocol, detailed comments will be sent by CG.



It was clarified that within the sports clubs, interviews should be conducted with 6 stakeholders, not managers.

It was also agreed that reference to alcohol industry should be deleted.

It was agreed that for the clarify of the document wording will be changed from '3 key actions' to '3 key elements'.

Discussion followed regarding the difference between regulatory intervention, practice, policy. It was agreed that, taking into account cultural differences in definitions, it will be clarified in the protocol what is understood by policy.

Reference to fans should also be deleted from the protocol, they are not a target group for interviews. Interviews will be directed to stakeholders but including three different policy areas (also including policy towards fans).

Eurocare will make amendments to the protocol and disseminate.

It was also noted that national interview should not be different from local interview; needs to be clarified to make sure the reporting is complying.

Question was raised regarding progress report.

Eurocare will distribute the progress report template and timesheets.

WP 2 Dissemination - APYN/Eurocare

APYN presented the dissemination work to date and encouraged partners to actively participate in the social media channels.

It was noted that for reporting, it is important for each partner to register each kind of dissemination promotion information activities.

WP 3 Evaluation - Romtens

TH presented the final evaluation plan and ask for feedback over the coming week.

Project has 17 process indicators and 11 outcome indicators.

In terms of process satisfaction, questionnaire will be send at the end of September and second one next year. Romtens will engage two external evaluators; conducting Qualitative analysis of most relevant outputs (toolkit).

For assessment of dissemination activities, partners will be provided with an Excel file with one worksheet, to report dissemination activities.

It was noted that regarding WP7 change should be made - old number 56 should change to 48 interviews.

It was reiterated that it is crucial for website to be linked into Google Analytics.

Eurocare to ensure linkages between website and Google Analytics.



WP 4 Review international policies - SHAAP

Video from VT was presented to participants, it is available in the project Dropbox folder.

EC replied to questions on the date regarding the slides.

It was noted that the number of websites researched should be increased.

A general analysis with search terms 'alcohol policy' will be conducted of wider amount. Eurocare will share with SHAAP the work undertaken.

An in-depth analysis, with search term 'alcohol' of 10 websites will be included as well.

SHAAP reported low responses rate to interview requests, possibility online questionnaire will be explored.

Action – SHAAP include broad search scope into in-depth.

WP 5 Review national policies - ISS

Overlap was identified with local level in areas of Task 5.2. (survey) local football club will be cut.

Some core questions by mainly by analysing results provided by literature review. Such as, level of understanding and compliance of people in relationship with what literature review, effectiveness of measure.

The grid of the discussion (questionnaire) grid items how much they know about that how much they agree on possible implementation on what they are reading or listening what are perceptions in order to give some guidance in implementation and possibility including barriers and facilitators.

Perceived obstacle will be part of the survey.

National level review added value will be the exploration of possible differences on policy levels as well as interventions, in relation to international level.

It was speculated that some national level clubs participating in international tournaments might adopt more of international mindset. i.e. Juventus. Their thinking might be more international oriented in terms of legislation they follow (even though national club but of international prestige).

It was noted that the fact that policies do not exist in peer-review journals, does not exclude them. On the contrary peer-reviewed journals are most likely to be last source of policy.

It was noted, that if at national level there is something not at international level then it will be added to the national level.

These 3 working packages (WP₄, WP₅, WP₆) are complementary but not comparable, as they work together. Not a typical international comparison project.

Project aims at combine evidence base with expert opinion. Asking stakeholders, what they think about the literature and also what does for instance Italian legislation says etc.



Availability and not merely implementation, should be noted in the project. Something that is lacking, collecting what they have in terms of possible programmes even if implementation is lacking

ISS is expecting to finish by November 2018.

WP 6 Review local policies - VAD

VAD will be sending the template in the coming week.

Partners were asked to recruit clubs by April 2018.

Beginning of May template for policies within the clubs will be distributed. By end of October interviews should be done and policies put in the template.

By end of November partners will provide information with final report also expected in November.

It was noted that national and local questionnaires could be harmonised (the same questions, have the same period).

Questions was raised regarding incentives for the clubs to participate in the project. Partners will reflect on this aspect.

It was reiterated that the aim is to:

- Recruit one club
- Interview 3-6 stakeholders within that club (including one manager)
- Engage youth for interviews

Regarding naming the clubs which participate or not, it was noted that this should be left to the clubs to decide.

All data however, will be anonymised, but if the clubs their logo should be associated with the project. This should be decided at the stage of recruiting the club already.

Each case study should contain detailed description. Detailed description of the club will not be giving out the identity of it.

Discussion followed regarding most important criteria when choosing the club. References where made that some criteria, depending on the country, could be mutually exclusive.

For instance, a club which is average (not professional) will not be attractive to sponsors.

It was agreed that the main criteria should be:

1. Local club in a Member States indicated in the project proposal
2. Offering services to 14-16 years olds playing football (or other sports that allow female - male comparison)
3. Having alcohol sponsors
4. Being not professional



WP7 Research young people – EHYT

EHYT informed participants that support of Finish Olympic Committee has been obtained.

LS presented some sources of information that partners might find of interest.

It was reiterated that interviews will be semi-structured. EHYT suggested conducting pair interviews.

Partners agreed; this would mean less interviews all together would that be ok; 24 interviews. It was noted the reasoning would have to clearly explained in the report, as it is slightly different than in the proposal.

EHYT will conduct their interviews by August and would aim for other to be finished by the end of September.

It was noted that in Italy are very strict rules on video recording minors. ISS will clarify under which conditions they could fulfil this project requirement.

ISS noted difficulties with interview in Italy; asked whether questionnaire as an alternative without the video recording.

The possibility of change needs to be investigated by ISS and project Coordinator.

WP7 would be picking up the ones to be interviewed; parental approval would need to be obtained.

EHYT noted that Finish Olympic Committee is a strong recommendation but do understand difference in different countries.

EHYT informed participants of their ongoing negotiations with fchonka.fi near Helsinki; club of 2200 (biggest football club).

Regarding age it was noted that the best age would be teams of 14 years old as the average.

It was agreed interview should take 30 minutes not an hour. Info pack should be prepared for parents and clubs. Key notes of the interview will be taken in English. All partners will be responsible for translation of the interview.

EHYT presented some question in their presentation to which participants will give written feedback.

WP8 Video – SHAAP

WP9 Exchange of knowledge – PARPA

6. Planning next meeting - Edinburgh November 2018

7. AOB

Due to time constraints these two items were discussed at the next skype meeting and next management meeting in November.



It was agreed that next meeting will start with package WP9.

Eurocare would send Doodle for next skype meeting

Task	Responsible	By date
Collect and disseminate protocols from STAD paper to partners	Eurocare	23/03/2018
Send detailed feedback to the protocol to Eurocare	ISS	21/03/2018
Update protocol and share with partners	Eurocare	23/03/2018
Re-send reporting and timesheets templates	Eurocare	16/03/2018
Update and share the project timeline	Eurocare	23/03/2018
Provide feedback to evaluation plan to Romtens	All	23/03/2018
Update the search to include wider number of webpages	SHAAP	23/03/2018
Recruit clubs by April 2018	All	31/04/2018
Sending the template review of the local policies	VAD	23/03/2018
Reply to EHYT presentation questions	All	02/04/2018
Send Doodle for skype meetings	Eurocare	23/03/2018

Management meeting minutes 22nd November 2018

Edinburgh

09:00 - 15:00

Participants	
Name	Organisation
Urša Šetina	APYN
Lukas Galkus	
Briege Nugent	SHAAP
Eric Carlin	
Claudia Gandin	ISS
Leena Sipinen	EHYT
Katarzyna Okulicz	PARPA
Jolanta Terlikowska	
Johan Jongbloet	VAD
Astrid De Schutter	
Mariann Skar	Eurocare
Sandra Tricas-Sauras	
Aleksandra Kaczmarek	
Apologies	
Name	
Theodor Haratau	Romtens
Ioana Precup	



Emanuele Scafato	ISS
Mariusz Morawski	PARPA

1) Approval of Agenda

Draft agenda was approved.

2) Approval of the minutes of the skype meeting 12 September 2018

Minutes of the last skype meeting were approved.

3) Updates from Work packages

WP 1

Eurocare apologised for the difficulties with the first reporting period, it was partially caused by the flaws in the submission system of the amendment. Amendment was re-submitted in October.

It was highlighted that participants portal is causing difficulties to all its users. It was highlighted by ISS that organisations need more time for reporting of finances. Especially, in big organisations and institutions finances departments need notice to process the accounting requests.

On the topic of timesheets, it was noted that partners are encouraged to fill them in on an ongoing basis (even if it is not required for reporting per se). Some partners shared their practice of accumulating hours throughout the week and reporting per day, which makes it easier for the financial parts and counting, when reporting.

Eurocare once again apologized for the difficulties with the reporting and next time notice will be sent at least 3 months in advance.

WP 9

PARPA informed the participants of the format of the meeting, which will be a one-day expert meeting, with limited number of participants.

All partners were asked to send ideas for participants to PARPA and Eurocare. Some of the proposed participants which should be involved were: sports medicine professionals, homeless sports project, UN Programme on Sports and Drugs, EMCDA.

The date for the meeting was set for 21st May 2019 in Warsaw. The project management meeting will take place on 20th May 2019 also in Warsaw.

Action:

All send proposed participants for the expert meeting to PARPA and Eurocare.



WP 8

It was agreed by project partners to move interviews from Italy to Poland. This was due to stringent privacy policies in Italy, which would cause a number of obstacles while filming young people.

Presentation was given by Media Education which will be subcontracted by SHAAP to produce videos.

All partners expressed their enthusiasm for the video provider based on the examples of their previous work.

It was suggested that video in the UK will serve as a test, for partners to comment on regarding the style of the videos. Video should be expected in January 2019.

Partners were reminded that they have to comply with their national legislation regarding privacy and filming young people. It is a responsibility of each of the partners to verify the rules and comply with them in their consent forms. It was also highlighted that since May this year GDPR has entered into force, which made amendments to the existing rules, therefore partners have to check their national rules (not use forms from previous projects).

Media Education offered to share their consent form. Caution has to be taken that this covers the UK, national rules might be slightly different. In some countries approval of the ethical committees might be required etc.

It was also noted that the consent form has to clearly state that his video will be used outside the scope of the project and shared on videosharing platforms such as YouTube as well as shared in conferences.

Partners have to take care to keep control of the video at all times, meaning upload only to channels you control and do not share the file itself with others, you can share a link to a video. In the future a request could be made to delete young person from the video and partners have to ensure they have means to do so.

It was requested by the partners to have description of the filming process that they could present to parents and guardians while obtaining permissions.

3 videos per country will be produced and one whole video.

Videos will be in original language with subtitles, with no names of young people.

Actions:

All prepare consent forms (in accordance with national law).

SHAAP, share Media Education consent form.

SHAAP, share description of the procedure of filming from Media Education.



WP 7

EHYT reported some difficulties with the interviews. SHAAP has already conducted some interviews and gave feedback on the questions. The interview took on average 40 minutes.

EHYT reminded that key notes outlining answers to the questions would be sufficient, however they would appreciate transcriptions in English.

Actions:

SHAAP share feedback with EHYT.

EHYT send updated protocol (questions).

WP 6

VAD reported that Astrid will be staying on the project for another year. All partners expressed their satisfaction with this decision.

Poland and Slovenia have recruited 2 football clubs. Italy is in the process of recruitment.

WP 5

ISS thanked all partners for their comments to the protocol. It was noted that the questionnaire is designed to help to collect data from 6 countries. Regarding the scope, it was agreed that respondents do not have to fill in all parts of the questionnaire, only relevant ones.

ISS informed participants that deadline for data collection is end of January 2019, as 2 months will be sufficient to produce a report.

Regarding the scale of opinions participants can include in their national summaries a mean variant.

PARPA suggested adding sport commentators, who are considered opinion formers in their field as a potential target group for the questionnaire. All partners agreed.

Eurocare reminded partners that if needed a surveymonkey online questionnaire can be set up, as it was the case for VAD.

WP 4

SHAAP briefly presented the results of the WP₄ international review report. It was noted that WP₄ report is only awaiting response from WHO. However, given the time it takes the project has to conclude that WHO declined to answer.

Actions:

Eurocare to send SHAAP's presentation to partners.

Eurocare to upload WP₄ report (deliverable) in its current form.

WP 3

Due to lack of Romtens representative, this item will be discussed at the next skype call.



WP 2

APYN reminded partners to make use of the document that was distributed for monitoring of dissemination activities.

VAD informed about a new logo.

It was noted by partners that each public deliverable should produce a one-page summary of the content and findings. APYN reminded partners that infographics will be produced that should be translated into national languages.

Actions:

Eurocare to update project templates with new VAD logo and send it to project partners.

APYN re-send link to dissemination document.

APYN and Eurocare prepare infographics.

APYN and Eurocare prepare and send newsletter.

Eurocare send FYFA poster that was presented in EUPSR.

4) Planning next meetings

Next meeting will be in Warsaw on 20th May 2019. For the next skype meeting Doodle will be sent.

Task	Responsible	By date
WP9 send proposed participants for the expert meeting to PARPA and Eurocare	All	28/01/2019
WP8 prepare consent forms (in accordance to national law)	All	28/01/2019
WP8 share Media Education consent form	SHAAP	14/01/2018
WP8 share description of the procedure of filming from Media Education	SHAAP	14/01/2018
WP7 share feedback with EHYT	SHAAP	10/12/2018
WP7 send updated protocol (questions)	EHYT	17/12/2018
WP4 send presentation to partners	Eurocare	26/10/2018
WP4 upload report (deliverable) in its current form	Eurocare	10/12/2018
WP2 update project templates with new VAD logo and resend	Eurocare	10/12/2018
WP2 resend link to dissemination document	APYN	10/12/2018
WP2 prepare infographics	APYN Eurocare	04/02/2018
WP2 prepare and send newsletter	APYN Eurocare	13/12/2018
WP2 send FYFA poster that was presented in EUPSR	Eurocare	10/12/2018
WP1 send Doodle for next skype call	Eurocare	10/12/2018



Management meeting minutes, Warsaw 20th May 2019

12:00 - 18:00

Participants	
Name	Organisation
Urša Šetina	YHO
Lukas Galkus	
Theodor Haratau	Romtens
Ioana Precup	
Briege Nugent	SHAAP
Eric Carlin	
Emanuele Scafato	ISS
Claudia Gandin	
Johan Jongbloet	VAD
Astrid De Schutter	
Leena Sipinen	EHYT
Katarzyna Okulicz	PARPA
Jolanta Terlikowska	
Mariusz Morawski	
Aleksandra Kaczmarek	Eurocare
Sandra Tricas-Sauras	
Mariann Skar	

1) Welcome and introduction

Warm welcome to all to Warsaw.

It was agreed with the evaluators that discussions in the Management group should not influence the overall evaluation of the project. The evaluation of the project should be based on the outcomes and not on internal discussions.

2) Approval of Agenda

Draft agenda was approved.

3) Approval of the minutes of the skype meeting 26 March 2019

Minutes of the last skype meeting were approved.

4) Updates from Work packages

WP 1 - The work packages are moving well forward. However, it is good we got the 1-year extension as it is clearly needed. It has been challenging to get good quality data in this area. It



is a new area for us all and we need to develop new contacts that trust us and deliver the needed information.

There have been some communication problems between partners – however, we hope to manage it and deliver excellent results.

The final conference will take place in Brussels in May 2020 – if possible, we would like to organise it at a sporting venue. Eurocare will be exploring different possibilities.

The FYFA website is missing some updated information due to sickness leave of the webpage responsible person. It will be followed up as quickly as possible.

The next reporting period is from 01.9.2018 to 31.08.2019 and the report is to be delivered to Eurocare by the latest beginning of October 2019 by all partners.

WP 2 - YHO reminded partners to make use of the document that was distributed for monitoring of dissemination activities. The template will be resent to all and it needs to be updated.

The FYFA project has been promoted at several events and meetings and YHO needs to have an overview over where it has taken place. Please also provide updates on production of posters, infographics, articles, abstracts – even if they were declined.

YHO also reminded partners that each public deliverable should produce a one-page summary of the content and findings. Infographics will be produced that should be translated into national languages.

FYFA is promoting the project at a big football tournament in Helsinki

WP 3 - Romtens presented the Interim evaluation report. For more detailed information please see the power-point presentation and report (when available).

Conclusions and recommendations for the last year of the FYFA project:

- ✓ Design a strategy for the last year
- ✓ Schedule regular updates – every month with clear milestones
- ✓ Transparent decision-making process
- ✓ Resend and update timeline
- ✓ Update Gant Chart
- ✓ Update website with newsletters
- ✓ Update website (News should be clearer/events linked to social media and update on objective, results, photos...etc. /links to GDPR)
- ✓ Increase traffic through social media
- ✓ Target and contact organisations to help promote the FYFA website and disseminate information
- ✓ More efforts to get more followers on twitter + all partners must re-tweet



- ✓ Increase when external events are taking place
- ✓ Add protocol to website
- ✓ Each work package should find 3-4 teaser to spread on #FYFA
- ✓ Use hashtags...youth, alcohol, football and reach a wider audience add alcohol consumption, promoted live events...
- ✓ Update on RESEARCHGATE
- ✓ Use of Facebook to engage and build a network- gather topics relevant on alcohol consumption
- ✓ Instagram? Rather than Facebook???

WP 5 - ISS has been struggling to receive data for work-package 5. Several reminders have been sent and the deadline for submissions postponed. There has been an ongoing discussion related to methodology and choices led by specific countries.

All partners must check and double check that the data delivered are of high quality. Final deadline for submissions to ISS agreed to be mid-June.

For more detailed information that has been gathered – please see the power-point presentations.

WP 6 - Due to delays in WP 5 VAD was asked by the Coordinator to not send out request for information related to work-package 6.

Now is the time to move forward on WP 6 and VAD will re-send information in order to keep everyone updated.

There was a discussion on methodology regarding Italy's approach (questionnaire versus interview). There was an agreement to transcribe interviews in own languages and send an extensive summary including the background to facilitate the analysis for Astrid to analyse all the data. VAD is to send an example within a week.

It was agreed that the transcription of interviews was to be done by mid-July. An extensive summary on the background to facilitate the analysis.

The draft report will be sent to the partners by end-September.

Final Report to be send by mid-November.

WP 7 - EHYT reminded that key notes outlining answers to the questions would be enough, however they would appreciate transcriptions in English.

Interviews (4 girls and 4 boys) is to be send to EHYT.

End-September is the deadline for all partners.

Summaries and Transcripts to be send asap.

WP 8 - Media Education have been subcontracted by SHAAP to produce videos and have already produced the ones from Scotland. There was a discussion on the messaging of the



young people and agreed it should be included in the video that this is the opinion of young people and not the FYFA project partners.

Scotland will continue to work with Poland and Finland to continue working on the construction of the video.

A reminder that all partners must comply with their national legislation regarding privacy and filming young people. It is a responsibility of each of the partners to verify the rules and comply with them in their consent forms – please be aware that there might be amendments following the implementation of GDPR. The consent form must clearly state that this video will be used outside the scope of the project and shared in conferences and on video sharing platforms. Partners must take care to keep control of the video, meaning upload only to channels you control. In the future a request could be made to delete young person from the video and partners must ensure they have means to do so. The partners should also have a description of the filming process to present to parents/guardians while obtaining permissions.

3 videos per country will be produced and one whole video.

Videos will be in original language with subtitles, with no names of young people.

Strive to be early 2020 and must be ready before the final conference in May 2020.

WP 9 - PARPA is responsible for the Expert meeting taking place on the 21 May in Warsaw. All partners have been asked to send ideas for participants to PARPA and Eurocare.

Around 33 experts are expected to the meeting: 18 partners, 5 associated partners, 7 experts and 3 representatives from Member States.

There was a discussion on how to get the maximum outcome from the meeting and get as much information from the experts as possible.

The Guidelines will be drafted after the Expert meeting.

5) Planning next meetings

Eurocare is to send around a doodle for the next skype meetings in June.

Final conference will take place in May and date is to be decided as soon as possible.

Task	Responsible	By date
WP1 send draft minutes of Management Board and Expert meeting	Eurocare	30/06/2019
WP1 send updated timeline and gant chart	Eurocare	30/06/2019
WP1 send Doodle for next skype call	Eurocare	30/06/2019
WP1 prepare reporting end August	Eurocare	15/10/2019
WP1 prepare final conference	Eurocare/Parpa with input ALL	31/03/2020



WP1 prepare reporting	ALL	15/10/2020
WP2 resend link to dissemination document	YHO	30/06/2019
WP2 prepare and send newsletter	YHO/Eurocare	30/06/2019
WP3 send interim report to all partners (already delayed)	Romtens	30/06/2019
WP5 all partners send final information to ISS	ALL	30/05/2019
WP5 prepare final report – key findings	ISS	30/06/2019
WP6 send example of way forward	VAD	30/05/2019
WP6 all partners send interviews and transcriptions	ALL	15/07/2019
WP6 send draft report to all partners	VAD	30/09/2019
WP6 send final report to all partners – key findings	VAD	15/11/2019
WP7 all partners send interviews and transcriptions	ALL	30/09/2019
WP7 prepare report interviews	EHYT	30/11/2019
WP7 prepare final report – key findings	EHYT	15/04/2020
WP8 prepare and finalise video of young people	SHAAP, EHYT and PARPA	01/05/2020
WP9 prepare minutes Expert meeting	PARPA	30/06/2019
WP9 prepare guidelines	PARPA	28/02/2020

Response to consolidated report after meeting 27.11

Luxembourg

To European Commission

Consumers, Health, Agriculture and Food executive Agency

Health and Food safety unit

Project Officer Cinthia Menel-Lemos

Brussels 12th December 2019

Re: 3rd Health Programme Project: 738157 FYFA Project review (Article 17) – Response to consolidated report

Undersigned on behalf of the FYFA partners has been requested to send a letter of response to the reviewers' comments, including a remediation plan.



The FYFA partners thank the reviewers for their comments and suggestions. In line with the comments we have been following the suggestions for improvement and will use the final months to especially work on the dissemination of the findings and continue the discussions with the sport organisations in order to strive towards implementation of the guidelines/tool kit for reducing and preventing alcohol related harm among the young members of the sports clubs.

1. Objectives & impact

Does the work carried out contribute to the expected impacts detailed in the DoA? – partially

“The overall objective is nevertheless very ambitious and there seems to be a gap between the reach of specific objectives and actions and the overall objectives and therefore impact.”

Yes, we agree it is ambitious. However, the majority of the partners are NGOs that do not see the final date of the project as the end. The findings will hopefully be followed up in the coming years. Several of the partners have thanks to the project good contact with the local clubs now and it is in this spirit there is a possibility that change might happen quickly. However, on the national and international level – it will take longer.

Does the work carried out contribute towards European policy objectives and strategies and have an impact on policy making?

The FYFA partners will focus in the Management meeting on the 31 January 2020 on the fora and methods of communication, dissemination of project results and advocacy needed especially for the development and dissemination of the “guidelines” or tool kit at national and local level.

2. Activities & work packages

Is the progress reported in line with the objectives and work plan as specified in the DoA?

Eurocare has taken duly notice of the comments from the partners in the evaluation report. This has been followed up in emails, skype meetings and will be discussed face to face in the management meeting. As a result, every month the Coordinator sends around an updated list of tasks. Deadlines and plans for the deliverables are discussed with both the project leaders and all partners.

Deliverable 6.1 Overview over local alcohol policies is nearly finalised. The deadline in the participants portal was not changed correctly after the amendment – it should have been 31.04.2020 instead of 31.04.19

3. Participation & project management

Has the project been efficiently and effectively managed?

The Project coordinator accepts the comments regarding the interim evaluation report and is striving towards improvement of the communication with the partners.



The Second technical report has been improved, clarified with tables and overview over the progress monitoring. It is our hope and aim to ensure that this format will be more accessible.

Have the comments and recommendations from previous project review been taken into account?

Recommendations have been taken into account and will be followed up with stronger leadership in the third period of the project.

4. Overall assessment

Corrective actions will be taken in the coming months.

According to updated planning of deliverables the FYFA partners are not concerned about the timelines. All project deliverables are planned to be finalised well ahead of the final date 31.08.20. The final conference is planned towards the end of the May 2020.

Kind regards,

Mariann Skar

Management meeting minutes, Brussels 31st

January 2020

09:00 - 16:00

Participants	
Name	Organisation
Lukas Galkus	YHO
Ioana Precup	Romtens
Briege Nugent	SHAAP
Eric Carlin	
Emanuele Scafato	ISS
Claudia Gandin	
Astrid De Schutter	VAD
Leena Sipinen	EHYT
Katarzyna Okulicz	PARPA
Jolanta Terlikowska	
Mariann Skar	Eurocare
Aleksandra Kaczmarek	
Sandra Tricas-Sauras	
Kamila Mahamoud	
Apologies	
Urša Šetina	YHO



Theodor Haratau	Romtens
-----------------	---------

1) Approval of the Agenda

Agenda was approved

2) Approval of the last skype Minutes 16th January 2020

Minutes of the last meeting were approved.

3) Update from the Coordinator

MS updated partners that interim report was submitted, however it was rejected. It has been returned again, with financial questions remaining for two organisations. The concerned organisations are in touch with MS and will be re-submitting the financial reporting.

MS asked partners whether following the evaluation and previous comments, they would like some areas to improve on, or they would have comments regarding the management of the project.

VAD, EHYT, PARPA and SHAAP expressed their satisfaction and gratitude for the support given by the Coordinator, as needed, especially with the deliverables (WP6, WP7). Direct communication and instant availability of the Coordinator was also highlighted.

MS updated partners on the progress to date on deliverables and tasks per month (following the monthly updates), these are currently on track.

4) Discussion and a way forward regarding evaluation report

IP presented evaluation following the Warsaw expert meeting, for details please consult the presentation.

It was highlighted by partners that even though some target groups might have been not reached as attendees for the event, they were being invited.

PARPA will send to IP the details of who and when was invited, to be added to the evaluation report.

With regards to the expert meeting evaluation, care should be taken that experts were evaluating the presentation themselves (not reports). Attendees of the expert meeting considered international level more relevant, which is an interesting finding. One of the main lessons learnt from the meeting, was the need for the moderator and clearly stated objective of the meeting.

The main outcomes to be included in the future actions (events) of the project are:

- How the knowledge gained in the expert meeting will feed into guidelines
- Utilizing a moderator
- Clearly indicating time for each speaker and keeping to the times



- Inclusion of young people

IP noted that for the final conference Romtens would like to prepare both a short questionnaire for the participants and conduct short interviews with some attendees.

With regards to the broader evaluation, IP highlighted the importance of keeping the google document up to speed.

It was also suggested that all slides should include a hashtag for the project.

Eurocare will update the project template for the slides and send to partners

Actions:

All continuously update dissemination paper

Eurocare to update and re-send slide template

PARPA send to Romtens record of invites sent

5) Discussion on draft toolkit/guidance (name of the document to be decided at the meeting)

ISS shared its opinion that the project of this kind can not produce guidelines, as these are associated with associations that are reputable and standard setting in a given field i.e. official bodies, medical associations. The name could be misleading.

It was agreed by partners that the name of the final document (final product of WPg) will be recommendations.

Furthermore, it was suggested that a risk assessment or a check list questionnaire should be included in the document. That could help sport organisations with practical implementation of the project recommendations.

While constructing the questions, one should have in mind: (i) what is needed to implement good policies? (ii) how to overpass barriers for implementation (iii) what kind of support is needed to help sport associations to have good policies.

AS suggested that in WP6 in its literature review has useful examples of good practices, especially with respect to implementation and barriers.

It was agreed by partners that recommendations document should not be too long, as the target group are the sport associations, for which long document might not be serving the purpose. The main document could be around 20 pages and they key points presented in 2-3 pages attractive summary.

It was also suggested that all documents (WP deliverables) should not be repeated but referred to in the document itself (WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7 report deliverables referenced).

Furthermore, with regards to the draft outline presented by PARPA it was suggested that aims and objectives should be moved to the beginning of the document.

Young people recommendations will be included within point 7.



It was suggested recommendations part should be more visible in the document, perhaps renaming the chapters to make them clearer where are recommendations i.e. international recommendations, national recommendations, local recommendations, tips for parents, tips for coaches etc.

Partners suggested that draft recommendations document should be sent to a group of experts for their feedback before the conference and production of the final recommendations.

With regards to the literature review for WPg that was shared with partners, it was suggested positive aspects should be better highlighted.

Partners will send comments to PARPA.

With regards to alcohol advertising policies, these should be included under the tips for club managers/sport associations management.

Roments highlighted that the check list (which was mentioned above) should be linked to the recommendations, so users can go back to check which activities can be implemented. (reference checklist with recommendations).

Tips and questions can be used also by WP2 for social media.

PARPA asked partners to send tips for fans that should be included in the recommendations. It was suggested STAD project should be examined for content.

With regards to the timelines the following was agreed:

- By 10 March draft shared with partners
- By 17 March partners send comments
- By 20 March final recommendations are send to partners
- By 23 March partners share recommendations with experts identified by them within their countries. Partners send the list of whom the document was sent to PARPA. Deadline given to experts will be 3rd April (this is due to variety in Easter break across Europe, to ensure feedback is given before Easter)
- Easter period break
- By 27 April final recommendations ready

Actions:

Partners to send feedback to PARPA for WPg Literature review

PARPA to redraft the outline

PARPA to prepare draft recommendations

PARPA to send draft recommendation to partners

All to send draft recommendations to experts

PARPA to prepare final recommendations



YHO prepare social media i.e. tips and questions for coaches etc. from WP9

All send tips for fans to PARPA

All partners will consult recommendations with experts in their countries

6) Conference planning - presentation PARPA and Eurocare

Partners were presented with propositions for the dissemination of the results, for more details please consult the presentation and draft agendas. Partners agreed to the idea of two meetings.

All partners will check the possibility within their budgets to invite young people to ensure that the voice of young people is heard.

It was decided that the idea of the match was too complicated to organise and it was cancelled.

The date for a conference at a national level was set for 28th May in Warsaw. PARPA secured room at the national stadium.

With regards to the draft agenda presented, it was suggested that the afternoon session should be moved to the morning. Agenda will be amended accordingly.

Partners were asked to send suggestion for speakers.

It was also highlighted that with regards to the dissemination at the national level partners are best placed. Partners were asked to map the relevant stakeholders and send them to Eurocare and YHO with the date when dissemination (i.e. sending invitation to the conference took place) this will allow FYFA project to record all the dissemination efforts.

Eurocare will send outline of what kind of stakeholders need to be mapped and reached out to at the national level.

In relation to the event in the European Parliament, the date will be confirmed after meeting MEP. If meeting room in the European Parliament can not be secured, possibilities in Norway House will be investigated.

Partners were also presented with drafts for the conference poster, two posters were equally favoured by the partners. One poster will be utilised for the Warsaw meeting and the other for the Brussels event.

Actions:

All partners to check possibility to invite young people within their budgets

All partners send suggestions for speakers

Eurocare send outline for the national stakeholders mapping

Eurocare to organise and confirm meeting in Brussels

7) Draft videos - presentation from SHAAP

All partners liked the videos presented by SHAAP.



Partners volunteered to translate the subtitles into their languages, which will allow to promote videos to a wider audience.

SHAAP will investigate with Media Education what would be the price for the inclusion of the additional subtitles.

It was suggested that EHYT will have money in the budget as in the proposal two videos where envisaged, but it was decided to merge it into one longer video and sub videos.

Media Education will be asked to send word document with subtitles for partners to translate.

Partners should translate it in February, as March will be dedicated to videos promotion.

Actions:

SHAAP investigate with Media Education costs and ask for subtitles in word document

All to translate video subtitles by end of February

8) Brief update from workpackages

- WP2 Dissemination – YHO/Eurocare

LG gave a presentation regarding the revised communication plan and state of play in relation to communication targets to date, please consult the presentation for further details.

Project results promotion

- February - WP6
- March - videos
- April - WP7

It was agreed Eurocare will send the outline of key stakeholders to be mapped to partners.

However, it was emphasised it will be for the partner to decide, which project element/deliverable will be relevant for stakeholders i.e. whether a full report or infographic would be of interest. The main objective of dissemination at national level is to acquaint relevant stakeholders with the project and raise interest in it.

It was reiterated that it is up to the project partners to decide how to disseminate results at the national level, however it must be captured for the dissemination records.

Romtens has inquired whether Google analytics could provide data on clicks/downloads of deliverables/ specific articles etc. Eurocare will examine.

ISS informed that 5000 leaflets were distributed in Italy.

YHO will add leaflets column to the dissemination document.

LG noted that tweets in other languages have helped to reach more followers.

Partners were asked to be tweeting and retweeting in other languages and translate the tweets.



It was noted that Facebook page does not allow other users to post on it when they comment. YHO will examine.

Partners were asked that the mapping exercise should also include who project should follow on Twitter from national stakeholders.

It was noted that Twitter statistics are lacking behind, some idea to increase it, were to engage in more general sport discussions, following more accounts, more surveys and questions. For instance, when promoting videos, asking to share people experiences

Romtens offered to check whether a video placed on Facebook would the YouTube channel views (if counts globally views regardless of channels of distribution).

YHO asked partners to share with them the analytics of their posts i.e. EHYT account how many impressions tweets about FYFA have. This would add to the global dissemination of the project.

Actions:

Eurocare to examine possibilities for more details from Google Analytics with website developer

YHO to add leaflets distribution to dissemination document

All tweet/retweet and translate tweets into national languages

YHO examine Facebook page functionalities.

Romtens to check Facebook/YouTube compatibility of views count

Partners to share Twitter impressions of FYFA project with YHO

- WP6 Review of local policies – VAD

AS presented briefly presented the results of D6.2, emerging themes and highlighting most interesting elements. AS asked for final comments to be sent by partners; SHAAP offered to assist with the English language as well.

It was reiterated by partners that the fact this report is not representative but provides a snapshot of a situation, should be highlighted. Moreover, it was noted that it should be mentioned more prominently that clubs can survive without alcohol advertising.

VAD will send final draft to partners, comments should be received 10 February

Actions:

All partners to send final feedback to VAD by 10 February

VAD to send final version to partners by 14 February

- WP7 Research young people – EHYT

LS presented the updated key findings document to partners via email. Currently, EHYT is working on the final version of D7.2 as well as D7.1. Interesting similarities between WP6 results



and WP7 are emerging, which will be mentioned in the report. EHYT also mentioned the workshop at a conference on 27 May it is preparing. EHYT will include project recommendations in EHYT network booklet.

D7.1 has to be submitted by end of February and D7.2 by end of March (Monday 30th March) Draft version should be sent to partners in mid-March to allow time for comments.

Actions:

EHYT to finalise D7.1

EHYT to send draft D7.2 by mid-March

EHYT to include all dissemination efforts in dissemination document.

9) AOB

No other business was mentioned.

5) Planning next meetings

Eurocare is to send around a doodle for the next skype meetings in the spring.

Task	Responsible	By date
WP1 send draft minutes of Management meeting	Eurocare	14/02/2020
WP1 re-send interim report with partners	Eurocare	ASAP
WP1 send Doodle for next skype call	Eurocare	14/02/2020
WP1 send update for February/March	Eurocare	14/02/2020
WP1 update and re-send slide template with hashtag	Eurocare	14/02/2020
WP2 continuously update dissemination paper	All	
WP2 WP9 send mapping outline to partners	Eurocare	14/02/2020
WP2 examine possibilities for more details from Google Analytics with website developer	Eurocare	14/02/2020
WP2 add leaflets distribution to dissemination document	YHO	21/02/2020
WP2 tweet/retweet and translate tweets into national languages	All	ongoing
WP2 examine Facebook page functionalities.	YHO	21/02/2020
WP2 to check Facebook/YouTube compatibility of views count	Romtens	21/02/2020
WP2 share Twitter impressions of FYFA project with YHO	All	28/02/2020
WP3 send to Romtens record of invites sent	PARPA	21/02/2020
WP6 send final feedback to VAD	All	10/02/2020
WP6 send final report to all partners	VAD	14/02/2020
WP7 finalise D7.1	EHYT	28/02/2020
WP7 send draft D7.2 to partners	EHYT	16/03/2020



WP7 finalise D7.2	EHYT	30/03/2020
WP8 investigate with Media Education costs and ask for subtitles in word document	SHAAP	14/02/2020
WP8 translate video subtitles	All	28/02/2020
WP9 send suggestions for speakers	All	14/02/2020
WP9 send tips for fans to PARPA	All	28/02/2020
WP9 organise and confirm meeting in Brussels.	Eurocare	ongoing
WP9 check possibility to invite young people within their budgets	All	28/02/2020
WP9 send feedback to PARPA for WP9 Literature review	All	14/02/2020
WP9 prepare draft recommendations and send to partners	PARPA	10/03/2020
WP9 send feedback to PARPA	All	17/03/2020
WP9 send final recommendations to partners	PARPA	20/03/2020

