

ANNEX 1:

Progress Performance Measurement Framework

Data sources and collection methods

Progress Annual Performance Report monitors and reports on immediate outcomes, as well as outputs produced by Progress in the period of 2007-2008. As this is the first performance monitoring report of this kind, it serves as a piloting of the performance monitoring system, testing its data sources, collection and analysis strategies and means of reporting.

Information on **outputs** was collected using the primary sources of information. First, **standard reporting templates** for collection of information on outputs in different policy areas of Progress were prepared on the basis of Annual work plans for the years 2007 and 2008. In addition, a separate reporting template for key EU networks and NGOs was created. Then, sources of information on outputs were identified: these were either the Commission officials or beneficiaries/contractors. Finally, the identified persons were contacted with the request to fill in the templates. Thus, detailed information on outputs produced by Progress in the reference period was collected. Moreover, the missing or ambiguous information was double-checked during telephone interviews with the Commission officials and beneficiaries/contractors.

Information on **outcomes** was collected using both primary and secondary sources of information. Information collection methods included **qualitative desk research** and a **Progress annual survey**. The survey was conducted between December 2008 and January 2009. Questionnaires tailored for each of the five Progress policy areas were developed and sent to a list of pre-defined respondents. 1333 questionnaires were sent and 474 responses were received, which makes a 36% average return rate. The data was analyzed through SPSS system. The survey targeted EU and national level officials and other relevant key stakeholders (NGOs, social partners, civil society) involved in the programme implementation. A separate annual survey targeted EU-wide networks and served as an important source of information on the capacity of national and pan-European networks.

Among the key **primary sources** for the desk research, there was the Strategic Framework and General Guidelines for the Implementation of Community Action Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity Progress (2007-2013), which provided guidelines for monitoring and performance expectations, official websites of the Commission, other EU institutions, networks and NGOs, Commission staff working documents, communications from the Commission, proposals for Directives, Impact Assessment Reports, Eurobarometer surveys, etc.

Since data from primary sources was not always sufficient for assessing all performance measures, some **secondary sources** were used (i.e., data collected by other outside organizations, reports by independent experts), namely, peer reviews and assessments in social inclusion, by the Network of independent social inclusion experts, regulatory impact assessment and Impact Assessment Board findings. While analysing these document, going into too much detail was avoided, given that Progress will be subject to mid-term and final evaluations. Secondary sources have some limitations in that their conclusions are not always unequivocally accepted and, thus, they have to be treated with caution. Therefore, secondary sources were never treated as the only or the most important ones in this report.

One of the major challenges of Progress performance monitoring was to create links between outputs and immediate outcomes. This was done through the desk research, templates and interviews. In particular, reference lists, lists of contributors and responses to public consultations were scrutinized to identify specific outputs of Progress that contributed to the policy outcomes in Progress policy areas. Interviews with the Commission officials were very helpful in this respect.

Table 1 Data sources for performance measures

Performance measure	Data Sources
Immediate Outcome 1: Effective information sharing and learning	
1. Greater awareness of policy-and decision-makers, social partners, NGOs and networks regarding their rights/obligations in relation to Progress policy areas	Progress annual survey Official websites (on peer reviews, EU networks) Expert analysis and Recommendations
2. Greater awareness of policy-and decision-makers, social partners, NGOs and networks regarding EU objectives and policies in relation to Progress policy areas	Progress annual survey Official websites (on peer reviews, EU networks) Expert analysis and Recommendations
3. Satisfaction of clients with information	Progress annual survey
Immediate Outcome 2: Evidence-based EU policies and legislation	
1. EU policies are grounded in thorough analysis of situation and responsive to conditions, needs and expectations of Member States in Progress areas	Progress annual survey Impact Assessment Reports
2. Extent to which Progress-supported policy advice feed into the development and implementation of EU legislation and policies	Communications from the Commission, Commission staff working documents, proposals for Directives, Impact Assessment reports
Immediate Outcome 3: Better integration of cross-cutting issues and greater consistency in EU policies and legislation	
1. Cross-cutting issues are addressed in Progress policy sections	Annual Progress work plan Progress annual survey
2. EU policies and legislation in relation to Progress issues display a common underlying logic of intervention	Communications from the Commission, Commission staff working documents, proposals for Directives, Impact Assessment reports
3. Gender mainstreaming is systematically promoted in Progress	Communications from the Commission, Commission staff working documents, proposals for Directives, Impact Assessments
4. Share of funding devoted to support or undertake cross-cutting issues	Annual Progress work plans
Immediate Outcome 4: Greater capacity of national and pan-European networks	
1. Number of individuals served or reached by networks supported by Progress	Standard reporting templates for EU networks and NGOs
2. Extent to which advocacy skills of Progress-supported networks have improved	Progress annual survey Standard reporting templates for EU networks and NGOs
3. Satisfaction of EU and national authorities with contribution of networks	Progress annual survey Interviews
4. Extent to which Progress-supported networks take a cross-cutting approach	Communications from the Commission, Commission staff working documents, proposals for Directives, Impact Assessments, reports on public consultations launched by the Commission
Immediate Outcome 5: High-quality and participatory policy debate	
1. Extent to which principles of good governance are respected in policy debate	Progress annual survey Official websites (European Commission, EU networks and NGOs)
2. Extent to which the outcomes of policy debate feed into the development of EU law and policy	Communications from the Commission, Commission staff working documents, proposals for Directives, Impact Assessments, reports on public consultations launched by the Commission

ANNEX 2:

Technical notes on charts

This Annex includes a detailed explanation on calculations behind each chart included in the Progress Annual Report 2008, which present the results of the Progress Annual Survey 2008. The detailed information on the survey and its results is available in the Annex 3 of this report.

Chart 2: Share of respondents stating they are familiar with EU objectives and policies, by policy section

Indicator: Share of respondents stating they are familiar with EU objectives and policies

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, question “7. To what extent are you aware of the following aspects of the EU policies in the area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality: [multiple choice answers]?”

Definition: Respondents are said to be familiar with EU objectives and policies in their respective policy areas if they chose the answer “(3) I am sufficiently familiar”, “(4) I am very familiar” or “(5) I am an expert”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “(3) I am sufficiently familiar”, “(4) I am very familiar” and “(5) I am an expert”; Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the question.

Chart 3: Share of respondents stating they acquired relevant knowledge through the information sharing and learning activities, by policy section

Indicator: Share of respondents stating they acquired relevant knowledge through the information sharing and learning activities

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, questions “10. Would you say that in the events you participated: [multiple choice answers]?”, “12. With regard to the training/mutual learning activities on employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality you have been involved in, would you say that: [multiple choice answers]?”, “14. With regard to exchange of good practices and innovative approaches, would you say that: [multiple choice answers]?” and “16. In your opinion, to what extent the assessment and monitoring reports you are familiar with contributed to the development of the European policy in the area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality?”

Definition: Respondents are said to have acquired relevant knowledge through the information sharing and learning activities if they chose the answer “a) We acquired relevant knowledge, but we do not have plans to use it for policy making or policy advocacy”, “b) We acquired relevant knowledge and we intend to use it for policy making or policy advocacy” or “c) We acquired relevant knowledge and we have already used it for policy making or policy advocacy”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “a) We acquired relevant knowledge, but we do not have plans to use it for policy making or policy advocacy”, “b) We acquired relevant knowledge and we intend to use it for policy making or policy advocacy” and “c) We acquired relevant knowledge and we have already used it for policy making or policy advocacy”; Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the questions.

Chart 4: Share of respondents stating they acquired relevant knowledge through the information sharing and learning activities, by type of activity

Indicator: Share of respondents stating they acquired relevant knowledge through the information sharing and learning activities, by type of activity

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, questions “10. Would you say that in the events you participated: [multiple choice answers]?”, “12. With regard to the training/mutual learning activities on employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality you have been involved in, would you say that [multiple choice answers]?” “14. With regard to exchange of good practices and innovative approaches, would you say that [multiple choice answers]?” and “16. In your opinion, to what extent the assessment and monitoring reports you are familiar with contributed to the development of the European policy in the area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality?”

Definition: Respondents are said to have acquired relevant knowledge through the information sharing and learning activities if they chose the answer “a) We acquired relevant knowledge, but we do not have plans to use it for policy making or policy advocacy”, “b) We acquired relevant knowledge and we intend to use it for policy making or policy advocacy” or “c) We acquired relevant knowledge and we have already used it for policy making or policy advocacy”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “a) We acquired relevant knowledge, but we do not have plans to use it for policy making or policy advocacy”, “b) We acquired relevant knowledge and we intend to use it for policy making or policy advocacy” and “c) We acquired relevant knowledge and we have already used it for policy making or policy advocacy” (disaggregated by type of activity: information sharing and learning events, training/mutual learning activities, exchange of good practices and innovative approaches, assessment and monitoring reports); Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the questions (disaggregated by type of activity: information sharing and learning events, training/mutual learning activities, exchange of good practices and innovative approaches, assessment and monitoring reports).

Chart 5: Share of respondents stating they have already used or intend to use the acquired knowledge for policy making or policy advocacy, by policy section

Indicator: Share of respondents stating they have already used or intend to use the acquired knowledge for policy making or policy advocacy

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, questions “10. Would you say that in the events you participated: [multiple choice answers]?”, “12. With regard to the training/mutual learning activities on employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality you have been involved in, would you say that; [multiple choice answers]?”, “14. With regard to exchange of good practices and innovative approaches, would you say that: [multiple choice answers]?” and “16. In your opinion, to what extent the assessment and monitoring reports you are familiar with contributed to the development of the European policy in the area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality?”

Definition: Respondents are said to have used or intended to use the acquired knowledge for policy making or policy advocacy if they chose the answers “b) We acquired relevant knowledge and we intend to use it for policy making or policy advocacy” or “c) We acquired relevant knowledge and we have already used it for policy making or policy advocacy”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “b) We acquired relevant knowledge and we intend to use it for policy making or policy advocacy” and “c) We acquired relevant knowledge and we have already used it for policy making or policy advocacy”; Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the questions.

Chart 7: Share of respondents stating that the EU policy is grounded in thorough analysis of situation

Indicator: Share of respondents stating that the EU policy is grounded in thorough analysis of situation

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, question “17. How much would you agree with the following statements on the European policy in the area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality?”, a sub-question „a) European policy and legislation in the area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality is grounded in thorough analysis of situation”.

Definition: Respondents are said to be stating that the EU policy is grounded in thorough analysis of situation if they chose the answers “(4) Rather agree” or “(5) Strongly agree”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “(4) Rather agree” and “(5) Strongly agree”; Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the sub-question.

Chart 8: Share of respondents stating that the EU policy is responsive to conditions, needs and expectation in Member States

Indicator: Share of respondents stating that the EU policy is responsive to conditions, needs and expectation in Member States

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, question “17. How much would you agree with the following statements on the European policy in the area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working

conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality?”, a sub-question „b) European policy and legislation in the area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality is responsive to conditions, needs and expectations in Member States”.

Definition: Respondents are said to be stating that the EU policy is responsive to conditions, needs and expectation in Member States if they chose the answers “(4) Rather agree” or, “(5) Strongly agree”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “(4) Rather agree” and “(5) Strongly agree”; Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the sub-question.

Chart 9: Share of respondents stating that they use policy advice, research and analysis initiated by the European Commission

Indicator: Share of respondents stating that they use policy advice, research and analysis initiated by the European Commission

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, question “18. Are you aware of policy advice, research and analysis initiated by the European Commission in the policy area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality?”.

Definition: Respondents are said to be stating that they use policy advice, research and analysis initiated by the European Commission if they chose the answers “c) Yes, somewhat aware” or “d) Yes, very well aware”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “c) Yes, somewhat aware” and “d) Yes, very well aware”; Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the question.

Chart 10: Share of respondents stating that they are aware of policy advice, research and analysis initiated by the European Commission

Indicator: Share of respondents stating that they are aware of policy advice, research and analysis initiated by the European Commission

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, question “18. Are you aware of policy advice, research and analysis initiated by the European Commission in the policy area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality?”

Definition: Respondents are said to be aware of policy advice, research and analysis initiated by the European Commission if they chose the answers “c) Yes, somewhat aware” or “d) Yes, very well aware”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “c) Yes, somewhat aware” and “Yes, very well aware”; Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the question.

Chart 11: Share of respondents stating that Progress-funded policy advice, research and analysis of which they were aware, has ...

Indicator: Share of respondents stating that Progress-funded policy advice, research and analysis of which they were aware, has [statements]...

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, question “21. How would you assess the quality of this policy advice, research and analysis?”, statements “a) Addressed issues that are highly relevant”, “b) Used the concepts which accurately defined and reflected the nature of problems and challenges analysed”, “c) Accurately identified the conditions, needs, concerns and expectations in Member States”, “d) Proposed the best solutions and policy options in response to these conditions, needs, concerns and expectations” and “e) Identified and presented policy practices, which are innovative, transferable or demonstrating results”.

Definition: Respondents are said to agree with the statements if they chose the answers “(4) Rather agree” or “(5) Strongly agree”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “(4) Rather agree” or “(5) Strongly agree”; Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the question.

Chart 12: Share of respondents stating that Progress-funded policy advice, research and analysis, which they were aware of, had contributed (in their respective Progress policy area) to:

Indicator: Share of respondents stating that Progress-funded policy advice, research and analysis, which they were aware of, had contributed (in their respective Progress policy area) to [statements]...

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, question “22. In your opinion, to what extent the policy advice, research and analysis you are familiar with contributed to the development and implementation of the European policy and law in the policy area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality as regards the following aspects?”, aspects in the policy areas of employment and social protection and social inclusion: “a) Reaching the agreement of stakeholders on common concepts, objectives”, targets, indicators and policy solutions at EU level”, “b) Triggering/strengthening national policy debate on the basis of policies, practices and achievements in the Member States”, “c) Triggering new national policy initiatives on the basis of policies, practices and achievements in the Member States”, “d) Establishing/improving methodologies and indicators for policy evaluation at national level” and “e) Improving governance of the European policy”; aspects in the policy areas of working conditions, antidiscrimination and gender equality: “a) Adopting/amending the EU legislation”, “b) Adopting/amending national legal acts implementing the EU law”, “Reaching the agreement of stakeholders on common concepts, objectives”, targets, indicators and policy solutions at EU level”, “d) Triggering/strengthening national policy debate on the basis of policies, practices and achievements in the Member States”, “e) Triggering new national policy initiatives on the basis of policies, practices and achievements in the Member States”, “f) Establishing/improving methodologies and indicators for policy evaluation at national level” and “g) Improving governance of the European policy”.

Definition: Respondents are said to be stating that Progress-funded policy advice, research and analysis, which they were aware of, had contributed to the abovementioned aspects if they chose the answers “(2) They were rather useful” or “(3) They were very useful”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “(2) They were rather useful” and “(3) They were very useful” (disaggregated by aspects); Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the question (disaggregated by aspects).

Chart 13: Share of respondents stating that Progress-funded statistical indicators, tools and methods, which they were aware of, had contributed (in their respective Progress policy area) to:

Indicator: Share of respondents stating that Progress-funded statistical indicators, tools and methods, which they were aware of, had contributed (in their respective Progress policy area) to [statements]...

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, questions “24. In your opinion, to what extent the statistical indicators, tools and methods you are familiar with contributed to the development and implementation of the European policy in the area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality as regards the following aspects?”: “a) Reaching the agreement of stakeholders on common targets and indicators at EU level”, “b) Triggering/strengthening national policy debate”, “c) Triggering new national policy initiatives” and “d) Establishing/improving methodologies and indicators for policy evaluation at national level”.

Definition: Respondents are said to be stating that Progress-funded statistical indicators, tools and methods, which they were aware of, had contributed to the abovementioned aspects if they chose the answers “(2) They were rather useful” or “(3) They were very useful”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “(2) They were rather useful” and “(3) They were very useful” (disaggregated by aspect); Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the question (disaggregated by aspects).

Chart 15: Share of respondents stating that the principles of good governance had been followed in the policy debate at the European level, by policy section

Indicator: Share of respondents stating that the principles of good governance had been followed in the policy debate at the European level

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, question “4. Please, assess the extent to which the principles of good governance have been followed in the policy debate you have been involved at the European level”, sub-questions: “a) Clarity of the policy issues discussed”, “b) Involvement of all relevant EU and national policy- and decision-makers”, “c) Involvement of all relevant stakeholders (social partners, networks, NGOs, independent experts, etc.)”, “d) Adequacy of time given to prepare and plan participation” and “e) Dissemination of results of policy debate”.

Definition: Respondents are said to be stating that the principles of good governance had been followed in the policy debate at the European level if they chose the answers “(3) Sufficient”, “(4) Good” or “(5) Very good”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “(3) Sufficient”, “(4) Good” and “(5) Very good”; Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the question.

Chart 16: Share of respondents stating that the principles of good governance were respected in the Progress-funded events, by policy section

Indicator: Share of respondents stating that the principles of good governance were respected in the Progress-funded events

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, question “9. Please, assess the extent to which the principles of good governance were respected in the events you attended?”, sub-questions: “a) Clarity of the policy issues discussed”, “b) Involvement of all relevant EU and national policy- and decision-makers”, “c) Involvement of all relevant stakeholders (social partners, networks, NGOs, independent experts, etc.)”, “d) Adequacy of time given to prepare and plan participation” and “e) Dissemination of results of policy debate”.

Definition: Respondents are said to be stating that the principles of good governance had been followed in the policy debate at the European level if they chose the answers “(3) Sufficient”, “(4) Good” or “(5) Very good”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “(3) Sufficient”, “(4) Good” and “(5) Very good”; Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the question.

Chart 17: Share of respondents stating that involvement of all relevant stakeholders in the policy debate at European level was satisfactory and very satisfactory, by policy section

Indicator: Share of respondents stating that involvement of all relevant stakeholders in the policy debate at European level was good and very good

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, question “4. Please, assess the extent to which the principles of good governance have been followed in the policy debate you have been involved at the European level”, a sub-question “c) Involvement of all relevant stakeholders (social partners, networks, NGOs, independent experts, etc.)”.

Definition: Respondents are said to be stating that involvement of all relevant stakeholders in the policy debate at European level was good and very good if they chose the answers “(4) Good” or “(5) Very good”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “(4) Good” and “(5) Very good”; Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the sub-question.

Chart 19: Share of respondents stating that EU contribution to the integration of cross-cutting issues into their respective policy area is high, by policy section

Indicator: Share of respondents stating that EU contribution to the integration of cross-cutting issues into their respective policy area is high

Data Source: Progress Annual Survey 2008, question “25. To what extent EU has contributed to integration of these cross-cutting issues into the policy area of employment/social protection and social inclusion/working conditions/antidiscrimination/gender equality”, sub-questions: “a) Gender equality”, “b) Non-discrimination” and “c) Combat against poverty”.

Definition: Respondents are said to be stating that EU contribution to the integration of cross-cutting issues into their respective policy area is high if they chose the answers “(3) The contribution is rather high” or “(4) The contribution of the EU is very high”.

Formula: $X/Y * 100$ where: X= total number of respondents who answered “(3) The contribution is rather high” and “(4) The contribution of the EU is very high”; Y= total number of respondents giving valid answers to the question.

ANNEX 3: Detailed information on Progress Annual Survey 2008

Overview

The Progress Annual Survey was a web-based survey (i.e., data collection was done using Internet), which was conducted in December 2008 - January 2009. 1333 questionnaires have been sent to representatives of the five policy areas covered by Progress (Table 1). A total of 474 respondents returned a completed questionnaire. The overall average response rate amounted to 36%, which by the standards of social research is a good level of response. The data analysis was done using SPSS.

Table 1: Response rate by policy sections

Policy sections	Requests sent	Responses	Response rate
Employment	169	76	45%
Social protection and social inclusion	351	132	38%
Working conditions	174	53	30%
Anti-discrimination	409	129	32%
Gender equality	230	84	37%
Total	1333	474	36%

Table 2: Respondents by type of involvement

1. Are you ...	Frequency	Percent
a) Member of the European Parliament	0	0%
b) European Commission official	15	3%
c) Public official working at the Permanent Representation	5	1%
d) Employee at European social partners' organisation	7	1%
e) Employee/volunteer at a European-level network/NGO	45	9%
f) Member of the parliament (national or regional level)	10	2%
g) Public official working in one of the national, regional or local government institutions	244	51%
h) Employee/ volunteer at a national social partners' organisation (business association or trade union)	37	8%
i) National NGO representative (or employee)	78	16%
j) Researcher, university teacher, independent expert	33	7%
Total	474	100%

Table 3: Geographical profile of respondents (EU and Member State levels)

	Total respondents, of which	Public officials	Other partners and stakeholders (social partners, NGOs)
I. Member State level representatives			
Austria	16	9	7
Belgium	17	17	0
Bulgaria	22	12	10
Cyprus	35	16	19
Czech Republic	9	4	5
Denmark	6	2	4
Estonia	3	2	1
Finland	25	17	8
France	2	1	1

Germany	7	6	1
Greece	15	14	1
Hungary	7	7	0
Ireland	6	4	2
Italy	9	8	1
Latvia	16	10	6
Lithuania	22	11	11
Luxembourg	11	10	1
Malta	19	10	9
Netherlands	7	6	1
Poland	27	11	16
Portugal	6	5	1
Romania	11	9	2
Slovakia	16	9	7
Slovenia	19	11	8
Spain	34	26	8
Sweden	7	5	2
United Kingdom	9	5	4
Unspecified*	19	7	12
Sub-total:	402	254	148
II. EU-level representatives			
Sub-total:	72	20	52
Total	474	274	200

* Respondents which were impossible to attribute to a specific Member State.

Survey Data

The tables below present the key survey data by question of the questionnaire used for the Progress Annual Survey 2008.

Please note that there was a separate questionnaire for each of the five policy sections covered by Progress:

- Employment;
- Social protection and social inclusion;
- Working conditions (including management of change, labour law, health and safety at work)
- Anti-discrimination and diversity;
- Gender Equality.

All these below are referred to as [Progress policy sections].

1. Are you ... (N=474)	Frequency	Percent
a) Member of the European Parliament	0	
b) European Commission official	15	3,2
c) Public official working at the Permanent Representation	5	1,1
d) Employee at European social partners' organisation	7	1,5
e) Employee/ volunteer at a European-level network/ NGO	45	9,5
f) Member of the parliament (national or regional level)	10	2,1

g) Public official working in one of the national, regional or local government institutions	244	51,5
h) Employee/ volunteer at a national social partners' organisation (business association or trade union)	37	7,8
i) National NGO representative (or employee)	78	16,5
j) Researcher, university teacher, independent expert	33	7
k) Journalist	0	
l) Student	0	

2. How much have you been involved in the formulation and implementation of the national and EU policies aimed at improving [Progress policy section]? (N=474)	Frequency	Percent
a) I was a member of a committee, working group at the EU level	103	21,7
b) Was submitting proposals, aimed to provide suggestions for the improvement of the management of change and/ or the European working conditions and/ or health and safety at work policy, and/ or labour law	65	13,7
c) Took part in the national policy process on management of change, working conditions, labour law, health and safety at work (participated in drafting legislation, public consultation, implementation, etc.)	230	48,5
d) Not involved	102	21,5
e) I am not familiar with the EES; (N=208)	10	2,1

3. Did you take part in such policy debate in 2008? (N=472)	Frequency	Percent
a) Yes, at the European as well as at the national level	177	37,3
b) Yes, at the European level	49	10,3
c) Yes, at the national, regional, local or sectoral level	146	30,8
d) No	100	21,1

4. Please, assess the extent to which the principles of good governance have been followed in the policy debate you have been involved at the European level	(1) Very poor	(2) Poor	(3) Sufficient	(4) Good	(5) Very good	Do not know
a) Clarity of the policy issues discussed (N=224)	2	21	67	86	46	2
b) Involvement of all relevant EU and national policy- and decision-makers (N=225)	6	31	65	77	41	5
c) Involvement of all relevant stakeholders (social partners, networks, NGOs, independent experts, etc.) (N=223)	8	29	76	69	36	5
d) Adequacy of time given to prepare and plan participation (N=223)	6	44	90	59	16	8
e) Dissemination of results of policy debate (N=226)	5	60	77	59	21	4

f) Other (please, specify): (N=17)	1	3		2	1	10
---------------------------------------	---	---	--	---	---	----

5. To what extent the quality of the national/regional/local policy debate in the area of working conditions was influenced by initiatives coming from the European level? (N=374)	(1) No susceptible influence	(2) Limited influence	(3) Some influence	(4) Significant influence	(5) Crucial influence	Do not know
a) Clarity of the policy issues discussed	14	43	99	157	47	14
b) Involvement of all relevant stakeholders (social partners, networks, NGOs, independent experts, etc.)	10	52	124	121	56	11

6.1. To what extent the development of European law and policies in the [Progress policy section] was influenced by policy debate you have been involved in at the EU level? (e.g., this debate contributed to the adoption/ amendment of legislation or agreement on objectives, policy solutions, targets and indicators)? (N=374)	Frequency	Percent
a) No susceptible influence	21	4,4
b) Limited influence	57	12
c) Some influence	128	27
d) Significant influence	96	20,3
e) Crucial influence	20	4,2
f) Do not know	43	9,1

6.2. To what extent the development of European law and policies in the [Progress policy section] was influenced by policy debate you have been involved in at the national / regional / local level? (e.g. this debate contributed to the adoption/ amendment of legislation or agreement on objectives, policy solutions, targets and indicators)? (N=367)	Frequency	Percent
a) No susceptible influence	33	7
b) Limited influence	95	20
c) Some influence	118	24,9
d) Significant influence	74	15,6
e) Crucial influence	19	4
f) Do not know	28	5,9

7. To what extent are you aware of the following aspects of the EU policies in the [Progress policy section]	(1) I am not at all familiar with this aspect	(2) I am vaguely familiar	(3) I am sufficiently familiar	(4) I am very familiar	(5) I am an expert	Do not know
a) Key challenges and problems facing the European labour market (N=205)	3	27	80	80	14	1
b) Targets and indicators to measure them (N=204)	16	41	83	48	14	2
c) Solutions, policy options and best practices (N=203)	7	25	95	60	14	2

d) Governance process, your role in this process (N=204)	9	39	79	53	20	4
e) Other; (N=9)	1	1	4	2	1	
a) Legal protection against direct and indirect discrimination (N=129)	1	7	33	54	31	3
b) Guidance for victims of discrimination (N=129)	5	20	37	49	15	3
c) National Equality Bodies (N=129)	6	7	25	57	31	3
d) Diversity management (N=129)	9	20	38	41	15	6
e) Governance process, your role in this process (N=128)	13	13	32	39	21	10
f) Other; (N=9)			1		4	4
a)Management of change, anticipating and accompanying restructuring in order to develop employment (N=53)	5	19	19	5	3	2
b)Setting minimum requirements to improve working and employment conditions and strengthen workers' rights (labour law) (N=53)	2	6	18	18	8	1
c)Improving and simplifying existing legislation on working conditions and health and safety and enhancing its implementation in practice (N=53)	2	5	15	17	13	1
d)Fostering definition and implementation of national strategies on occupational health adjusted to the specific context of each Member State (N=52)	1	6	18	18	8	1
e)Promoting changes in behaviour, a general culture which values health, risk prevention and goes beyond the workplace and working population; (N=53)	2	6	16	22	6	1
f)Better identifying, assessing and confronting new and increasing risks to occupational health; (N=53)	1	9	17	18	7	1
g) Other; (N=8)		1	2	1	1	3
a) Equal economic independence of women and men (N=82)	1	8	18	38	16	1
b) Reconciliation of work, private and family life (N=82)	1	1	18	42	19	1

c) Equal participation of women and men in decision making (N=82)	1	3	19	37	21	1
d) Eliminating gender stereotypes in society (N=82)	2	1	19	38	21	1
e) Governance process, your role in this process (N=81)	5	15	20	29	12	1
f) Other; (N=9)	1		1	3	2	2

8. Did you take part in these events? (N=471)	Frequency	Percent
a) Yes, I participated in these events	236	49,8
b) No, I did not participate in these events	233	49,2

9. Please, assess the extent to which the principles of good governance were respected in the events you attended:	(1) Very poor	(2) Poor	(3) Sufficient	(4) Good	(5) Very good	Do not know
a) Clarity of the policy issues discussed (N=238)	2	18	67	100	48	3
b) Involvement of all relevant EU and national policy- and decision-makers (N=237)	3	26	70	79	56	3
c) Involvement of all relevant stakeholders (social partners, networks, NGOs, independent experts, etc.) (N=236)	2	27	67	81	57	2
d) Adequacy of time given to prepare and plan participation (N=237)	6	31	97	74	25	4
e) Dissemination of results of policy debate (N=236)	8	47	77	78	21	5
f) Other (please, specify): (N=13)	2		3		1	7

10. Would you say that in the events you participated: (N=240)	Frequency	Percent
a) We acquired relevant knowledge, but we do not have plans to use it in policy making or policy advocacy	31	6,5
b) We acquired relevant knowledge and we intend to use it for policy making or policy advocacy	114	24,1
c) We acquired relevant knowledge and we have already used it for policy making or policy advocacy	80	16,9
d) The information presented during these events was not relevant	9	1,9
e) Do not know	6	1,3

11. Did you take part in these activities of training/ mutual learning? (N=471)	Frequency	Percent
a) Yes, I participated	128	27
b) No, I did not participate in these activities	343	72,4

12. With regard to the training/ mutual learning activities on [Progress policy section] you have been involved in, would you say that: (N=132)	Frequency	Percent
a) We acquired relevant knowledge, but we do not have plans to use it in policy making or policy advocacy	15	3,2
b) We acquired relevant knowledge and we intend to use it for policy making or policy advocacy	63	13,3
c) We acquired relevant knowledge and we have already used it for policy making or policy advocacy	49	10,3

d) The information presented during these seminars was not relevant	3	0,6
e) Do not know	2	0,4

13. Did you take part in these activities of development of practical tools to facilitate the exchange of good practices/innovative approaches? (N=470)	Frequency	Percent
a) Yes, I participated in most of the exchanges of good practices/ innovative approaches	129	27,2
b) No, I did not participate in these activities, however I was aware of them	341	71,9

14. With regard to the development of practical tools to facilitate the exchange of good practices and innovative approaches, would you say that: (N=132)	Frequency	Percent
a) We acquired relevant knowledge, but we do not have plans to use it in policy making or policy advocacy	12	2,5
b) We acquired relevant knowledge and we intend to use it for policy making or policy advocacy	73	15,4
c) We acquired relevant knowledge and we have already used it for policy making or policy advocacy	39	8,2
d) The information we acquired in these events was not relevant	5	1,1
e) Do not know	3	0,6

15. Are you familiar with these assessment and monitoring reports? (N=469)	Frequency	Percent
a) Yes, most of the above-mentioned reports	93	19,8
b) Yes, few of them	151	32,2
c) No, I am not familiar, however I am aware that such reports are being (or have been) produced	116	24,7
d) No	109	23,2

16. In your opinion, to what extent the assessment and monitoring reports you are familiar with contributed to the development of the European policy in the [Progress policy section]?	Frequency	Percent
a) They provide relevant knowledge, but we do not have plans to use it in policy making or policy advocacy	33	7
b) They provide relevant knowledge and we intend to use it for policy making or policy advocacy	133	28,1
c) They provide relevant knowledge and we have already used it for policy making or policy advocacy	59	12,5
d) They do not provide knowledge which would be of relevance to us	4	0,8
e) Do not know	20	4,2

17. How much would you agree with the following statements on the European policy in the [Progress policy section]:	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Rather disagree	(3) Neither agree, nor disagree	(4) Rather agree	(5) Strongly agree	Do not know
a) European policy and legislation in the area of working conditions (including management of change, labour law, health and safety at work) is grounded in thorough analysis of situation; (N=470)	5	47	74	238	87	19

b) European policy and legislation in the area of working conditions (including management of change, labour law, health and safety at work) is responsive to conditions, needs and expectations in Member States; (N=471)	7	64	104	221	55	20
--	---	----	-----	-----	----	----

18. Are you aware of policy advice, research and analysis initiated by the European Commission in the [Progress policy section]? (N=471)	Frequency	Percent
a) No, not at all	10	2,1
b) No, rather not	26	5,5
c) Yes, somewhat aware	258	54,4
d) Yes, very well aware	163	34,4
e) Do not know	14	3

19. Do you use policy advice, research and analysis initiated by the European Commission in the [Progress policy section]? (N=471)	Frequency	Percent
a) No, not at all	16	3,4
b) No, rather not	50	10,6
c) Yes, somewhat	253	53,4
d) Yes, very much so	134	28,3
e) Do not know	18	3,8

20. Are you familiar with the aforementioned PROGRESS-funded policy advice, research and analysis? (N=472)	Frequency	Percent
a) Yes, most of the above-mentioned reports	80	16,9
b) Yes, few of them	193	40,7
c) No, I am not familiar, however I am aware that such advice (research, analysis) is being (or has been) produced	119	25,1
d) No	80	16,9

21. How would you assess the quality of this policy advice, research and analysis:	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Rather disagree	(3) Neither agree, nor disagree	(4) Rather agree	(5) Strongly agree	Do not know
a) Addressed issues which are highly relevant; (N=273)	2	4	30	149	84	4
b) Used the concepts which accurately defined and reflected the nature of problems and challenges analysed; (N=271)	1	9	41	165	51	4
c) Accurately identified the conditions, needs, concerns and expectations in the Member States as regards the implementation of EU legislation on working conditions (including management of change, labour law, health and safety at work); (N=271)	1	22	71	148	25	4

d) Proposed the best solutions and policy options in response to these conditions, needs, concerns and expectations; (N=272)	2	30	76	128	28	8
e) Identified and presented policy practices, which are innovative, transferable or demonstrating results; (N=269)	2	22	63	131	44	7
f) Other (please, specify); (N=22)		2	4	5	2	9

22. In your opinion, to what extent the policy advice, research and analysis you are familiar with contributed to the development and implementation of the European policy and law in the [Progress policy section] as regards the following aspects:	(1) They were useful only to a limited extent or not useful	(2) They were rather useful	(3) They were very useful	Do not know
a) Adopting/ amending the EU legislation in this policy area; (N=153)	10	80	52	11
b) Adopting/ amending national legal acts implementing the EU law in this policy area; (N=153)	22	66	51	14
c) Reaching the agreement of stakeholders on common concepts, objectives, targets, indicators and policy solutions at EU level; (N=175)	27	135	71	32
d) Triggering/ strengthening national policy debate on the basis of policies, practices and achievements in the Member States; (N=175)	45	124	85	21
e) Triggering new national policy initiatives on the basis of policies, practices and achievements in the Member States; (N=175)	51	125	75	24
f) Establishing/ improving methodologies and indicators for policy evaluation at national level; (N=175)	50	129	62	34
g) Improving governance of the European policy in the field of working conditions; (N=175)	27	140	73	35

23. Are you familiar with these surveys and tools?	Frequency	Percent
a) Yes, most of the above-mentioned surveys and tools	121	25,5
b) Yes, few of them	148	31,2
c) Aware but not familiar	138	29,1
d) No	67	14,1

24. In your opinion, to what extent the statistical indicators, tools and methods you are familiar with contributed to the development and implementation of the European policy in the [Progress policy section] as regards the following aspects:	(1) They were useful only to a limited extent or not useful	(2) They were rather useful	(3) They were very useful	Do not know
a) Reaching the agreement of stakeholders on common targets and indicators at EU level; (N=269)	29	131	80	29
b) Triggering/ strengthening national policy debate; (N=269)	40	134	81	14
c) Triggering new national policy initiatives; (N=269)	61	111	77	20
d) Establishing/ improving methodologies and indicators for policy evaluation at national level; (N=269)	46	121	82	20

25. To what extent EU has contributed to integration of these cross-cutting issues into the [Progress policy section]	(1) No contribution	(2) The contribution is limited	(3) The contribution is rather high	(4) The contribution of the EU is very high	Do not know
a) Gender equality; N=390	9	84	144	120	33
b) Non-discrimination; N=345	6	77	141	97	24
c) Combat against poverty; N=474	18	192	127	72	65

26. How would you assess the activity of EU-level networks/ NGOs/organizations?	(a) I am aware of this network	(b) It is a source of useful and appropriate information on the implementation of EU law and/or conditions, needs and expectations of relevant target groups	(c) It is successful in increasing awareness and exerting pressure on policy makers in the relevant policy area
1. IF (International Federation for Spina Bifida and Hydrocephalus)	130	33	11
2. FEANTSA (The European Federation of National Organisations Working with the Homeless)	159	72	62
3. Mental Health Europe	148	75	41
4. EMN (European Microfinance Network)	121	36	21
5. European Anti Poverty Network	191	107	105
6. European Federation for Street Children	123	35	12
7. Caritas Europa	208	95	69
8. Equinet Europe (European Network of Equality Bodies)	151	74	56
9. AGE - the European Older People's Platform	167	99	67
10. Autism Europe	131	49	29
11. CECOP (European Confederation of Worker Cooperatives and Social and Participative Enterprises)	134	60	29
12. European Disability Forum	168	101	95
13. European Women's Lobby	182	107	118
14. Inclusion Europe	137	53	47
15. Workability Europe	120	33	15
16. Eurodiaconia (European Federation for Diaconia)	134	32	15
17. EASPD (European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities)	131	47	32
18. European Roma Information Office	149	76	42
19. European Social Network	165	104	55
20. European Network on Independent Living	121	44	24

21. European Network Against Racism	169	98	74
22. International Lesbian and Gay Association Europe	151	88	79
23. Eurocities	163	63	34
24. COFACE-EU (Confederation of Family Organizations in the European Union)	135	46	26
25. European Blind Union	113	47	23
26. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (Bilbao)	161	97	84
27. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Dublin)	163	134	121

ANNEX 4:

List of acronyms

ANED	Academic Network of European Disability Experts
ASISP	Analytical Support on the Socio-Economic Impact of Social Protection Reforms
DG EMPL	Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities
ECJ	European Court of Justice
EEA	European Economic Area
EES	European Employment Strategy
EFTA	European Free Trade Area
EMCO	Employment Committee
ESF	European Social Fund
EU	European Union
EU-SILC	European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions
EU-12	New EU Member States (after January 2007)
EU-15	EU Member States prior to May 2004
EU-27	EU Member States after January 2007
IA	Impact Assessment
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organization
MISSOC	Mutual Information System on Social Protection
MS	Member States
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRP	National Reform Programme
NSR	National Strategy Report
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OMC	Open Method of Co-ordination
PES	Public Employment Services
SLIC	Senior Labour Inspectors Committee
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SPSI	Social Protection and Social Inclusion
SSGI	Social Services of General Interest