



## EUROPE

THE ARTS  
CHILD POLICY  
CIVIL JUSTICE  
EDUCATION  
ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT  
HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE  
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS  
NATIONAL SECURITY  
POPULATION AND AGING  
PUBLIC SAFETY  
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
SUBSTANCE ABUSE  
TERRORISM AND  
HOMELAND SECURITY  
TRANSPORTATION AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE  
WORKFORCE AND WORKPLACE

This PDF document was made available from [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org) as a public service of the RAND Corporation.

[Jump down to document](#) ▼

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world.

### Support RAND

[Browse Books & Publications](#)

[Make a charitable contribution](#)

### For More Information

Visit RAND at [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org)

Explore [RAND Europe](#)

View [document details](#)

### Limited Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law as indicated in a notice appearing later in this work. This electronic representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for non-commercial use only. Unauthorized posting of RAND PDFs to a non-RAND Web site is prohibited. RAND PDFs are protected under copyright law. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of our research documents for commercial use. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please see [RAND Permissions](#).

This product is part of the RAND Corporation technical report series. Reports may include research findings on a specific topic that is limited in scope; present discussions of the methodology employed in research; provide literature reviews, survey instruments, modeling exercises, guidelines for practitioners and research professionals, and supporting documentation; or deliver preliminary findings. All RAND reports undergo rigorous peer review to ensure that they meet high standards for research quality and objectivity.

# TECHNICAL REPORT

---

## The European Alcohol and Health Forum

### First Monitoring Progress Report

Claire Celia, Stephanie Diepeveen, Tom Ling

Prepared for the European Commission Directorate General for  
Health and Consumers (DG SANCO)

The research described in this report was prepared for the European Commission. The opinions expressed in this study are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world. RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

**RAND**® is a registered trademark.

© Copyright 2010 European Commission

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the European Commission.

Published 2010 by the RAND Corporation  
1776 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138  
1200 South Hayes Street, Arlington, VA 22202-5050  
4570 Fifth Avenue, Suite 600, Pittsburgh, PA 15213-2665  
Westbrook Centre, Milton Road, Cambridge CB4 1YG, United Kingdom  
RAND URL: <http://www.rand.org>  
RAND Europe URL: <http://www.rand.org/randeurope>  
To order RAND documents or to obtain additional information, contact  
Distribution Services: Telephone: (310) 451-7002;  
Fax: (310) 451-6915; Email: [order@rand.org](mailto:order@rand.org)

# Preface

---

The European Alcohol and Health Forum was launched in June 2007 following the adoption by the European Commission of the EU strategy to reduce alcohol-related harm in October 2006<sup>1</sup>. The Forum is a stakeholder platform of (currently) more than 60 members from production and sales organisations, media and advertising organisations, NGOs that work to limit alcohol-related harm, research organisations, professional bodies and others. Membership of the Forum is voluntary and members are expected to commit formally and publicly to concrete actions to reduce alcohol-related harm. These concrete actions are referred to as 'commitments'. Members need to provide monitoring information on the progress of their commitment(s) in writing. This information must be put in a standardised monitoring report and include details of the objectives of the commitments, resources allocated to them and outputs produced, as well as dissemination of the results of the commitments alongside other information. A copy of this monitoring report is included in this report as Appendix B.

DG SANCO commissioned RAND Europe to carry out a quality assessment of the information contained in the monitoring reports. This progress report presents the findings of the quality assessment.

This report should be of interest to officials in the European Commission who deal with alcohol policy; to Forum members; and to a wider audience of policy-makers and researchers who are interested in the feasibility, acceptability and sustainability of delivering agreed objectives through a voluntary, non-hierarchical instrument such as the European Alcohol and Health Forum.

For more information about RAND Europe or this document, please contact:

Professor Tom Ling  
Director  
RAND Europe  
Westbrook Centre  
Milton Road  
Cambridge CB4 1YG

---

<sup>1</sup> An EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm, 2006: [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol\\_com\\_625\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol_com_625_en.pdf)

United Kingdom  
Tel. +44 (1223) 353 329  
tling@rand.org

For information regarding the EU Alcohol and Health Forum, please visit the website of the European Commission's Health and Consumers Directorate General:

[http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/alcohol\\_charter\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/alcohol_charter_en.htm)

# Contents

---

<b>Preface</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Contents</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of figures</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>List of tables</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>Definitions of terms</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>1</b>
The EU Alcohol and Health Forum	1
The importance of monitoring the actions of the Forum	1
This report	2
Methodology	3
Criteria used for scoring	3
Overview of results from the quality assessment	3
Key recommendations	4
Outlook	4
<b>CHAPTER 1 Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 The EU Alcohol and Health Forum	5
1.2 The importance of monitoring the actions of the Forum	6
1.3 This report	7
<b>CHAPTER 2 Overview of monitoring reports</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Introduction	9
2.1.1 Type of Forum member	9
2.1.2 Target groups	10
2.2 Commitments made by Forum members under each priority area	11
2.2.1 Better cooperation/actions on responsible commercial communications and sales	13
2.2.2 Develop efficient common approaches to provide adequate consumer information	16
2.2.3 Develop information and education programmes on the effects of harmful drinking	17

2.2.4	Develop information and education programmes on responsible patterns of consumption.....	19
2.2.5	Enforce age limits for serving and selling alcoholic beverages.....	21
2.2.6	Develop a strategy aimed at curbing underage drinking.....	22
2.2.7	Promote effective behaviour change among children and adolescents .....	24
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>Method used for monitoring quality assessment .....</b>	<b>25</b>
3.1	Monitoring commitments .....	25
3.2	Methodology .....	26
3.3	Scoring matrix for monitoring reports .....	26
3.3.1	Criteria used for scoring .....	26
3.3.2	The monitoring report template.....	27
3.4	Communicating the results of the quality assessment to Forum members .....	31
3.4.1	Caveats and limitations .....	34
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>Results of monitoring quality assessment .....</b>	<b>36</b>
4.1	Introduction: Applying the scoring system.....	36
4.2	Overall results.....	37
4.2.1	Scores by section of the monitoring reports .....	37
4.2.2	Scores by status of reports .....	37
4.2.3	Scores by type of commitment holder .....	38
4.2.4	Scores by priority area .....	39
4.3	Description of results by report section .....	40
4.3.1	Description of implementation .....	40
4.3.2	Objectives .....	42
4.3.3	Relevance .....	43
4.3.4	Input indicators .....	45
4.3.5	Output indicators .....	46
4.3.6	Outcome and impact indicators .....	48
4.3.7	Evaluation details .....	49
4.3.8	Other comments .....	51
4.3.9	Dissemination .....	52
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>	<b>Conclusions .....</b>	<b>55</b>
5.1	Key findings .....	55
5.2	Limitations of this quality assessment .....	56
5.3	Key recommendations .....	56
5.4	Outlook.....	58
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>59</b>	
	Reference list.....	61
<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>63</b>	



Appendix A: List of all monitoring reports submitted by Forum members in  
2009..... 65  
Appendix B: Monitoring report template..... 71



## List of figures

---

Figure 2.1 Breakdown of monitoring report by priority area of the Forum.....	12
Figure 3.1 Example of scoring representation with Radar graph.....	34
Figure 4.1 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘Description of implementation’ .....	41
Figure 4.2 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘objectives’ .....	42
Figure 4.3 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘relevance’ .....	44
Figure 4.4 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘input indicators’ .....	45
Figure 4.5 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘output indicators’ .....	47
Figure 4.6: Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘outcome and impact indicators’ .....	48
Figure 4.7 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘evaluation details’ .....	50
Figure 4.8 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘other comments’ .....	51
Figure 4.9 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘dissemination’ .....	52
Figure 5.1 A logic model of the elements of a commitment.....	57



## List of tables

---

Table 2.1 Breakdown of monitoring reports by status of report and type of Forum member.....	10
Table 2.2 Breakdown of monitoring reports by primary target group.....	11
Table 2.3 Breakdown of monitoring reports by type of Forum member and by primary Forum by priority areas.....	13
Table 2.4 Overview of Forum members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 1 of the Forum.....	14
Table 2.5 Overview of Forum members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 2 of the Forum.....	16
Table 2.6 Overview of Forum members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 3 .....	18
Table 2.7 Overview of Forum members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 4 .....	20
Table 2.8 Overview of Forum members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 5 .....	22
Table 2.9 Overview of Forum members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 6 of the Forum.....	23
Table 2.10 Overview of members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 7 .....	24
Table 3.1 Details of criteria used for scoring each section of the monitoring report.....	29
Table 3.2 Summary table of scores.....	32
Table 3.3 Example of scores given for each section of a monitoring report.....	34
Table 4.1 Meaning of scores awarded.....	37
Table 4.2 Median score by section of the monitoring report .....	37
Table 4.3 Median score by status of report.....	38
Table 4.4 Median scores by type of commitment holder and by section of the monitoring report .....	39
Table 4.5 Median scores for each section by priority area.....	40

Table 4.6 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for the ‘Description of implementation’ section.....	41
Table 4.7 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for the ‘objectives’ section.....	43
Table 4.8 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for relevance .....	44
Table 4.9 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for input indicators.....	46
Table 4.10 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for output indicators .....	47
Table 4.11 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for outcome and impact indicators .....	49
Table 4.12 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for evaluation details.....	50
Table 4.13 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for dissemination.....	53

## Definitions of terms

---

Commitment	Commitments are promises made by members of the Forum to take actions to achieve a particular goal that advances the Forum's aims.
Monitoring reports	<p>In order to monitor the progress of their commitments, Forum members are requested to submit a 'monitoring report' for each commitment they make.</p> <p>These monitoring reports are organised into sections that enable Forum members to state the 'objectives' of their commitment, 'inputs', 'outputs', 'outcomes', 'means of dissemination', and so on.</p> <p>A monitoring report template is included in Appendix B.</p>
Median score	This represents the midpoint value among the scores given; there is an equal number of scores below and above the value. When there is no single middle score, the average of the two middle scores is given.
Objectives	Objectives define what the commitment is trying to achieve. They should be specific and clear, and should include targets and milestones that are feasible.
Inputs	Inputs are the resources used to accomplish an objective; for example, money used to produce a leaflet on the health risks of binge drinking or the number of staff working on a strategy to curb underage drinking.
Outputs	Outputs are the immediate products of actions/tasks within a commitment. For example, an output could be the number of leaflets produced on the risks of drinking alcohol during pregnancy or the number of events organised by a Forum member.
Outcomes and impacts	Outcomes and impacts are wider consequences of an action; for example, a change in drinking behaviour as a result of consumers watching a prevention campaign on the dangers of drinking and driving.





# Executive summary

---

## The EU Alcohol and Health Forum

The EU Alcohol and Health Forum was launched in June 2007 following the EU alcohol harm reduction strategy in 2006.<sup>2</sup> The Forum is a multi-stakeholder platform where members from different types of organisations – such as production and sales organisations, media and advertising organisations and NGOs – commit to taking concrete actions to combat alcohol-related harm on a voluntary basis. The Forum was created to involve industry and other stakeholders in ‘shaping the social environment to support healthy lifestyles, whether in relation to ensuring a responsible approach to labelling, selling, marketing communication, or, ultimately, in raising awareness about the harmful consumption of their product’.<sup>3</sup>

Forum members agree to commit formally and publicly to concrete actions to reduce alcohol-related harm. These concrete actions are referred to as ‘commitments’. Members need to provide monitoring information on the progress of their commitment(s) in writing. This information must be put in a standardised monitoring report (see Appendix B for the template of this report) which is then made publicly available in an online database (<http://ec.europa.eu/eahf/searchForm.html>). In these reports, commitment holders must provide monitoring information on the resources allocated to the commitment and on its objectives, outputs, outcomes and impacts, as well as on how the results were disseminated and evaluated, where feasible. These reports are therefore essential in enabling the Forum and its members to monitor the progress of their commitments.

## The importance of monitoring the actions of the Forum

Monitoring has been strongly emphasised from the launch of the Forum in 2007. The Charter establishing the Forum makes it clear that monitoring is key to achieving its

---

<sup>2</sup> An EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm, 2006. [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol\\_com\\_625\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol_com_625_en.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> First Progress Report on the implementation of the EU alcohol strategy, 2009. [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol\\_progress.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol_progress.pdf)

objectives, reviewing progress and creating trust in the activities undertaken by its members.<sup>4</sup>

In addition, consistent monitoring facilitates a better understanding of commitments and their relevance to the Forum, and also contributes to providing more comprehensive evidence to inform practice, encourage trust and promote the duplication of good practice.

A total of 91 monitoring reports, submitted by 43 Forum members, were received in time to be included in this report. These 43 members belong to the following categories of members:

- 22 production and sales organisations;
- 13 NGOs and health professionals;
- 4 advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship organisations;
- and 4 research institutes and other organisations.

Of the 91 monitoring reports, 59 were intermediate reports and 32 were final reports.

Through these commitments, Forum members have engaged in initiatives to:

- curb underage drinking
- inform industry and other stakeholders better about responsible commercial communications and sales practices
- inform policy-makers about the range of policy options available
- provide adequate consumer information through logos and responsible drinking messages.

The monitoring reports suggest that a considerable amount of activity is being undertaken by the Forum. In that way, the Forum provides a foundation for building trust and sharing good practice. Nevertheless, care is needed in interpreting these findings as the monitoring of the activities of Forum members is sometimes incomplete or poorly articulated.

## **This report**

DG SANCO commissioned RAND Europe to carry out a quality assessment of all the monitoring reports submitted by Forum members up to March 2009. This quality assessment builds on similar work that RAND Europe carried out for DG SANCO in relation to the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health.<sup>5</sup>

RAND Europe's role is to provide support and recommendations in order to help improve what is undertaken by members in their monitoring reports. This assessment does not judge the value of the commitments detailed in the monitoring reports. The scores given

---

<sup>4</sup> Charter establishing the European Alcohol and Health Forum, 7 June 2007. [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/documents/Alcohol\\_charter2007.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/documents/Alcohol_charter2007.pdf), p.3

<sup>5</sup> For more information about the work of the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health, please see: [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/nutrition/platform/platform\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/nutrition/platform/platform_en.htm) and Hallsworth M, Krapels, J and Ling T (2007): [http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical\\_reports/TR609/](http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR609/)

are for the quality of monitoring in the reports, and do not relate to consideration of the scale, value or extent of the possible impacts of the commitment.

## Methodology

In August 2009 the RAND Europe research team drafted a scoring matrix for the quality assessment of Forum members' monitoring reports. This matrix took into account the guidelines for monitoring included in the Forum Charter and built on RAND Europe's previous experience of assessing monitoring quality for the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health. A first draft of this scoring matrix was sent to DG SANCO for comments and subsequently revised before being 'tested' on ten random monitoring reports to ensure that it was fit for purpose.

The quality assessment process involved scoring different sections of the monitoring report as well as submitting feedback to members on their individual monitoring reports to help them improve their monitoring in the following rounds of submissions. The scoring took place in September 2009 and forms the basis for this first Monitoring Progress Report.

### Criteria used for scoring

In order to award scores to different sections of the monitoring reports, RAND Europe, in collaboration with DG SANCO, decided to use a set of four criteria defined by key questions, as follows:

- **Specificity:** Does the report clearly state what the commitment aims to do, for whom, how it will be done, and by when its actions will be accomplished?
- **Clarity:** Does the report allow the reader to understand the commitment fully? Does the report offer clear links between objectives, inputs, outputs and outcomes (if present)?
- **Focus:** Does the report include relevant information only and provide necessary contextual information so the reader can understand the scale of a commitment's impacts?
- **Measurement:** Does the report include quantitative data that has been measured accurately and at appropriate intervals, and that is framed in an understandable manner?

## Overview of results from the quality assessment

The wide range of scores awarded (from 0 to 5) show that there are significant variations in the quality of monitoring between the reports submitted by Forum members and that some members appear to struggle with monitoring their commitments. For example, some members have had difficulty in being able to clearly communicate how they relate to the aims of the Forum or what they have produced in terms of outputs. It is hoped that this Monitoring Progress Report, along with the feedback and scores which have been disclosed to individual Forum members, will act as a catalyst to ensure an overall improvement in monitoring which can then be reflected in future reports on the quality of monitoring of Forum commitments.

## **Key recommendations**

The quality assessment has highlighted three key recommendations that would substantially improve the monitoring of commitments made by members:

- Providing clear and sufficient information to make the commitment's progress and outcomes understandable to those not directly involved in the commitment.
- Emphasising the relevance of the commitment to the aims of the Forum.
- Clearly differentiating between objectives, inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts.

## **Outlook**

The European Alcohol and Health Forum is the first multi-stakeholder platform at the EU level to discuss voluntary actions towards reducing alcohol-related harm. Therefore the Forum raises important and interesting questions as an alternative mechanism for pursuing public benefits through the innovative actions of its members. At a later stage, it is envisaged that an evaluation of the Forum's activities could contribute to understanding how far the Forum has achieved some of its aims and how successful it has been as an alternative mechanism for change and action on the issue of alcohol-related harm, compared to policy and enforcement mechanisms more commonly used in this field.

### 1.1 The EU Alcohol and Health Forum

The creation of the EU Alcohol and Health Forum was announced in the first EU alcohol harm reduction strategy adopted in 2006.<sup>6</sup> The Forum is a multi-stakeholder platform within which members from different types of organisations – such as production and sales organisations, media and advertising organisations, and NGOs that work to limit alcohol harm – commit to taking concrete actions on a voluntary basis to combat alcohol-related harm. The rationale for the creation of the Forum was to involve industry and other stakeholders in ‘shaping the social environment to support healthy lifestyles, whether in relation to ensuring a responsible approach to labelling, selling, marketing communication, or, ultimately, in raising awareness about the harmful consumption of their product’.<sup>7</sup>

The overall objective of the Forum is to ‘provide a common platform for all interested stakeholders at EU level that pledge to step up actions relevant to reducing alcohol-related harm’.<sup>8</sup> To guide this process, the Forum has set seven main priorities around which members can pledge concrete actions to reduce alcohol harm:

- **Priority 1:** Better cooperation/actions on responsible commercial communications and sales.
- **Priority 2:** Develop efficient common approaches to provide adequate consumer information.
- **Priority 3:** Develop information and education programmes on the effect of harmful drinking.
- **Priority 4:** Develop information and education programmes on responsible patterns of consumption.
- **Priority 5:** Enforce age limits for selling and serving alcoholic beverages.

---

<sup>6</sup> An EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm, 2006: [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol\\_com\\_625\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol_com_625_en.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> First Progress Report on the implementation of the EU alcohol strategy, 2009. [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol\\_progress.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol_progress.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> Charter establishing the European Alcohol and Health Forum, 7 June 2007. [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/documents/Alcohol\\_charter2007.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/documents/Alcohol_charter2007.pdf), p.2

- **Priority 6:** Develop a strategy aimed at curbing underage drinking.
- **Priority 7:** Promote effective behavioural change among children and adolescents.

Members are expected to commit formally and publicly to concrete actions to reduce alcohol-related harm. These actions are referred to as ‘commitments’. Each of the commitments needs to be put into writing in a standardised commitment form (see Appendix B). The reports are made publicly available in an online database: <http://ec.europa.eu/eahf/searchForm.html>. Each of the reports needs to contain information that enables the monitoring of the actions of the commitment. The information includes the objectives of the commitment, resources allocated to the commitment (‘inputs’), resources produced (‘outputs’), impacts and outcomes engendered by the commitment, and details of how the results of the commitment will be communicated, amongst other information. The monitoring reports and the information they contain are therefore essential in enabling the Forum and its members to monitor the progress of their commitments as well as in promoting learning and the duplication of good practice.

## 1.2 The importance of monitoring the actions of the Forum

The Charter establishing the Forum makes it clear that monitoring the commitments undertaken by Forum members is key to achieving its objectives. In addition, it states that it is essential that ‘there is sufficient outside involvement in reviewing progress and outcomes to create trust in the process’.<sup>9</sup> Therefore all members of the Forum agree ‘to monitor and evaluate the performance of their commitments in a transparent, participative and accountable way’.<sup>10</sup>

The use of consistent monitoring facilitates a better understanding of commitments and of their relevance to the Forum and can also contribute to producing more comprehensive evidence to inform practice, as well as to encourage trust and promote the duplication of good practice. As previously mentioned, this is done through completing for each commitment a monitoring report that contains information necessary for the transparent monitoring of the commitment. Members therefore agree to provide this information and must report on the input, output and outcomes of the commitments as well as stating the objectives of their commitments and giving evaluation details and information on how the results of their commitment will be disseminated. Members were consulted on the draft monitoring report template produced by DG SANCO. Following feedback, a simplified template was adopted and circulated in March 2009.

In addition, a workshop on monitoring and evaluation was organised by DG SANCO in June 2008. This workshop presented ‘lessons learnt’ from members’ experience with monitoring their commitments and progress made under the EU Platform on Diet,

---

<sup>9</sup> Charter establishing the European Alcohol and Health Forum, 7 June 2007. [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/documents/Alcohol\\_charter2007.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/documents/Alcohol_charter2007.pdf), p.3

<sup>10</sup> *ibid.*

Physical Activity and Health, a similar initiative to the Forum which was launched in 2005.

### 1.3 **This report**

DG SANCO commissioned RAND Europe to carry out a quality assessment of all the monitoring reports submitted by Forum members up to March 2009, which was the deadline for the submission of the monitoring reports. This quality assessment builds on similar work to that RAND Europe carried out for DG SANCO in relation to the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health.<sup>11</sup>

To date, there have been 115 commitments made by Forum members. Of these 91 were received in time to be included in this report. The aim of RAND Europe's quality assessment is to provide impartial input into the work that the Forum is currently undertaking in terms of monitoring. RAND Europe's role is essentially to provide support and recommendations in order to help improve the monitoring currently undertaken by members in their monitoring reports. This will be achieved by providing Forum members with scores and constructive feedback with a view to the information contained in their monitoring reports becoming clearer, more focused and relevant as well as inclusive of indicators (i.e. information on resources used, resources produced, impacts and outcomes) where feasible.

This is an essential first step in order to, at a later date, assess the impacts of the commitments made by members, and ultimately the ability of the Forum, as a voluntary stakeholder platform, to produce tangible results with regard to reducing alcohol harm.

In undertaking this quality assessment, RAND Europe has endeavoured to treat each monitoring report in an objective way. The analysis and scoring of these monitoring reports is based on whether the information presented in the reports is clearly set out and relevant to the commitment to which it relates, in accordance with the criteria set out in Chapter 3. Thus, RAND Europe's quality assessment did not entail any judgement on the value or worthiness of the commitments undertaken by Forum members. RAND Europe's role in this quality assessment is essentially that of an impartial scorer. It is therefore possible that through this exercise a commitment which could be seen as having the potential to reduce alcohol-related harm noticeably in an area could receive poor scores if the information presented in the monitoring report is unclear and patchy. In contrast, another commitment which could have very limited potential impact on reducing alcohol harm could receive high scores if the information in the monitoring report is clear, relevant and focused, and contains information on inputs, outputs, and so on.

This report is organised as follows. Chapter 2 provides an overview of the monitoring reports submitted by members of the Forum and discusses these by type of Forum member (i.e. production and sales organisations; NGOs and health professionals; advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship organisations; and research institutes and others), status

---

<sup>11</sup> For more information on the work of the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health, please see: [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/nutrition/platform/platform\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/nutrition/platform/platform_en.htm) and Hallsworth M, J Krapels and T Ling (2007): [http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical\\_reports/TR609/](http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR609/)

of monitoring report (final or intermediate) and target population, as well as which priorities of the Forum they relate to and their target groups. Chapter 3 describes the scoring matrix used to attribute scores to the different sections of the monitoring reports. Chapter 4 gives an overview of how Forum members have handled the monitoring of their commitments through their monitoring reports and gives the median scores awarded for each section scored. This chapter gives a description of the common strengths, weaknesses and problems encountered by Forum members as well as recommendations for improving the monitoring information presented in the reports. Finally, Chapter 5 presents the conclusion to this report, with a recapitulation of key findings, limitations and recommendations for improving the future monitoring of the Forum's activities.



## 2.1 **Introduction**

This chapter provides a broad overview of the monitoring reports submitted by Forum members up to March 2009. It gives a general picture of the number of commitments submitted by type of Forum member (i.e. production and sales organisations, NGOs and health professionals, advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship, etc.), and primary target group. In addition, it provides a brief overview of the activities undertaken by Forum members for each priority aim of the Forum, including some examples of commitments under each priority area.<sup>12</sup>

To date, there have been 115 commitments made by members of the Forum, of which 91 monitoring reports were received in time to be included in this Monitoring Progress Report. These monitoring reports have been submitted by 43 members, which include the following types of organisation: 22 production and sales organisations, 13 NGOs and health professionals, 4 advertising, marketing and media sponsorship, and 4 other organisations including research institutes. Of these 91 monitoring reports, 59 were intermediate monitoring reports and 32 were final monitoring reports.

### 2.1.1 **Type of Forum member**

The classification of Forum members by type is based on the classification used in DG SANCO's Summary Report of April 2009.<sup>13</sup> The original classification used in the Summary Report contains nine categories; however, it was decided in consultation with DG SANCO that the classification should be simplified for the purposes of this progress report. As only a few commitment holders fall into some of the nine categories used in the Summary Report (e.g. media organisations or health professionals), broader categories were compiled to prevent traceability to specific commitment holders when communicating scores. Therefore, we have used the following categories in this report:

---

<sup>12</sup> For more information on the content of all the commitments, please refer to DG SANCO's summary report of the commitments made under the Forum in April 2009. The summary report contains an initial analysis as well as many summaries of the commitments submitted as of April 2009. Alternatively, please consult the public database of the Forum, which contains all commitments made to date as well as all the monitoring reports submitted by members: <http://ec.europa.eu/eahf/searchForm.html>

<sup>13</sup> Commitments made by members of the European Alcohol and Health Forum – Summary Report (April 2009). [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/Forum/docs/report\\_commitments\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/Forum/docs/report_commitments_en.pdf)

- production and sales organisations: alcohol producers, retailers, wholesalers and caterers – referred to as ‘production and sales organisations’ throughout this report
- advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship organisations
- NGOs and health professionals
- research institutes and other: this category includes members such as the European Transport Safety Council (ETSC) and the European Social Insurance Platform (ESIP).

Table 2.1 below shows the breakdown of monitoring reports by type of Forum member. It shows that an overwhelming majority (69%) of monitoring reports have been submitted by members of the Forum who come under the classification of ‘production and sales organisations’. This is not surprising, given that production and sales organisations represent almost half of all members of the Forum (22 out of 43 members are representatives of the production and sales sector). In addition, some members have submitted more than one monitoring report; for example, The Brewers of Europe (also under the classification of production and sales organisations) have submitted 25 out of 91 monitoring reports.

**Table 2.1 Breakdown of monitoring reports by status of report and type of Forum member**

Type of Forum member	Final		Intermediate		Reports submitted	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship organisations	2	50%	2	50%	4	4%
Production and sales organisations	24	38%	39	62%	63	69%
NGO and health professionals	6	35%	11	65%	17	19%
Research institutes and other	0	0%	7	100%	7	8%
Total	32	35%	59	65%	91	100%

### 2.1.2 Target groups

For the quality assessment of the monitoring reports, RAND Europe also categorised each report according to the primary target group of the commitment. For this purpose we categorised target groups as follows: Adults (both male and female), Adult female, Adolescent/children, Policy-makers and professionals, Own staff<sup>14</sup> and No target group specified.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> ‘Own staff’ means staff directly employed by the Forum member and also staff of member organisations in cases where the commitment holder is an umbrella group. For example, if an umbrella group of spirit producers proposes to train their members’ staff in responsible marketing practices, then the primary target group of that commitment would be classified as ‘own staff’. On the other hand, if that same umbrella group proposes to produce information on the effects of harmful drinking in pregnancy to be distributed to doctors, the primary target group would be ‘policy-makers and professionals’.

<sup>15</sup> This option was used where no target group was explicitly specified in a monitoring report and where it was not possible for the RAND Europe researchers to deduce the target group from reading the monitoring report.

**Table 2.2 Breakdown of monitoring reports by primary target group**

Primary target group	Total number of monitoring reports
Policy-makers and professionals	33
Own staff	28
Adults (both)	22
Adolescent/children	4
Adult female	2
No target group specified	2
Total number of monitoring reports	91

Table 2.2 above shows the breakdown of monitoring reports by primary target group. Overall, the most common primary target groups are ‘policy-makers and professionals’ (33 commitments) and ‘own staff’ (28 commitments). Very few monitoring reports related to commitments whose primary target were ‘adolescents/children’ or ‘adult female’, with only four and two monitoring reports respectively. On the other hand, 2 monitoring reports did not specify a target group.


## 2.2 Commitments made by Forum members under each priority area

The monitoring reports relate to commitments undertaken through a variety of activities such as media campaigns, websites, self-regulation and marketing. This section aims to give an overview of the types of activity undertaken by Forum members under the seven priority areas of the Forum, defined as follows:

- **Priority 1:** Better cooperation/actions on responsible commercial communications and sales.
- **Priority 2:** Develop efficient common approaches to provide adequate consumer information.
- **Priority 3:** Develop information and education programmes on the effect of harmful drinking.
- **Priority 4:** Develop information and education programmes on responsible patterns of consumption.
- **Priority 5:** Enforce age limits for selling and serving alcoholic beverages.
- **Priority 6:** Develop a strategy aimed at curbing underage drinking.
- **Priority 7:** Promote effective behavioural change among children and adolescents.

Figure 2.1 below provides a breakdown of the 91 monitoring reports by the seven priority areas of the Forum. It is worth noting that some of the commitments related to more than one priority area of the Forum. However, for the purpose of this report we classified each monitoring report under its ‘primary’ priority area, which was the first area mentioned in the summary of the monitoring reports as extracted from the Forum commitment database by DG SANCO. An overwhelming majority of commitments were submitted in the following priority areas: Priority 1 (25 reports), Priorities 3 and 4 (20 reports each). On the

other hand, only three commitments have been made in the area of promoting effective behavioural change among children and adolescents (Priority 7).



**Figure 2.1 Breakdown of monitoring report by priority area of the Forum**

Table 2.3 below shows a breakdown of monitoring reports by type of Forum member and by primary priority area. It shows that, across all types of Forum members, the primary priority areas under which most of the monitoring reports were submitted are as follows: Priority 1 Responsible commercial communications and sales, 27% of all commitments; Priority 3 Information and education on effects of harmful drinking, 22% of all commitments; and Priority 4 Information and education on responsible patterns of consumption, 22% of all reports.

It also shows that the two primary priority areas under which most of the monitoring reports submitted by production and sales organisations are as follows: Priority 1 Better cooperation/actions on responsible commercial communications and sales, with 33% of all their commitments, and Priority 4 Develop information and educational programmes on responsible patterns of consumption, with 27%. On the other hand, more than half of all monitoring reports submitted by NGOs and health professionals, 59%, come under Priority 3 Develop information and education programmes on the effect of harmful drinking; whereas three-quarters of all reports (75%) submitted by members who belong to the advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship sector came under Priority 1 Better cooperation/actions on responsible commercial communications and sales. Unsurprisingly, this shows that for the most part Forum members made commitments in line with their areas of expertise. For example, advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship organisations made commitments that were closely linked to their communication and sales expertise, while NGOs and health professionals made commitments closely related to their knowledge of the effects of harmful drinking.

**Table 2.3 Breakdown of monitoring reports by type of Forum member and by primary Forum by priority areas**

Type of Forum member	Priority 1		Priority 2		Priority 3		Priority 4		Priority 5		Priority 6		Priority 7		Total monitoring reports	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Production and sales organisations	21	33%	6	10%	7	11%	17	27%	6	10%	5	8%	1	2%	63	69%
NGO and health professionals	1	6%	1	6%	10	59%	0	0%	1	6%	3	18%	1	6%	17	19%
Research institutes and other	0	0%	1	14%	2	29%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%	7	8%
Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	4%
All types	25	27%	8	9%	20	22%	20	22%	7	8%	8	9%	3	3%	91	100%

The sections below provide an overview of the type of activities that Forum members have been carrying out under the seven priority areas of the Forum.

### 2.2.1 Better cooperation/actions on responsible commercial communications and sales

There is a total of 25 monitoring reports (out of 91) submitted to the Forum that relate to Priority 1 of the Forum: 'Better cooperation/actions on responsible commercial communications and sales'.

Table 2.4 below provides an overview of each monitoring report under this priority area along with the name of the report owner, the status of the report (final or intermediate) and the type of Forum member who submitted it.

**Table 2.4 Overview of Forum members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 1 of the Forum**

Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report	Type of Forum member
Compendium of regulations, self-regulatory standards and industry codes of conduct on audiovisual advertising of alcoholic beverages	Egta, Association of Television and Radio Sales Houses	Final	Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship organisations
Self-regulation survey amongst sponsorship rights holders	The European Sponsorship Association	Final	Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship organisations
Strengthening advertising self-regulatory effectiveness	Advertising Information Group (AIG; representing ZAW and WKO)	Intermediate	Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship organisations
Training on internal code on commercial communication	Heineken International	Final	Production and sales organisations
The placement of the French pregnancy logo on the back label of all Pernod Ricard's wine and spirit brands in the EU-27 countries	Pernod Ricard S.A.	Final	Production and sales organisations
Enhanced staff training on compliance to SABMiller's code of commercial communication	SABMiller	Final	Production and sales organisations
Brewers of Romania Association – self-regulation / independent jury	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
Brewers of Sweden – enhancing public awareness of the self-regulation system	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
Polish Brewers – self-regulation (part 4) – increase the coverage of the commercial communications code	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
Polish Brewers – self-regulation (part 2) – introduction of impartial judgements within the system	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
Portuguese Brewers (APCV) – self-regulation beer code for commercial communication	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
The Danish Brewers' Association – self-regulation of commercial communication	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
Union of Brewers in Bulgaria (UBB) – improved compliance mechanism for self-regulation	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
Improving compliance with code of commercial communications	Anheuser-Busch InBev	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations

Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report	Type of Forum member
Bacardi Limited marketing principles	Bacardi-Martini B.V.	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Commercial communications for beer: The Brewers of Europe's 7 operational standards	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Czech Beer and Malt Association – upgrade self-regulation system for beer commercial communications	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Dutch Brewers Association (CBK) – assurance on self-regulation report	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Polish Brewers – self-regulation (part 1) – increase compliance with the commercial communication code	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Polish Brewers – self-regulation (part 3) – public awareness of complaints procedure within the system	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
The Brewers of Spain's self-regulation code: expanded self-regulation	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Marketing self-regulation	The European Spirits Organisation (CEPS)	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
The Scotch Whisky Association (SWA) code of practice for the responsible marketing and promotion of Scotch whisky: audit of implementation and code development	The Scotch Whisky Association	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
www.marketresponsibly.eu	European Forum for Responsible Drinking	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Overview of European alcohol marketing regulations and overview of research on effects of alcohol marketing	National Foundation for Alcohol Prevention (STAP)	Intermediate	NGOs and health professionals

A majority of the commitments under the Forum's Priority 1 were submitted by The Brewers of Europe (13 commitments) and fall under what they refer to as 'The Brewers of Europe's seven operational standards'.<sup>16</sup> These commitments relate to the operational standards to ensure increased compliance with responsible commercial communications and sales in Member States. In order to increase compliance with these standards, the following activities were put in place by The Brewers of Europe themselves or by their

<sup>16</sup> 'The Brewers of Europe in 2007 adopted seven operational standards to ensure that the brewers' self-regulatory codes operate within transparent, effective and credible systems.' For more detail, see: [http://www.brewersofeurope.net/asp/newsroom/11.asp?doc\\_id=53](http://www.brewersofeurope.net/asp/newsroom/11.asp?doc_id=53)

member organisations: training workshops, free copy advice by experts available to all brewers, enhanced review mechanisms for the beer code, facilitation of access to complaint submission forms from consumers, and so on.

### 2.2.2 Develop efficient common approaches to provide adequate consumer information

There is a total of eight monitoring reports (out of 91) submitted to the Forum that relate to Priority 2 of the Forum: ‘Develop efficient common approaches to provide adequate consumer information’. As may be seen in Table 2.5, all of these reports are intermediate at this stage.

Table 2.5 below provides an overview of each monitoring report under this priority area, along with the name of the report owner, the status of the report (final or intermediate) and the type of Forum member who submitted it.

**Table 2.5 Overview of Forum members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 2 of the Forum**

Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report	Type of Forum member
Bacardi-Martini Limited: consumer Information website	Bacardi-Martini B.V.	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Reinforcing responsible drinking messages	British Retail Consortium	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Online dialogue: encouraging people to make informed choices about alcohol	SABMiller	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Consumer awareness	The European Spirits Organisation (CEPS)	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Independent evaluation	The European Spirits Organisation (CEPS)	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Programme to provide information to consumers in Europe	European Forum for Responsible Drinking	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
To ascertain the education and practices of midwives in Member States on reducing alcohol-related harm preconception and during pregnancy	European Midwives Association	Intermediate	NGOs and health professionals
ICAP periodic review on drinking and culture	International Center for Alcohol Policies (ICAP)	Intermediate	Research institutes and other

The types of commitments these members have made include the following:

- the delivery of a programme by the European Forum for Responsible Drinking (CEPS) aimed at raising consumer awareness of the risk of alcohol-related harm, which will include amongst other activities research on the



current level of consumer awareness and how best to communicate with consumers, as well as the design and implementation of a communication programme;

- the communication of the responsible drinking message by CEPS through advertising (by including, where permitted, a responsible drinking message) and through tools such as websites and consumer leaflets, amongst other initiatives;
- research to establish if alcohol-related harm is commonly discussed by midwives, women and their partners and if such issues are included in the core content of the pre-registration midwifery education curricula of Member States, as well as finding examples of any current national research initiatives related to alcohol-related harm during preconception and pregnancy, amongst other activities of the European Midwives Association.

### 2.2.3 **Develop information and education programmes on the effects of harmful drinking**

There is a total of 20 monitoring reports (out of 91) submitted to the Forum that relate to Priority 3 of the Forum: ‘Develop information and education programmes on the effects of harmful drinking’. Six of these monitoring reports are final and 14 are intermediate.

The table below provides an overview of each monitoring report under this priority area along with the name of the report owner, the status of the report (final or intermediate) and the type of Forum member who submitted it.

**Table 2.6 Overview of Forum members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 3**

Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report	Type of Forum member
Educational contribution of editorial content	European Federation of Magazine Publishers (FAEP)	Intermediate	Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship organisations
Finnish Federation of the Brewing Industry – ‘Drunk, you’re a fool!’ education campaign	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
<i>La carretera te pide SIN</i>	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
Employee responsible drinking programme	Anheuser-Busch InBev	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
International Bartender Association server training	Bacardi-Martini B.V.	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Corporate social responsibility code	Brown-Forman	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Server training module	Brown-Forman	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Polish Brewers – drink driving in Poland beer industry program	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
A new alcohol action Ireland website	Alcohol Action Ireland (AAI)	Final	NGOs and health professionals
Youth empowerment for a better life!	Alcohol Policy Youth Network (APYN)	Final	NGOs and health professionals
New Eurocare website	Eurocare	Final	NGOs and health professionals
Resource tool on alcohol addiction and homelessness	FEANTSA (European Federation of National Organisations Working with People who are Homeless)	Final	NGOs and health professionals
Support capacity and competence building	Deutsche Hauptstelle für Suchtfragen (DHS)	Intermediate	NGOs and health professionals
Awareness raising of foetal alcohol spectrum disorders (FASD)	Eurocare	Intermediate	NGOs and health professionals
Translation and dissemination of ‘Alcohol in Europe’ short report	Eurocare Italia	Intermediate	NGOs and health professionals
Building capacity for action on alcohol-related health policy	European Public Health Alliance (EPHA)	Intermediate	NGOs and health professionals

Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report	Type of Forum member
Dissemination of updated alcohol information to relevant stakeholders	European Public Health Alliance (EPHA)	Intermediate	NGOs and health professionals
Promoting the understanding of alcohol-related harm and effective health strategies	Royal College of Physicians (RCP London) – member of the European Public Health Alliance	Intermediate	NGOs and health professionals
Fight against alcohol-related harm: the role of social insurers	ESIP (European Social Insurance Platform)	Intermediate	Research institutes and other
Safe and sober	European Transport Safety Council (ETSC)	Intermediate	Research institutes and other

Commitments under this priority area included the following:

- the use of websites to make resources on alcohol available to professionals and policy-makers as well as raise the impact and visibility of the organisation by Alcohol Action Ireland (AAI) and Eurocare;
- the setting up of a programme to raise the awareness of policy-makers, private sector stakeholders and key opinion leaders about the dangers of drink driving by the European Transport Safety Council (ETSC);
- the creation by the Alcohol Policy Youth Network (APYN) of a network of youth organisations across Europe that work or are willing to work in the field of alcohol policy;
- the production of a server training book, training module and training course by Bacardi-Martini B.V. in association with the International Bartender Association.

#### 2.2.4 **Develop information and education programmes on responsible patterns of consumption**

There is a total of 20 monitoring reports (out of 91) submitted to the Forum that relate to Priority 4: ‘Develop information and education programmes on responsible patterns of consumption’. Eleven of these monitoring reports are final and nine are intermediate.

The table below provides an overview of each monitoring report under this priority area along with the name of the report owner, the status of the report (final or intermediate) and the type of Forum member who submitted it.

**Table 2.7 Overview of Forum members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 4**

Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report	Type of Forum member
Social norms forum	Anheuser-Busch InBev	Final	Production and sales organisations
Attitudes to alcohol programme	Diageo Plc	Final	Production and sales organisations
Choices Germany	Diageo Plc	Final	Production and sales organisations
Help educate and remind consumers about the consequences of not drinking responsibly	Heineken International	Final	Production and sales organisations
Promotion of responsible consumption towards French general practitioners (GPs)	Moet Hennessy	Final	Production and sales organisations
Placement of a responsible drinking message on all of Pernod Ricard's advertising in the EU-27 countries	Pernod Ricard S.A.	Final	Production and sales organisations
Campaign on responsible alcohol consumption	SAB Miller (subsidiary: Dreher Breweries)	Final	Production and sales organisations
<i>Un dedo de espuma, dos dedos de frente</i> (An inch of foam, two miles of mind / A thick head on your beer but not on your shoulders)	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
AssoBirra – 'If you're expecting a child, alcohol can wait'	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
The Danish Brewers' Association – <i>Er du klar til at kore?</i> (Are you ready to drive?)	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
To share with Forum members the impact and learning gained from delivering Scotland's first-ever Alcohol Awareness Week	The Scotch Whisky Association	Final	Production and sales organisations
'Wine in moderation' – <i>Art de vivre</i> programme	Comité Européen des Entreprises de Vins (CEEV)	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Evaluation of the Heineken rules on alcohol and work	Heineken International	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Contribute to consumer awareness of information service on blood alcohol content	SABMiller	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Responsible drinking – SMS programme	SABMiller	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Becoming drink aware – the practical promotion of positive drinking behaviours	The Alcohol Beverage Federation of Ireland	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Dutch Brewers Organisation (CBK) – information material on responsible drinking patterns	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations

Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report	Type of Forum member
ICAP Blue Book: practical guides for alcohol policy and targeted interventions	International Center for Alcohol Policies (ICAP)	Intermediate	Research institutes and other
Attitudes and behaviour of young people towards alcohol	IREB (Institut de Recherche Scientifique sur les Boissons)	Intermediate	Research institutes and other
Call for tenders 2008	IREB (Institut de Recherche Scientifique sur les Boissons)	Intermediate	Research institutes and other

Commitments made under this priority area included the following:

- The organisation by Anheuser-Busch Inc. of a social norms forum with the participation of experts as well as examples of best practice from those who have implemented social norms programs. Attendants at the forum can access an online social norms handbook which contains information on this approach and how to implement it.
- A commitment to include responsible drinking messages on the advertising of all their brands by Pernod-Ricard S.A., including advertisements in print and poster, outdoors and on television as well as within their marketing activities.
- An SMS programme by SABMiller to allow mobile phone users to find out about when it might be safe for them to drive after having had a drink. With money generated by this programme, which is being undertaken in Poland, breath analysers are bought and wall-mounted in participating pubs.
- An initiative to inform and make obstetricians and gynaecologists aware of Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) through information kits mailed to 5,000 professionals. CD-ROMs and a mini-site are also planned as part of the campaign for both professionals, and pregnant women.
- The deployment of an epidemiological survey by l'Institut de Recherche Scientifique sur les Boissons (IREB) among 1,800 young people aged 13–24 in order to study their attitudes and behaviour towards alcohol

#### 2.2.5 Enforce age limits for serving and selling alcoholic beverages

A total of seven monitoring reports (out of 91) submitted to the Forum relate to Priority 5: 'Enforce age limits for serving and selling of alcoholic beverages'. Only one of these monitoring reports is final.

The table below provides an overview of each monitoring report under this priority area along with the name of the report owner, the status of the report (final or intermediate) and the type of Forum member who submitted it.

**Table 2.8 Overview of Forum members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 5**

Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report	Type of Forum member
Raising awareness of retailers to carry out actions against abuse of alcohol	EuroCommerce	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Enforce age limits for serving and selling alcoholic beverages	Finnish Hospitality Association (FHA)	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Raising awareness of national associations / call for actions	HOTREC – hotels, restaurants and cafés in the European Union	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Actions for responsible service of alcohol	Swedish Hotel and Restaurant Association (SHR)	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
The Belgian Brewers – curbing underage drinking: ‘Respect 16’	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
The German Brewers Association – <i>Bier? Sorry. Erst ab 16</i>	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Training guides for responsible service of alcohol	European Forum for Responsible Drinking	Final	Production and sales organisations

These commitments relate to three different actions:

- The European Forum for Responsible Drinking, the Finnish Hospitality Association (FHA) and the Swedish Hotel and Restaurant Association (SHR) committed themselves to enforcing age limits for serving and selling alcoholic beverages through information activities aimed at member companies and organisations. These commitments are being implemented through a number of tools including training guides, guidelines, website information, press conferences and information leaflets.
- Informing member companies of the activities of the Forum in this area and encouraging them to make commitments to enforce age limits for selling and serving alcoholic beverages – both EuroCommerce and HOTREC (hotels, restaurants and cafés in the European Union) have committed themselves to taking action in this area.
- Running a campaign to increase awareness of restrictions for selling and serving alcohol to minors – two commitments have been submitted in this area by The Brewers of Europe: one in Belgium and one in Germany. These campaigns are being implemented through websites, leaflets and press outreach, amongst other activities.

### 2.2.6 Develop a strategy aimed at curbing underage drinking

In total, eight monitoring reports (out of 91) have been submitted that relate to Priority 6: ‘Develop a strategy aimed at curbing underage drinking’. Of those, only one is final.

The table below provides an overview of each monitoring report under this priority area along with the name of the report owner, the status of the report (final or intermediate) and the type of Forum member who submitted it.

**Table 2.9 Overview of Forum members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 6 of the Forum**

Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report	Type of Forum member
Polish Brewers – underage drinking	The Brewers of Europe	Final	Production and sales organisations
Enforcement of age limits for selling and serving alcoholic drinks	British Beer and Pub Association	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Best bar none	Brown-Forman	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Promotion of alcohol abstinence among underage youth	The Absolut Company (V&S Group)	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Brewers of Romania – alcohol does not make you big: underage drinking campaign	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Alcohol-free café in Tallinn	Estonian Temperance Union	Intermediate	NGOs and health professionals
Statutory codes for alcohol advertising in Ireland	National Youth Council of Ireland	Intermediate	NGOs and health professionals
Building a network supporting evidence-based alcohol policies in the Baltic states	NordAN (the Nordic Alcohol and Drug Policy Network)	Intermediate	NGOs and health professionals

The commitments made under this priority area include the following:

- A documentary by The Brewers of Europe in Poland to increase public awareness of underage drinking. The documentary highlights the legal age limit for selling and serving alcoholic beverages and the responsibility of retailers and the hospitality sector in respecting the law. This commitment builds on a programme already established that aims to reduce minors' access to alcohol.
- The creation of an alcohol-free café in Tallinn, Estonia, by the Estonian Temperance Union. This café is targeted at young people from 13 to 25 years old. This commitment aims to spread the café initiative to create five alcohol-free cafés across Estonia by 2010.
- The possibility of Brown-Forman extending the Best Bar None scheme, which is currently running in the UK, to other UK regions and possibly other Member States. This scheme aims to encourage premises to adopt a responsible attitude towards the sale of alcohol. It is being implemented in partnership with local police and councils.

- The provision of staff time and financial support by The Absolut Company (V&S Group) to increase the funding of existing programmes that aim to promote abstinence by underage young people. This commitment also aims to develop other such programmes and to contribute to experience-sharing on this issue across borders.

### 2.2.7 Promote effective behaviour change among children and adolescents

There is a total of three monitoring reports submitted to the Forum (out of 91) that relate to Priority 7 of the Forum: ‘Promote effective behaviour change among children and adolescents’. Of those, one is final.

The table below provides an overview of each monitoring report under this priority area along with the name of the report owner, the status of the report (final or intermediate) and the type of Forum member who submitted it.

**Table 2.10 Overview of members who have submitted a monitoring report under Priority 7**

Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report	Type of Forum member
The Danish Brewers' Association – <i>Er du klar</i> (Are you ready?)	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate	Production and sales organisations
Alcohol Policy Youth Network (APYN)	Eurocare	Final	NGOs and health professionals
The culture of extreme drinking	International Center for Alcohol Policies (ICAP)	Intermediate	Research institutes and other

Commitments under this priority area include the following:

- A project by Eurocare in collaboration with the European Youth Forum to create the APYN. This network is being set up in order to increase capacity building in this area; the network also provides training courses, seminars and training for trainers, amongst other things.
- A comparative survey conducted in focus groups and a book written on the findings of the survey about extreme drinking in various Member States by the International Centre for Alcohol Policies (ACAP). Ultimately, the book could be used to help improve approaches to prevention and interventions.
- The development by the Danish Brewers of tools that aim to promote effective behavioural change among teenagers and help parents to set the right standard. The tools created thus far include two websites. This commitment also includes, amongst other activities, various dissemination means such as a press release, a story in a national newspaper and newsletters and booklets.



## CHAPTER 3 **Method used for monitoring quality assessment**

---

### 3.1 **Monitoring commitments**

This chapter provides a detailed account of the way in which the quality assessment of the monitoring reports was carried out. Section 3.2 details the methodology used to score the monitoring reports and, in particular, how we ensured that different researchers awarded comparable scores. Section 3.3 describes the scoring matrix that was used and, finally, section 3.4 details the way in which scores and feedback were communicated to Forum members.

The Charter establishing the European Alcohol and Health Forum sets out consistent guidelines for Forum members to monitor their commitments. Monitoring is key to achieving the aims and objectives of the Forum and the intention is to build trust among members, while also assessing progress and outlining constraints against the commitments made by Forum members.

The Charter suggests that the overall framework for the monitoring of commitments by Forum members should be guided by SMART procedures, which means setting goals and objectives that meet the following requirements:

- Specific (connected to the action(s)) – clear about what, where, why and when the situation will be changed
- Measurable – able to quantify or qualify the achievements, changes or benefits
- Attainable/achievable – able to attain the objectives (knowing the resources and capacities at the disposal of all those concerned)
- Realistic – able to obtain the level of change reflected in the objective
- Time bound – stating the time period in which objectives will be accomplished.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Charter establishing the European Alcohol and Health Forum, 7 June 2007. [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/documents/Alcohol\\_charter2007.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/documents/Alcohol_charter2007.pdf), p.9-10

## 3.2 Methodology

In August 2009 the RAND Europe research team drafted a scoring matrix (the final version of which is presented in section 3.3 below) for the quality assessment of Forum members' monitoring reports. This matrix took into account the guidelines for monitoring included in the Forum Charter. A first draft of this scoring matrix was sent to DG SANCO for comments and subsequently revised before being 'tested' on ten random monitoring reports. This testing process was particularly important given that both researchers subsequently scored different batches of monitoring reports.

The process of testing the scoring matrix on ten monitoring reports was carried out by two RAND Europe researchers, who each scored the same monitoring reports. Once the scoring of these ten monitoring reports was completed, the two researchers met with a third researcher to ensure consistency. This testing process not only allowed the RAND researchers to verify that the scoring matrix devised for the monitoring exercise was adequate, but also to make sure that they both used similar judgements, provided similar scores and the same level of details for comments on the monitoring reports. Once this testing process was completed, the RAND Europe research team reported on progress to DG SANCO and proceeded with the scoring of the remaining monitoring reports.

## 3.3 Scoring matrix for monitoring reports

The quality assessment process of the monitoring reports involved scoring different sections of the monitoring report as well as submitting feedback to members on their individual monitoring reports. The scoring took place in September 2009 and forms the basis for this first Monitoring Progress Report. Feedback and scores were circulated to members after of the plenary meeting of the Forum on 12 November 2009. At this meeting, RAND Europe presented the main findings of this report.

### 3.3.1 Criteria used for scoring

In order to award scores to different sections of the monitoring reports, a set of four criteria was defined along key questions as follows:

- **Specificity:** Does the report state clearly what the commitment aims to do, for whom, how it will be done, and by when its actions will be accomplished?
- **Clarity:** Does the report allow the reader to understand the commitment fully? Does the report offer clear links between objectives, inputs, outputs and outcomes (if present)?
- **Focus:** Does the report include only relevant information and provide necessary contextual information so a reader can judge the scale of a commitment's impacts?
- **Measurement:** Does the report include quantitative data that have been measured accurately and at appropriate intervals, and that are framed in an understandable manner?

The criteria above are broadly in line with the SMART procedures; however, it was felt that whilst the SMART procedures were fit for purpose as guiding criteria for Forum

members to monitor their commitments, they were not appropriate for RAND Europe researchers to carry out their quality assessment. This was the case because, as previously mentioned, RAND Europe's role was not to judge commitments on their values or ability to be achieved but rather to make an assessment of the quality of the information provided. Thus, we would have been able to apply only the first two SMART criteria to our quality assessment, namely Specific and Measurable, and it was deemed more appropriate to include further considerations – such as the clarity and focus of the information provided in our scoring. In addition, the four criteria RAND Europe used for its quality assessment had been successfully used previously for a similar quality assessment of the monitoring of the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health.<sup>18</sup>

### 3.3.2 The monitoring report template

The monitoring report template<sup>19</sup> that all Forum members had to fill in for their commitments contains a total of 12 sections, as follows:

1. commitment summary
2. link to websites relating to the commitment
3. description of the implementation of the commitment
4. objectives of the commitment
5. relevance to the aims of the Forum
6. input indicators
7. output indicators
8. outcome and impact indicators
9. evaluation details
10. other comments related to monitoring the commitment
11. dissemination of commitment's results
12. references to further information relating to the monitoring of the commitment.

In consultation with DG SANCO, it was decided that sections 1, 2 and 12 would not be quality assessed by RAND Europe as the information contained in the other sections of the report should be clear and relevant enough to enable a full understanding of what the commitment is about – its objectives, inputs, outputs, and so on – without having to refer to external sources of information.

Thus, the remaining sections (namely 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11) were each allocated a score from 0 to 5 (5 being the highest score awarded and 0 the lowest<sup>20</sup>) according to the

---

<sup>18</sup> See for example: Hallsworth M, J Krapels and T Ling (2007): [http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical\\_reports/TR609/](http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR609/)

<sup>19</sup> A copy of this template is available in Appendix B.

four criteria. A graphic representation of the scores will be provided to each Forum member using a Radar graph (see section 3.4 for an illustrative example). Scores were given by individual section, rather than overall, as certain sections were not relevant to all commitments (e.g. intermediate reports were not required to submit monitoring information on the evaluation and dissemination of results). Thus, a maximum score of 5 could be obtained for each relevant section of the reports.

Further details on which criteria were used to inform the scoring of different sections of the monitoring report are included in Table 3.1 below. These criteria were used as a baseline to produce guiding questions under each section. In addition to the scores, RAND Europe provided feedback on the scores received so that Forum members had a clear understanding of how they could improve their monitoring reports in the future. This feedback was given for each individual scored section of the report. More detailed feedback was provided for those sections of the report that scored less than 4 in order to enable Forum members to make significant improvements to their monitoring reports in the next rounds.

---

<sup>20</sup> A score of 0 was rarely awarded, when Forum members had not filled in a section which was mandatory or where the information provided had no relevance at all to a given section. Likewise, a score of 5 was awarded only where no changes or improvements were needed to a section at all.

**Table 3.1 Details of criteria used for scoring each section of the monitoring report**

Report fields	Scoring criteria
<i>Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.</i>	
Access code:*	Scoring not applicable
Commitment Number:	Scoring not applicable
Title of the commitment:*	Scoring not applicable
Name of the Forum member organisation owning the commitment:*	Scoring not applicable
Is this a report for an ongoing commitment or a final report?:*	Scoring not applicable
What is the time period covered by this report (in the case of a final report, the reporting period is the life span of the commitment)?*	Scoring not applicable
Point of contact for the commitment (the person authorised by the organisation owning the commitment who can be contacted for information about the commitment):*	Not scored
1. Commitment summary (based on summary given in original commitment form):*	Not scored
2. Link to websites relating to the commitment:	Not scored
3. Description of the implementation of the commitment (max. 500 words):*	<p>Maximum score: 5</p> <p><b>Specificity</b> Are key dates and milestones in the implementation of the commitment set out clearly? Is an overview of the resources involved in the implementation of the commitment given? Are details given on who is involved and/or responsible for the implementation of the commitment?</p> <p><b>Focus</b> Is only relevant information included in the description? Is enough contextual information included to make the implementation of the commitment understandable?</p>
4. Objectives (cf. sections 4–5 of the Monitoring Commitment in Annex II of the Forum Charter): in which way and to what extent have the objectives set out in the original commitment form been achieved in the reporting period? (max. 500 words)*	<p>Maximum score: 5</p> <p><b>Specificity</b> How and when have the objectives been achieved?</p> <p><b>Clarity</b> How clearly are the objectives set out?</p> <p><b>Focus</b> Is only relevant information included in the description of objectives? Is enough contextual information included to make the objectives of the commitment understandable?</p> <p><b>Measurement</b> Is some quantitative data included on the implementation of the commitment (e.g. how many people have been reached, how many events have been organised)?</p>
5. Relevance – i.e. how did the commitment during the reporting period contribute to achieving the overall aims of the Forum (cf. section 3 of the Monitoring Commitment in Annex II of the Forum Charter)? (max. 250 words)*	<p>Maximum score: 5</p> <p>RAND Europe will not comment on the relevance of the commitments to the aims of the Forum but on whether the link between the commitments and the aims of the Forum is set out clearly.</p> <p><b>Clarity</b> Does this section specify which aim/aims of the Forum the commitment relates to? Is it clear how commitment holders believe that their commitment is linked to the aim of the Forum?</p> <p><b>Focus</b> Is only relevant information included in the description of objectives?</p>
6. Input indicators – resources allocated to the commitment (What was done to put the objectives	<p>Maximum score: 5</p> <p><b>Clarity</b></p>

into practice?') – cf. section 5a of the Monitoring Commitment in Annex II of the Forum Charter? (max. 250 words)*	Are resources allocated to the commitment clearly set out? <b>Focus</b> Is only relevant information included?
7. Output indicators – measure from a quantitative point of view the results created through the use of inputs ('What was achieved with the resources allocated to the commitment') – cf. section 5b of the Monitoring Commitment in Annex II of the Forum Charter (max. 250 words):*	Maximum score: 5 <b>Clarity</b> Are output indicators clearly set out? <b>Focus</b> Is only relevant information included?
8. Outcome and impact indicators ('How successful has the commitment been during the reporting period in relation to the original objectives') - cf. section 6 of the Monitoring Commitment in Annex II of the Forum Charter. These indications go beyond the minimum agreed requirements to monitor a commitment, and it is expected that this type of evaluation will not be carried out for all commitments (max. 250 words):* :  Short term: Medium term: Long term: Other:	Maximum score: 5 <b>Clarity</b> Are outcome and impact indicators clearly set out? <b>Focus</b> Is only relevant information included?
9. Evaluation details – tools and methods used, internal or external evaluators ... (max. 250 words; mandatory for final report only):*	Maximum score: 5 This section is mandatory for final monitoring reports only. However, RAND Europe will provide scores for final reports and indicative scores for intermediate reports to inform Forum members of how this section could be improved if applicable. <b>Specificity</b> Are the evaluation details provided specifically linked to the commitment / different parts of the commitment? <b>Clarity</b> Are the evaluation details provided clearly set out? <b>Focus</b> Is only relevant information included?
10. Other comments related to monitoring the commitment. This section is to be used to add any other information which can be useful in terms of understanding issues relating to the monitoring of your commitment, such as any major obstacles that have been encountered, sources of data used, etc. If the basic details of the commitment have been changed, this field is to be used to explain why and how they were changed (max. 300 words):	Maximum score: 5 This section is not mandatory and should be used only when extra information is required to make the commitment fully understandable, as is explained in the right-hand column. <b>Focus</b> Is only relevant information included?
11. Dissemination ('How were the results of the commitment disseminated?') (max. 250 words; mandatory only for final report):*	Maximum score: 5 This section is mandatory for final monitoring reports only. However, RAND Europe will provide scores for final reports and indicative scores for intermediate reports to inform Forum members of how this section could be improved if applicable. <b>Specificity</b> What resources were used for dissemination? How and when has/will dissemination of the results occur? Who is dissemination aimed at and how many people/organisations does it expect to reach / has it reached? <b>Focus</b> Is only relevant information included? Is enough contextual information included to enable the reader of the commitment to judge/gauge the scale of dissemination?
12. References to further information relating to the monitoring of the commitment:	Not scored

### 3.4 **Communicating the results of the quality assessment to Forum members**

As mentioned previously, Forum members received their scores along with detailed feedback after the plenary Forum meeting on 12 November 2009. Table 3.2 below shows how the scores and feedback were presented to members of the Forum. We used a Radar graph to present the scores for each section and to make it easier for members to see where substantial improvements could be made to their monitoring reports and where they had done well.

**Table 3.2 Summary table of scores**


Section	Criteria	Scores	Comments
<i>Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.</i>			
Description of the implementation of the commitment *	<p><u>Specificity</u> Are key dates and milestones in the implementation of the commitment set out clearly? Is an overview of the resources involved in the implementation of the commitment given? Are details given of who is involved and/or responsible for the implementation of the commitment? Who is the commitment directed to?</p> <p><u>Focus</u> Is only relevant information included in the description? Is enough contextual information included to make the implementation of the commitment understandable?</p>		
Objectives: In what way and to which extent have the objectives set out in the original commitment form been achieved in the reporting period? *	<p><u>Specificity</u> How and when have the objectives been achieved?</p> <p><u>Clarity</u> How clearly are the objectives set out?</p> <p><u>Focus</u> Is only relevant information included in the description of objectives? Is enough contextual information included to make the objectives of the commitment understandable?</p> <p><u>Measurement</u> Are some quantitative data included on the implementation of the commitment (e.g. how many people have been reached, how many events have been organised)?</p>		
Relevance (i.e. How did the commitment during the reporting period contribute to achieving the overall aims of the Forum?) *	<p>RAND Europe will not comment on the relevance of the commitments to the aims of the Forum but on whether the link between the commitments and the aims of the Forum is set out clearly.</p> <p><u>Clarity</u> Does this section specify which aim/aims of the Forum the commitment relates to? Is it clear how commitment holders believe that their commitment is linked to the aim of the Forum?</p> <p><u>Focus</u> Is only relevant information included in the description of objectives?</p>		
Input indicators (resources allocated to the commitment) *	<p><u>Clarity</u> Are resources allocated to the commitment clearly set out?</p> <p><u>Focus</u> Is only relevant information included?</p>		
Output indicators (measure from a quantitative point of view the results created through the use of inputs) *	<p><u>Clarity</u> Are output indicators clearly set out?</p> <p><u>Focus</u> Is only relevant information included?</p>		
Outcome and impact indicators (How	<p><u>Clarity</u> Are outcome and impact indicators clearly</p>		



<p>successful has the commitment been during the reporting period in relation to the original objectives?) *</p>	<p>set out? <u>Focus</u> Is only relevant information included?</p>		
<p>Evaluation details (tools and methods used, internal or external evaluators, etc.) *</p>	<p>This section is mandatory for final monitoring reports only. However, RAND Europe will provide scores for final reports and indicative scores for intermediate reports to inform Forum members of how this section could be improved if applicable. <u>Specificity</u> Are the evaluation details provided specifically linked to the commitment / different parts of the commitment? <u>Clarity</u> Are the evaluation details provided clearly set out? <u>Focus</u> Is only relevant information included?</p>		
<p>Other comments related to monitoring the commitments (this section is to be used to add any other information which may be useful in terms of understanding issues relating to the monitoring of your commitment, such as any major obstacles that have been encountered, sources of data used, etc.; if the basic details of the commitments have been changed, this field is to be used to explain why and how they were changed).</p>	<p><u>Focus</u> Is only relevant information included?</p>		
<p>Dissemination (How were the results of the commitment disseminated?) (max. 250 words; mandatory for final report only):*</p>	<p>This section is mandatory for final monitoring reports only. However, RAND Europe will provide scores for final reports and indicative scores for intermediate reports to inform Forum members of how this section could be improved if applicable. <u>Specificity</u> What resources were used for dissemination? How and when has/will dissemination of the results occur? Who is dissemination aimed at and how many people/organisations does it expect to reach / has it reached? <u>Focus</u> Is only relevant information included? Is enough contextual information included to enable the reader of the commitment to judge/gauge the scale of dissemination?</p>		

**Table 3.3 Example of scores given for each section of a monitoring report**

Description of implementation	Objectives	Relevance	Input indicators	Output indicators	Outcome and impact indicators	Evaluation details	Other comments	Dissemination
3	4	4	2	5	1	4	2	4



SOURCE: RAND Europe, 2009

**Figure 3.1 Example of scoring representation with Radar graph**

**3.4.1 Caveats and limitations**

As the introduction explained, RAND Europe’s quality assessment of the information provided in monitoring reports did not judge the value or relevance of the commitment itself to the aims of the Forum; the scores are awarded on the basis of the clarity, focus, specificity and measurement of the information presented in the report. A commitment that is of great relevance to the aims of the Forum and designed to have an important impact on reducing alcohol harm could receive a low score if the information provided in the report lacks focus, is marred with irrelevant information (such as promotional material, etc.), does not contain indicators for measuring progress and does not set out clearly what the commitment aims to achieve and how. Likewise, a commitment which could be deemed to impact on only a very limited set of people could receive a high score if the

information provided in the report was clear and focused, and contained indicators to measure progress during the life of the commitment.

While we acknowledge that awarding scores to these reports entails a subjective component, we are confident that by having two researchers score the reports and by testing out their internal consistency we addressed the threat of subjectivity to the highest possible level. In addition, we trust that the criteria and scoring process we have put in place are as clear as possible to Forum members and will enable them to make improvements to the monitoring of their commitments for the benefit of the Forum's aims. The next chapter provides an overview of the scores awarded as well as details of strengths and weaknesses, and also recommendations for monitoring improvements in the next rounds of monitoring report submission.

#### 4.1 Introduction: Applying the scoring system

This chapter gives an overview of how Forum members have handled the monitoring of their commitments through their monitoring reports and gives the median scores awarded for each section. It also provides a description of the common strengths, weaknesses and problems encountered by Forum members, as well as recommendations for improving the monitoring information presented in these reports in future submissions.

The monitoring reports for the 91 commitments included in this quality assessment were examined and given scores of from 0 to 5 as well as detailed feedback by sections, based on the four criteria mentioned in Chapter 3, namely: specificity, clarity, focus and measurement. Individual scores along with comments for each section were distributed to Forum members after the plenary meeting of the Forum on 12 November 2009. Forum members were also given the opportunity to request further detail about their scores by 25 November 2009. A total of four members requested additional information or explanations, to which RAND Europe researchers responded by 10 December 2009.

Table 4.1 below offers a guide to the meaning of each score awarded. It is important to note that it was decided that in cases where a commitment holder failed to fill in a mandatory section of the report, a score of 0 was allocated; whereas in cases where a commitment holder did not fill in a non-mandatory section of the monitoring form<sup>21</sup>, the section was rated as ‘not applicable’<sup>22</sup>. All of the median scores given in this chapter have been calculated using scores of 1 to 5 only<sup>23</sup>.

---

<sup>21</sup> *Non-mandatory* sections are the ‘Evaluation details’, ‘Other comments’ and ‘Dissemination’ sections, as specified in Table 3.1.

<sup>22</sup> A total of 8 scores of 0 were received across all the sections of the monitoring reports (1% of all sections’ scores) and a total of 113 non-mandatory sections received a ‘Not applicable’ rating (41% of all non-mandatory sections received a ‘Not applicable’ rating).

<sup>23</sup> This explains why the total number of monitoring reports is different from one section to another in the tables throughout this chapter.

**Table 4.1 Meaning of scores awarded**

Score	Meaning
5	Excellent
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Poor
1	Very poor
0 or N/A	No response

## 4.2 Overall results

Each section in the monitoring report asked the commitment holder to describe a different aspect of their commitment. In order to provide an overview of the quality of the monitoring, this chapter provides a breakdown of scores by status of the report, type of Forum member and primary priority area as well as by section of the monitoring report. For each section of the report that we assessed, the median score was calculated.

### 4.2.1 Scores by section of the monitoring reports

The most common median score among all the sections was 3. Often monitoring reports provided some general information, but neglected to give enough detail to enable a full understanding of the commitment; those reports typically lacked clarity, focus, specificity and/or measurement. As evidenced in Table 4.2, 'relevance' was the section where the lowest scores were awarded, with a median score of 2. This low score reflected a common failure to name and describe clearly the link between the Forum priorities and the commitment activities. On the other hand, the highest quality monitoring information tended to be given for the 'description' section of the monitoring report.

**Table 4.2 Median score by section of the monitoring report**

Section	Median score
1. Description of commitment	3
2. Objectives	3
3. Relevance	2
4. Input indicators	3
5. Output indicators	3
6. Outcome and impact indicators	3
7. Evaluation details	3
8. Other comments	4
9. Dissemination	3

### 4.2.2 Scores by status of reports

The median score for commitments was similar for those submitting either intermediate or final reports. As evidenced in Table 4.3, those with intermediate reports had a lower

median score than those monitoring final reports in this section, with a median score of 3 for final reports and 2 for intermediate reports. This difference was partially explained by the relative ease of considering impacts at a later stage in the commitment. However, though perhaps more difficult to consider at earlier stages in the commitment, intermediate reports could have been more explicit about planned impacts and how they intended to measure them.

It was not mandatory for Forum members submitting intermediate reports to fill in the sections on ‘evaluation details’ and ‘dissemination’; however, we scored and provided feedback to those who answered these sections; they did not score lower on these sections in the intermediate than the final reports. Rather, intermediate reports had higher scores for the ‘dissemination’ section than final reports did.

**Table 4.3 Median score by status of report**

Section	Median score for intermediate reports	Median score for final reports
1. Description of implementation	3	3
2. Objectives	3	3
3. Relevance	2	2
4. Input indicators	2	3
5. Output indicators	3	3
6. Outcome and impact Indicators	2	3
7. Evaluation details	3	3
8. Other comments	3.5	4
9. Dissemination	3	2

#### 4.2.3 Scores by type of commitment holder

Table 4.4 below provides an overview of the scores awarded by type of member. As previously mentioned, we categorised members using DG SANCO’s Summary Report<sup>24</sup> as a starting point in order to group members into broader categories. Marketing and media organisations most often provided transparent and accountable monitoring information in the ‘description’, ‘objectives’, ‘evaluation’ and ‘dissemination’ sections. However, there was inconsistency in their monitoring reports. Often the reports lacked equivalent levels of specificity, clarity, focus and/or measurement in communicating outcomes and impacts.

Those classified as ‘research institutes and other’ seemed to have the most difficulty in providing high quality monitoring (Table 4.4). Though some of these monitoring reports provided clear, specific and focused information, the quality of monitoring was inconsistent between sections of the monitoring report.

It is difficult to ascertain underlying reasons for these trends. The trends were complicated by the variance in the number of monitoring reports submitted by each type of

<sup>24</sup> Commitments made by members of the European Alcohol and Health Forum – Summary Report (April 2009).

[http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/Forum/docs/report\\_commitments\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/Forum/docs/report_commitments_en.pdf)

commitment holder. Production and sales organisations provided notably more commitments than the other categories. Commitment holders in this category submitted 63 commitments, compared to 4 by marketing and media organisations, 17 by NGOs and health professionals, and 7 by research institutes and other organisations. Because of the varied number of monitoring reports submitted by type of commitment holder, caution is needed when analysing trends in scores awarded by type of member.

**Table 4.4 Median scores by type of commitment holder and by section of the monitoring report**

Type of commitment holder	Total commitments	Description	Objectives	Relevance	Input	Output	Outcome & Impact	Evaluation	Other Comments	Dissemination
Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship	4	4	4	3	2.5	3	2.5	4	5	4.5
Production and sales	63	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2
NGOs and health professionals	17	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	3
Research institutes and other	7	3	3	2	2	2	1	3	n/a	3

#### 4.2.4 Scores by priority area

Table 4.5 below shows the median scores awarded to each section of the monitoring report by priority area. As with the table above, caution is needed when analysing trends because of the varied number of monitoring reports submitted under each priority area. For example, median scores for priority 7 are based on 3 monitoring reports, compared with median scores for priority 1 which are based on 25 reports. However, we can see that the median scores for the ‘objectives’ section were the same across all priority areas (median score of 3) and that monitoring reports submitted under priority 2 achieved substantially higher median scores of 3.5 for the ‘relevance’ section compared with a median score of 2 for all the other monitoring reports submitted under other priority areas. It is difficult to assess the reason for this difference in median score for the ‘relevance’ section, in particular because monitoring reports submitted under priority 2 related to a variety of activities – including campaigns, the opening of an alcohol-free café for young people and the building of networks amongst youth organisations. Therefore, it cannot be said that this difference in scores relates to the type of activities undertaken in that priority area. Thus higher scores could be obtained in this section of the monitoring report, regardless of the type of activities undertaken, simply by clearly stating how the objectives or activities of a given commitment related to particular priority areas of the Alcohol Forum.

**Table 4.5 Median scores for each section by priority area**

Priority area	Total commitments	Description	Objectives	Relevance	Input	Output	Outcome & Impact	Evaluation	Other comments	Dissemination
<b>Priority 1</b> Better cooperation/actions on responsible commercial communications and sales	25	3.5	3	2	2.5	3	3	3	5	2
<b>Priority 2</b> Develop efficient common approaches to provide adequate consumer information	8	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3
<b>Priority 3</b> Develop information and education programmes on the effect of harmful drinking	20	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	3
<b>Priority 4</b> Develop information and education programmes on responsible patterns of consumption	20	3	3	2	2.5	3	3	3	3	3
<b>Priority 5</b> Enforce age limits for selling and serving alcoholic beverages	7	3	3	2	2.5	3	3	3	3	3
<b>Priority 6</b> Develop a strategy aimed at curbing underage drinking	8	3	3	3.5	3	3.5	2.5	3	4	2
<b>Priority 7</b> Promote effective behavioural change among children and adolescents	3	3	3	2.5	2.5	4	3	3	4	2
Median scores across all priority areas	91	3	3	2	2.5	3	3	3	4	3


### 4.3 Description of results by report section

#### 4.3.1 Description of implementation

The first section of the monitoring reports that was scored was the ‘Description of implementation’ section. Clear, focused and specific monitoring in this section of the report required information on the progression of activities involved, including the resources used, the dates of activities (when possible), the scale of activities and their target audiences.

Figure 4.1 below shows the distribution of scores for this section. It shows that a relatively high number of monitoring reports were awarded scores of 3 and 4 for this section but that, nonetheless, 6 monitoring reports achieved a low score of 1.





SOURCE: RAND Europe, Scoring of monitoring commitments submitted by Forum members, 2009

**Figure 4.1 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘Description of implementation’**

Table 4.6 below shows the number and percentage of commitments that were awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for this section.

**Table 4.6 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for the ‘Description of implementation’ section**

Type	Score: Total monitoring reports scored	1		2		3		4		5	
		Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row
Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship	4	1	25%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%
Production and sales	63	4	6.1%	5	7.9%	30	45.5%	22	34.9%	2	3.4%
NGOs and health professionals	17	0	0.0%	6	35.3%	5	29.4%	4	23.5%	2	11.8%
Research institutes and other	7	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%

Lower scores awarded in this section were often linked to one of three challenges:

1. Failure to differentiate between the summary and the description. Specific information on the different activities often crept into the summary and as such less attention was given to the description. The commitment summary was not scored. Thus, information on the activities involved in the commitment should have been included in the description rather than the summary. Clarity in future


monitoring reporting required including the relevant detail on the different activities in the description section of the monitoring report.

2. Failure to provide sufficient detail on the activities. Often the monitoring reports did not provide information on what was involved in the different activities. For instance, they commonly did not identify who was involved in the activities – both as audiences and in implementation.
3. An inability to provide a general overview of activities. Commitment holders often did not provide an overall picture of the activities undertaken and those planned within the scope of the commitment.

#### 4.3.2 Objectives

This section of the monitoring reports required commitment holders to provide details of the ways and extent to which the objectives set out in their original commitment form had been achieved during the reporting period. This required the provision of a clear description of the commitment's objectives, including how these would be met, as well as providing evidence (qualitative or quantitative, or both) of the extent to which these had been achieved during the reporting period.

The majority of responses in this section gave some detail on the commitment's objectives and/or some description of the indicators for their achievement, but generally tended to neglect to include information on both the objectives and the indicators, compromising the clarity of the response. This lack of information was the reason why a substantial number of monitoring reports achieved low scores of 1 and 2 (28 reports), as evidenced in Figure 4.2 below.



SOURCE: RAND Europe, Scoring of monitoring commitments submitted by Forum members, 2009

**Figure 4.2 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for 'objectives'**

There were some differences observed in the quality of the information provided between monitoring reports, and these differences can largely be explained by the different types of

objectives and commitments made by Forum members. For instance, it was much simpler for a commitment whose objective was to set up a website to evidence the extent to which this had occurred in contrast to a more impact-oriented objective, such as a commitment aiming to reduce the prevalence of drinking and driving through a media campaign. In the latter, providing evidence that the objective was achieved involves providing some evidence that a change in people’s behaviour has occurred, and linking this change to the commitment. In cases where direct quantifiable evidence was difficult to obtain, more descriptive indicators of change could be used. For instance, a commitment holder could combine evidence on the reach of the campaign with qualitative data on how people have reacted to the campaign to provide evidence of the campaign’s possible contribution to achieving an objective to reducing drinking and driving.

As Table 4.7 below shows, there were no stark differences in scores awarded by type of commitment holders for this section.


**Table 4.7 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for the ‘objectives’ section**

Type	Score: Total monitoring reports scored	1		2		3		4		5	
		Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row
Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship	4	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%
Production and sales	62	2	3.2%	17	27.4%	32	51.6%	10	16.1%	1	1.6%
NGOs and health professionals	17	1	5.9%	4	23.5%	9	52.9%	1	5.9%	2	11.8%
Research institutes and other	7	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%

**4.3.3 Relevance**

This section of the monitoring reports required commitment holders to provide details of how the commitment contributed to achieving the overall aims of the Forum during the reporting period.

As shown in Figure 4.3 below, a majority of commitment holders (60%) received low scores of 1 or 2 in this section. This was largely because although commitments were created within the framework of the Forum priorities, commitment holders often omitted to provide evidence of this link in this section.



SOURCE: RAND Europe, Scoring of monitoring commitments submitted by Forum members, 2009

**Figure 4.3 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for 'relevance'**

As shown in Table 4.8 below, 18 monitoring reports submitted by 'marketing and media organisations', 'production and sales organisations' or 'NGOs and health professionals' clearly stated and described the relevance of the commitment to the Forum priorities, as evidenced by the fact that they achieved scores of 4 or 5 for this section. However, more commonly among these types of commitment holders, the quality of monitoring was dispersed across the scale, from 1 to 5. Members belonging to 'research institutes and other organisations' provided the least comprehensive evidence of the relevance of their commitments; none in this category achieved a score of 3 or more.

**Table 4.8 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for relevance**


Type	Total monitoring reports scored	Score: 1		2		3		4		5	
		Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row
Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship	4	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%
Production and sales	62	13	21.0%	28	45.2%	8	12.9%	10	16.1%	3	4.8%
NGOs and health professionals	17	2	11.8%	4	23.5%	6	35.3%	3	17.6%	2	11.8%
Research institutes and other	7	1	14.3%	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Commitment holders often failed to state the priority areas they intended to address. It was therefore difficult to determine the relevance of the commitment. Instead, less relevant information was often provided, such as the commitment’s importance to greater social issues or to an umbrella organisation’s objectives. As a result, descriptions often did not describe a logical link between the priority area and the commitment’s objectives and activities.

**4.3.4 Input indicators**

This section of the monitoring reports required commitment holders to provide details of the resources they allocated in order to achieve their commitment.

As shown in Figure 4.4 below, a large number of monitoring reports were awarded a score of 2 on this section (34 reports) and over 50% of monitoring reports submitted achieved a score of adequate, good or excellent (3, 4 or 5).



SOURCE: RAND Europe, Scoring of monitoring commitments submitted by Forum members, 2009

**Figure 4.4 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘input indicators’**

As shown in Table 4.9 below, research institutes and other organisations were on average the least comprehensive about inputs in their monitoring reports (85.7% received a low score of 2) compared to other types of commitment holders. However, they were not alone in poorly monitoring inputs, as shown by the proportion of reports submitted by advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship organisations (50%). The lowest scores were found among those classified as production and sales organisations and the NGOs and health professionals, with 11.1% and 17.6% respectively receiving a score of 1. Nonetheless, some commitment holders also provided responses of good quality to this section, as shown by the fact that 25% of advertising, marketing and media organisations and 27% of production and sales organisations received a score of 4.

**Table 4.9 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for input indicators**

Type	Score: Total commitments scored	1		2		3		4		5	
		Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row
Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship	4	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
Production and sales	63	7	11.1%	20	31.7%	18	28.6%	17	27.0%	1	1.6%
NGOs and health professionals	17	3	17.6%	6	35.3%	5	29.4%	2	11.8%	1	5.9%
Research institutes and other	7	0	0.0%	6	85.7%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

The low scores in this section were due to two main factors:


1. a lack of detail about inputs, including reference to only one type of input; and/or
2. failure to convey the diversity of resources used.

On the other hand, higher scores were achieved by not only naming inputs – such as labour, skills, financial, and other – but also conveying the scale of inputs and which partners contributed to the commitment and how.

#### 4.3.5 Output indicators

This section of the monitoring reports required commitment holders to provide details of the resources produced by the implementation of their commitments.

As shown in Figure 4.5 below, there was a significant deviation in the quality of monitoring outputs in the monitoring reports scored. However, in comparison to the other sections, a significantly higher proportion of monitoring reports provided high quality monitoring and achieved a score of 5 in this section; 13.3% (12) of the monitoring reports achieved a score of 5.



SOURCE: RAND Europe, Scoring of monitoring commitments submitted by Forum members, 2009

**Figure 4.5 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘output indicators’**

Despite evidence of high quality monitoring, lower scores of 2 and 3 were also common. These lower scores resulted from a combination of the following factors:

1. too much brevity in describing outputs;
2. inclusion of irrelevant information;
3. failure to link output indicators with the previously described activities and inputs;
4. some confusion or misunderstanding of what should be counted as an output (e.g. some commitment holders included information about the target audience’s response to the commitment or the resources used in this section rather than where appropriate in the form; often, this extra information caused some confusion about outputs as it was frequently accompanied by insufficient information in the other areas, resulting in lower scoring across sections).

As shown in Table 4.10 below, there was some inconsistency in the scores awarded to this section across all types of commitment holders. The inconsistency in the quality of the information provided suggests that high scores for this section were possible across all types of commitment holders.

**Table 4.10 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for output indicators**


Type	Total monitoring reports scored	Score: 1		2		3		4		5	
		Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row
Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship	4	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%

Production and sales	62	3	4.8%	16	25.8%	17	27.4%	16	25.8%	10	16.1%
NGOs and health professionals	17	2	11.8%	2	11.8%	7	41.2%	5	29.4%	1	5.9%
Research institutes and other	7	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%

**4.3.6 Outcome and impact indicators**

This section of the monitoring reports required commitment holders to describe how successful their commitments had been in relation to the objectives they had set out in their original commitment forms during the reporting period. The template (see Appendix B), acknowledges that not all commitment holders will be able to provide this information by stating that ‘These indications go beyond the minimum agreed requirements to monitor a commitment, and it is expected that this type of evaluation will not be carried out by all commitments.’

Figure 4.6 below shows the spread of scores awarded for this section. It’s clear that a large number of reports achieved low scores of 1 (15 reports in total). In fact, this section had the second highest number of scores of 1 (very poor), after the ‘Relevance’ section.



SOURCE: RAND Europe, Scoring of monitoring commitments submitted by Forum members, 2009

**Figure 4.6: Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘outcome and impact indicators’**

Table 4.11 below shows the number and percentage of commitments being awarded each score by type of commitment holder. From this, we can see that commitment holders from the category of research institutes and other organisations had the most difficulty in describing outcomes and impacts; 75% of their commitments received a low score of 1.



**Table 4.11 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for outcome and impact indicators**

Type	Score: Total monitoring reports scored	1		2		3		4		5	
		Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row
Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship	4	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
Production and sales	57	10	17.5%	15	26.3%	19	33.3%	12	21.1%	1	1.8%
NGOs and health professionals	15	2	13.3%	3	20.0%	7	46.7%	3	20.0%	0	0.0%
Research institutes and other	7	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Overall, the greatest challenge of this section for commitment holders appeared to be providing evidence of the impact of their commitment on their target audience by demonstrating changed perspectives, attitudes, beliefs or behaviour.

Generally, shortcomings in monitoring outcomes and impact fell into two categories:


1. confusion over the differences between outcomes and outputs; and
2. failure to describe measurable indicators.

This section is concerned with the target audience’s response to the commitment – how the commitment resulted in changed attitudes or behaviour with respect to alcohol harm. Indicators of these changes can be difficult to illustrate. For instance, the link between the commitment and the desired change in behaviour could be indirect or could result from a combination of different influences. A high score for monitoring in this section could be achieved by acknowledging this complexity. For instance, one commitment provided evidence of a change in attitude towards responsible drinking, and measured the extent to which the target audience stated they would be likely to change their behaviours, rather than directly measuring a change in behaviour – which would be very difficult to do robustly due to issues of external influences and attribution of impacts.

**4.3.7 Evaluation details**

This section of the monitoring reports required commitment holders to provide details of the tools and methods as well as any internal or external evaluators they used to assess the achievements of their commitments. This section was mandatory for final reports only.

Figure 4.7 below shows the spread of scores awarded for this section. Overall, this section included consistently transparent and straightforward monitoring. The majority of reports received a score of 3 or higher. However, there is room for improved monitoring about evaluation details among all types of commitment holders as only one monitoring report achieved a 5 out of 5 score for quality of monitoring of evaluation details.



SOURCE: RAND Europe, Scoring of monitoring commitments submitted by Forum members, 2009

**Figure 4.7 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for 'evaluation details'**

As shown in Table 4.12 below, while some reports from each type of commitment holder provided good (score 4) monitoring information about their evaluation details, 43% of members belonging to the NGOs and health professionals group did not provide enough clarity, specificity, focus and/or measurement and therefore received scores below 3 for this section (21.4% received a score of 1 and 2 respectively).

**Table 4.12 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for evaluation details**

Type	Score: Total monitoring reports scored	1		2		3		4		5	
		Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row
Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
Production and sales	51	2	3.9%	9	17.6%	30	58.8%	9	17.6%	1	2.0%
NGOs and health professionals	14	3	21.4%	3	21.4%	6	42.9%	2	14.3%	0	0.0%
Research institutes and other	6	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	4	66.7%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%


Lower scores for this section generally reflected inattention to detail. Often, answers were not clear about the tools used for evaluation, its focus, and details of those staff or external advisors included in the evaluation process. Without this information, it was difficult to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation process.

Monitoring efforts could increase transparency and accountability by providing more specific information about how the scope of the evaluation, its details and indicators are specific to the particular commitment and its objectives. Moving from a score of 3 to a score of 4 or 5 requires that commitment holders tailor the information they provide about evaluation to the commitment their monitoring report relates to, instead of only generally describing evaluation activities.

**4.3.8 Other comments**

This section of the monitoring report was provided for members to add any other relevant information that can be useful in fully understanding their commitment and the way in which they set out to implement it and monitor it. The template (see Appendix B) stipulated that this section should be used to explain any issues related to the monitoring of the commitment and that such additional information could relate to ‘any major obstacles that have been encountered, sources of data used, etc’, or that this section should be used to explain why and how any of the basic details of the commitments had been changed if applicable. A total of 70 monitoring reports did not contain a response to this section.

Figure 4.8 below shows the spread of scores awarded to the 21 monitoring reports that contained a response for this section. As is shown, no monitoring reports received a score of 1 and many received high scores of 4 or 5 (11 reports, which comprise 52% of the total, received these scores for this section). However, it was sometimes the case that information which would have fitted better into other sections of the report, such as the ‘evaluation details’ section, was included in this section, often resulting in weaker responses in both sections.



SOURCE: RAND Europe, Scoring of monitoring commitments submitted by Forum members, 2009

**Figure 4.8 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for ‘other comments’**

Overall, scores for this section differed on the basis of three main criteria:

1. the relevance of the information to the commitment;


2. the extent to which sufficient detail was provided to make the information understandable; and
3. the relevance of information to the other sections of the monitoring report.

#### 4.3.9 Dissemination

This section of the monitoring reports required commitment holders to provide details of the way in which the results of their commitment had been disseminated. This section was mandatory for final reports only.

Figure 4.9 below shows the spread of scores for the 66 monitoring reports that contained a response to this section. Overall, 45% of reports received a score of 2 for this section. The high number of 2s awarded for monitoring dissemination corresponded largely with a lack of focus on and detail about the means and targets for dissemination.

The distribution of scores between 2, 3 and 4 corresponds with the level of clear, focused and specific information provided. Typically, high scores were awarded to monitoring reports that provided sufficient information to reveal when, to whom and through what means dissemination had or would occur.



SOURCE: RAND Europe, Scoring of monitoring commitments submitted by Forum members, 2009

**Figure 4.9 Number of monitoring reports receiving each score for 'dissemination'**

As Table 4.13 shows, production and sales organisations stand out with 61% of their monitoring reports receiving a score of 2 in the section on dissemination. This score was often due to a lack of specific information. While dissemination activities were discussed in broad terms, links between the outlets for dissemination – such as conferences – and the commitment were not often made explicit. The information provided did not convey exactly what information was being disseminated and in what forms this occurred.

**Table 4.13 Number and percentage of commitments awarded each score, by type of commitment holder for dissemination**

Type	Score: Total monitoring reports scored	1		2		3		4		5	
		Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Number scored	% of row	Per cent	% of row	Per cent	% of row
Advertising, marketing, media and sponsorship	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Production and sales	46	2	4.3%	28	60.9%	5	10.9%	10	21.7%	1	2.2%
NGOs and health professionals	13	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	6	46.2%	5	38.5%	1	7.7%
Research institutes and other	4	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%

It is worth noting that misunderstandings occurred about what information was desired in the section. As phrased in the reporting template, the question was concerned with dissemination of the *results* of the commitment rather than dissemination to target audiences within the commitment. As multiple monitoring reports described dissemination of the commitment activities themselves (e.g. information disseminated about a new website or campaign) rather than dissemination of their results, we took this confusion into account when scoring and decided not to penalise those members who had misunderstood the question (given the sheer number of commitment holders who had been confused). However, this confusion was highlighted in the individual feedback we gave to Forum members, and any future scores awarded for this section will be based on the responses to the exact question on the dissemination of the results of the commitment.



### 5.1 **Key findings**

This Monitoring Progress Report has given an overview of the wide range of activities associated with the Alcohol and Health Forum. These activities have included, amongst other measures: initiatives to curb underage drinking, measures to inform industry and other stakeholders better about the importance of their using responsible commercial communications and sales practices, initiatives to inform policy-makers of the range of policy options available to them and measures to provide adequate consumer information by featuring logos and responsible drinking messages in adverts. This shows that a considerable amount of activity is being undertaken by the Forum, but care must be taken with any interpretations of the findings because the monitoring and communication of these activities by Forum members is sometimes incomplete or poorly articulated.

All of the activities and achievements referred to in this Monitoring Progress Report were provided by Forum members through the submission of their monitoring reports. Therefore it should be noted that the inclusion of information on these activities does not mean that the RAND Europe research team has independently verified such statements. Nor does it mean that the problem of attribution, namely whether the activities described were a direct result of the existence of the Forum or whether they would have happened otherwise, has been overcome. The problem of the counter-factual also remains as the issue of what activities and actions would have taken place without the existence of the Forum has not been addressed.

Despite these limitations, the Forum raises important and interesting questions around whether it is an effective alternative mechanism to policy and regulatory enforcement measures for pursuing public benefits through innovative actions of its committed members. At a later stage, it may be envisaged that an evaluation of Forum members' commitments would contribute to shedding some light on how far the Forum has achieved some of its aims and how successful it has been as an alternative mechanism for change and action on the issue of alcohol-related harm.

This Monitoring Progress Report has also charted progress towards developing a comprehensive and persuasive set of monitoring practices. It has analysed the information provided by Forum members on the implementation and monitoring of their commitments and provided some insights into how such monitoring could be improved, particularly in the areas of specificity, focus, clarity and measurement. These criteria were applied to the monitoring reports submitted by Forum members in an attempt to assess the quality of the information provided in the forms through a scoring mechanism. The

resulting scores represent an honest, transparent, fair and independent judgement of the quality of information provided in the monitoring reports. Nevertheless, the scores should be regarded as a structured judgement since an element of subjectivity is inevitable in such an exercise. Indeed, despite our best efforts at creating a robust scoring matrix and testing researchers' scoring on ten monitoring reports, this exercise is unavoidably subject to researchers' judgements in some respect. As mentioned previously, Forum members who submitted monitoring reports by March 2009 have received individual scores for each section of their monitoring reports as well as specific feedback on how to improve the information presented in these sections. The rationale for giving feedback is not only to provide a transparent explanation for the scores awarded but also to advance the monitoring of the Forum in achieving its aims. In fact, this enables Forum members to improve the communication of their activities and how these relate to the Forum.

## 5.2 Limitations of this quality assessment

Once more, it is important to reiterate that RAND Europe's quality assessment of the monitoring information provided in monitoring reports did not judge the value or relevance of the commitment themselves to the aims of the Forum. The scores were awarded solely on the clarity, focus, specificity and measurement of the information presented in the report. Hence, some monitoring reports which relate to 'smaller-scale' commitments such as the production of information on a website can score higher than monitoring reports which relate to 'bigger-scale' commitments such as the organisation of a campaign on the dangers of binge drinking if the information provided in the former is clear, relevant and contains some measurement indicators (quantitative if possible and/or qualitative where quantitative indicators are not feasible).

The aim of this assessment is to help produce transparent and clear monitoring information on the commitments undertaken by members of the Forum that can then be used as the very first step in a process of finding out whether the members' commitments have been successful in reducing alcohol-related harm, and whether the Forum as a voluntary mechanism of taking action can produce tangible results. The following section highlights the key recommendations that this quality assessment has produced to improve this monitoring process.


## 5.3 Key recommendations

The scores awarded show that there are significant variations in the quality of the reports submitted by Forum members and that some members appear to be struggling with the monitoring of their commitments (e.g. not being able to communicate clearly how they relate to the aims of the Forum or what they have produced in terms of outputs). The frequent scores of 3 reveal a common level of adequacy in responses and the potential for clear, high quality monitoring by incorporating feedback on clarity, specificity focus and measurement in future reports. It is hoped that this Monitoring Progress Report, along with the feedback and scores which have been disclosed to individual Forum members, will act as a catalyst to ensure an overall improvement in monitoring which is reflected in future reports on the quality of monitoring of the Forum.



On the basis of the scoring exercise and the analysis of scores, several recommendations may be made which could help to improve monitoring and thereby further meet the monitoring commitment in the Forum Charter:

1. Greater attention to relevant detail. Often monitoring reports lacked enough detail to allow external stakeholders to review progress and outcomes. Good practice in monitoring entails providing enough information to make the commitment’s progress and outcomes understandable to those not directly involved in the commitment.
2. Emphasising relevance. Monitoring reports consistently failed to describe and rationalise the link between the commitment and the Forum priority areas. To emphasise this relationship, Forum priority areas need to be explicitly referred to in the monitoring reports, and clarification needs to be made of the linkages between the commitment’s objectives and activities and the Forum. This could be facilitated by including a drop-down/option box in the current monitoring report template, in addition to requesting members to explain the link between their commitment and the priority of the Forum it relates to.
3. Consideration of all aspects of the commitment. Finally, reporting could be substantially strengthened by more clarity in differentiating between objectives, inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts. Figure 5.1 below illustrates what a logic model of the steps involved in a commitment should look like. A logic model is a visual way of understanding the relationships between the resources of a commitment (‘inputs’), the activities pursued to realise certain objectives, the direct results (‘outputs’) and the broader changes (‘outcomes’ and ‘impacts’). Different sections of the monitoring report ask about different steps in the logic model. Good monitoring involves differentiating between the steps in the process and describing each step in its respective section of the monitoring report.



SOURCE: RAND Europe, 2009

**Figure 5.1 A logic model of the elements of a commitment**

This report, as the first Monitoring Progress Report on the commitments made by members of the European Alcohol and Health Forum, provides a benchmark for assessing the quality of future monitoring reports submitted to the Forum. These recommendations are derived from patterns seen in the monitoring and serve as a basis for encouraging more transparent and accountable monitoring of commitments in future reports.

## 5.4 Outlook

This report on the quality of the monitoring activities of Forum members reveals a high level of participation among members in monitoring their activities; monitoring reports were submitted for 91 out of 115 commitments this year. This evidence of participatory monitoring suggests the potential for an engaged, active Forum to continue. As well, by considering the recommendations made for better monitoring in this report as well as the individual feedback provided on commitment holders' monitoring reports, members of the Forum can further increase the level of accountability and transparency in their monitoring reports, thereby also providing space to build trust among stakeholders, and to encourage and duplicate good practices.

The European Alcohol and Health Forum represents the first multi-stakeholder platform at the EU level to discuss voluntary actions towards reducing alcohol-related harm. Not only does this Forum commit to providing an opportunity for different stakeholders to take a common approach to addressing alcohol-related harm, but it also aims to create an open, transparent arena for stakeholders to build trust and accountability and encourage dialogue. Thus, at a later stage, it can be envisaged that an evaluation of the commitments made by members of the Forum would be carried out to gauge their success and lessons learnt with regard to reducing alcohol harm.

## REFERENCES

---



## Reference list

---

- Directorate-General for Health and Consumers (2009), Commitments made by members of the European Alcohol and Health Forum – Summary Report. Online, available: [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/Forum/docs/report\\_commitments\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/Forum/docs/report_commitments_en.pdf) (last accessed October 2009)
- Directorate-General for Health and Consumers (2009), First Progress Report on the implementation of the EU alcohol strategy. Online, available: [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol\\_progress.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol_progress.pdf) (last accessed October 2009)
- Hallsworth, M, J Krapels and T Ling (2008), The EU Platform on Diet, Physical Activity and Health – Third Monitoring Progress Report. Online, available: [http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical\\_reports/TR609/](http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR609/) (last accessed October 2009)
- The European Commission (2007), Charter establishing the European Alcohol and Health Forum, 7 June 2007. Online, available: [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/documents/Alcohol\\_charter2007.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/documents/Alcohol_charter2007.pdf) (last accessed October 2009)
- The European Commission (2006), Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions – an EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm. Online, available: [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol\\_com\\_625\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/documents/alcohol_com_625_en.pdf) (last accessed October 2009)
- The European Commission (2008), First Announcement: Open Alcohol Forum – Brussels, Thursday 17 April 2008. Online, available: [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/alcohol/Forum/docs/openforum\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/alcohol/Forum/docs/openforum_en.pdf) (last accessed October 2009)



# APPENDICES

---





## Appendix A: List of all monitoring reports submitted by Forum members in 2009

---

Monitoring report number	Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report
1197048401839-442	A new alcohol action Ireland website	Alcohol Action Ireland (AAI)	Final
1214859773909-618	Youth empowerment for a better life!	Alcohol Policy Youth Network (APYN)	Final
1216060889036-636	Social norms forum	Anheuser-Busch InBev	Final
1196702688886-306	Attitudes to alcohol programme	Diageo Plc	Final
1216159858763-712	Choices Germany	Diageo Plc	Final
1229613770777-890	Compendium of regulations, self-regulatory standards and industry codes of conduct on audiovisual advertising of alcoholic beverages	Egta, Association of Television and Radio Sales Houses	Final
1228146625529-830	Alcohol Policy Youth Network (APYN)	Eurocare	Final
1228216531080-846	New Eurocare website	Eurocare	Final
12161418001149-642	Training guides for responsible service of alcohol	European Forum for Responsible Drinking	Final
1228144732390-824	Resource tool on alcohol addiction and homelessness	FEANTSA (European Federation of National Organisations Working with People who are Homeless)	Final
1196777155682-408	Help educate and remind consumers about the consequences of not drinking responsibly	Heineken International	Final
1228130395499-818	Training on internal code on commercial communication	Heineken International	Final

Monitoring report number	Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report
1228301985360-860	Promotion of responsible consumption towards French general practitioners (GPs)	Moët Hennessy	Final
120350419465-572	Placement of a responsible drinking message on all of Pernod Ricard's advertising in the EU-27 countries	Pernod Ricard S.A.	Final
1203504835220-574	The placement of the French pregnancy logo on the back label of all Pernod Ricard's wine and spirit brands in the EU-27 countries	Pernod Ricard S.A.	Final
1213352041248-616	Campaign on responsible alcohol consumption	SAB Miller (subsidiary: Dreher Breweries)	Final
1215864772016-626	Enhanced staff training on compliance to SABMiller's code of commercial communication	SABMiller	Final
1216143884015-654	<i>Un dedo de espuma, dos dedos de frent</i> (An inch of foam, two miles of mind / A thick head on your beer but not on your shoulders)	The Brewers of Europe	Final
1196698216859-190	AssoBirra – 'If you're expecting a child, alcohol can wait'	The Brewers of Europe	Final
1196695179200-140	Brewers of Romania Association – self-regulation / independent jury	The Brewers of Europe	Final
1228127517364-796	Brewers of Sweden – enhancing public awareness of the self-regulation system	The Brewers of Europe	Final
1196691370225-52	Finnish Federation of the Brewing Industry – 'Drunk, you're a fool!' education campaign	The Brewers of Europe	Final
1196711802738-338	<i>La carretera te pide</i> SIN	The Brewers of Europe	Final
1228128547627-804	Polish Brewers – self-regulation (part 4) – increase the coverage of the commercial communications code	The Brewers of Europe	Final
1228129328818-810	Polish Brewers – self-regulation (part 2) – introduction of impartial judgements within the system	The Brewers of Europe	Final
1216145752291-684	Polish Brewers – underage drinking	The Brewers of Europe	Final
1196698643506-264	Portuguese Brewers (APCV) – self-regulation beer code for commercial communication	The Brewers of Europe	Final

Monitoring report number	Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report
1216141124022-638	The Danish Brewers' Association – <i>Er du klar til at kore?</i> (Are you ready to drive?)	The Brewers of Europe	Final
1228227306321-854	The Danish Brewers' Association – self-regulation of commercial communication	The Brewers of Europe	Final
1203936976825-588	Union of Brewers in Bulgaria (UBB) improved compliance mechanism for self-regulation	The Brewers of Europe	Final
1228212969085-840	Self-regulation survey amongst sponsorship rights holders	The European Sponsorship Association	Final
1215161243841-622	To share with Forum members the impact and learning gained from delivering Scotland's first-ever Alcohol Awareness Week	The Scotch Whisky Association	Final
1228226937284-850	Strengthening advertising self-regulatory effectiveness	Advertising Information Group (AIG; representing ZAW and WKO)	Intermediate
1216154861853-708	Employee responsible drinking program	Anheuser-Busch InBev	Intermediate
1216154882875-710	Improving compliance with code of commercial communications	Anheuser-Busch InBev	Intermediate
1196770132284-388	Bacardi Limited marketing principles	Bacardi-Martini B.V.	Intermediate
1228310552345-872	Bacardi-Martini Limited consumer information website	Bacardi-Martini B.V.	Intermediate
1228301123926-856	International Bartender Association server training	Bacardi-Martini B.V.	Intermediate
1203610460993-584	Enforcement of age limits for selling and serving alcoholic drinks	British Beer and Pub Association	Intermediate
1203426211251-542	Reinforcing responsible drinking messages	British Retail Consortium	Intermediate
1201506750732-526	Best bar none	Brown-Forman	Intermediate
1201506713491-524	Corporate social responsibility code	Brown-Forman	Intermediate
1228227074666-852	Server training module	Brown-Forman	Intermediate
1228386816447-878	'Wine in moderation' – <i>Art de vivre</i> programme	CEEV (Comite Européen des Entreprises de Vins)	Intermediate
1228208154485-834	Support capacity and competence building	Deutsche Hauptstelle für Suchtfragen (DHS)	Intermediate

Monitoring report number	Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report
1212734516624-614	Fight against alcohol-related harm: the role of social insurers	ESIP (European Social Insurance Platform)	Intermediate
1228213572869-842	Alcohol-free café in Tallinn	Estonian Temperance Union	Intermediate
1228145491123-826	Awareness raising of foetal alcohol spectrum disorders (FASD)	Eurocare	Intermediate
1228214579818-844	Translation and dissemination of 'Alcohol in Europe' short report	Eurocare Italia	Intermediate
1216042634636-634	Raising awareness of retailers to carry out actions against abuse of alcohol	EuroCommerce	Intermediate
1228306431623-864	Educational contribution of editorial content	European Federation of Magazine Publishers (FAEP)	Intermediate
1216141988585-646	Programme to provide information to consumers in Europe	European Forum for Responsible Drinking	Intermediate
1216141920060-644	<a href="http://www.marketresponsibly.eu">www.marketresponsibly.eu</a>	European Forum for Responsible Drinking	Intermediate
1228211384102-838	To ascertain the education and practices of midwives in Member States on reducing alcohol-related harm preconception and during pregnancy	European Midwives Association	Intermediate
1203433846763-554	Building capacity for action on alcohol-related health policy	European Public Health Alliance (EPHA)	Intermediate
1203434684128-556	Dissemination of updated alcohol information to relevant stakeholders	European Public Health Alliance (EPHA)	Intermediate
1196694977669-138	Safe and sober	European Transport Safety Council (ETSC)	Intermediate
122812845206-802	Enforce age limits for serving and selling alcoholic beverages	Finnish Hospitality Association (FHA)	Intermediate
1228144364849-822	Evaluation of the Heineken rules on alcohol and work	Heineken International	Intermediate
1201877371999-534	Raising awareness of national associations / call for actions	HOTREC–hotels, restaurants and cafés in the European Union	Intermediate
1196693847270-98	ICAP Blue Book: practical guides for alcohol policy and targeted interventions	International Center for Alcohol Policies (ICAP)	Intermediate
1196696522731-152	ICAP periodic review of drinking and culture	International Center for Alcohol Policies	Intermediate

Monitoring report number	Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report
		(ICAP)	
1196695684694-146	The culture of extreme drinking	International Center for Alcohol Policies (ICAP)	Intermediate
1197825030274-462	Attitudes and behaviour of young people towards alcohol	IREB (Institut de Recherche Scientifique sur les Boissons)	Intermediate
1197371649461-450	Call for tenders 2008	IREB (Institut de Recherche Scientifique sur les Boissons)	Intermediate
1196415630102-12	Overview of European alcohol marketing regulations and overview of research on effects of alcohol marketing	National Foundation for Alcohol Prevention (STAP)	Intermediate
1232136241387-894	Statutory codes for alcohol advertising in Ireland	National Youth Council of Ireland	Intermediate
1218203595650-728	Building a network supporting evidence-based alcohol policies in the Baltic states	NordAN (the Nordic Alcohol and Drug Policy Network)	Intermediate
1228127899006-800	Promoting the understanding of alcohol-related harm and effective health strategies	Royal College of Physicians (RCP London) – member of the European Public Health Alliance	Intermediate
1215867169333-630	Contribute to consumer awareness of information service on blood alcohol content	SABMiller	Intermediate
1216026329291-632	Online dialogue: encouraging people to make informed choices about alcohol	SABMiller	Intermediate
1215865685036-628	Responsible drinking – SMS program	SABMiller	Intermediate
1207292888431-610	Actions for responsible service of alcohol	Swedish Hotel and Restaurant Association (SHR)	Intermediate
1228306022073-862	Promotion of alcohol abstinence among underage youth	The Absolut Company (V&S Group)	Intermediate
1217316912918-726	Becoming drink aware – the practical promotion of positive drinking behaviours	The Alcohol Beverage Federation of Ireland	Intermediate
1196692389398-60	Brewers of Romania – alcohol does not make you big: underage drinking campaign	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate
1216143966489-656	Commercial communications for beer: The Brewers of Europe's 7 operational standards	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate

Monitoring report number	Title of commitment	Owner of report	Status of report
1216148423958-690	Czech Beer and Malt Association – upgrade self-regulation system for beer commercial communications	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate
1203428726840-544	Dutch Brewers Association (CBK) – assurance on self-regulation report	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate
1228130695881-820	Dutch Brewers Organisation (CBK) – Information material on responsible drinking patterns	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate
1228311211775-874	Polish Brewers – drink driving in Poland beer industry program	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate
1228128976425-808	Polish Brewers – self-regulation (part 1) – Increase compliance with the commercial communication code	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate
1228311606999-876	Polish Brewers – self-regulation (part 3) – public awareness of complaints procedure within the system	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate
1228226898485-848	The Belgian Brewers – curbing underage drinking: 'Respect 16'	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate
1216144929885-682	The Brewers of Spain's self-regulation code: expanded self-regulation	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate
1216141269623-640	The Danish Brewers' Association – <i>Er du klar (Are you ready?)</i>	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate
1196688632636-46	The German Brewers Association – <i>Bier? Sorry. Erst ab 16</i>	The Brewers of Europe	Intermediate
1204018900194-596	Consumer awareness	The European Spirits Organisation (CEPS)	Intermediate
1228301522619-858	Independent evaluation	The European Spirits Organisation (CEPS)	Intermediate
1228130049267-814	Marketing self-regulation	The European Spirits Organisation (CEPS)	Intermediate
1215167754648-624	The Scotch Whisky Association (SWA) code of practice for the responsible marketing and promotion of Scotch whisky: audit of implementation and code development	The Scotch Whisky Association	Intermediate

## Appendix B: Monitoring report template

---

**(fields marked with an asterisk (\*)are mandatory)**

<b>Access code:*</b>
----------------------

<b><u>Commitment #:</u></b>	
<b><u>Title of the commitment:*</u></b>	
<b><u>Name of the Forum member organisation owning the commitment:*</u></b>	
<b><u>Is this a report for an ongoing commitment or a final report?:*</u></b>	
<b><u>What is the time period covered by this report (in the case of a final report, the reporting period is the life span of the commitment)?*</u></b>	

<b><u>Point of contact for the commitment (the person authorised by the organisation owning the commitment who can be contacted for information about the commitment):*</u></b>
---

<b><u>Commitment summary (based on summary given in original commitment form):*</u></b>
---

<b><u>Link to websites relating to the commitment:</u></b>
--

**Description of the implementation of the commitment (max. 500 words):\***

**Objectives (cf. sections 4–5 of the Monitoring Commitment in Annex II of the Forum Charter): in which way and to which extent have the objectives set out in the original commitment form been achieved in the reporting period? (max. 500 words):\***

**Relevance (i.e. how did the commitment during the reporting period contribute to achieving the overall aims of the Forum – cf. section 3 of the Monitoring Commitment in Annex II of the Forum Charter) (max. 250 words):\***

**Input indicators (resources allocated to the commitment ('What was done to put the objectives into practice?') – cf. section 5a of the Monitoring Commitment in Annex II of the Forum Charter) (max. 250 words):\***

**Output indicators (measure from a quantitative point of view the results created through the use of inputs ('What was achieved with the resources allocated to the commitment') – cf. section 5b of the Monitoring Commitment in Annex II of the Forum Charter) (max. 250 words):\***

**Outcome and impact indicators (How successful has the commitment been during the reporting period in relation to the original objectives – cf. section 6 of the Monitoring Commitment in Annex II of the Forum Charter. These indications go beyond the minimum agreed requirements to monitor a commitment, and it is expected that this type of evaluation will not be carried out for all commitments.) (max. 250 words)\* :**

Short term:



Medium term:
Long term:
Other:

**Evaluation details (tools and methods used, internal or external evaluators ...)(max. 250 words) (\*mandatory for final report only):\***

**Other comments related to monitoring the commitment (This section is to be used to add any other information which can be useful in terms of understanding issues relating to the monitoring of your commitment, such as any major obstacles that have been encountered, sources of data used, etc. If the basic details of the commitment have been changed, this field is to be used to explain why and how they were changed.) (max. 300 words):**

**Dissemination (How were the results of the commitment disseminated?) (max. 250 words) (\*mandatory for final report only):\***

**References to further information relating to the monitoring of the commitment:**