

Evaluation of the European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion

Annex

Client: European Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs and

Inclusion

Manuscript completed on 30 November 2011

Annex I Evaluation framework

Table A.I.1 Evaluation questions and indicators for relevance

Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
How relevant was the initiative to organise a specific European Year devoted to combating poverty and social exclusion, taking into consideration existing EU initiatives?	How far are national programmes and activities designed so as to produce added value - in terms of volume, scope, agenda setting, innovation and learning, as well as process effects - with respect to ESF, social inclusion OMC and PROGRESS?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of activities that produce added value since they: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ would not be eligible for funding under PROGRESS and the ESF; or ○ target different groups (e.g. citizens, the media); or ○ produce innovation and learning, by creating best practice examples; ○ improve the process of implementing the other initiatives. 	<p>EU level: interviews, survey questionnaire.</p> <p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>

Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
<p>How relevant were the EY2010's objectives, thematic priorities and types of activities at EU level and in the 29 participating countries, with regard to the objectives of the EU social inclusion strategy?</p>	<p>How do the thematic priorities and objectives defined at European level fit into the European social inclusion strategy?</p> <p>How are activities implemented under EY2010 in the 29 countries specifically related to the objectives of the EU social inclusion strategy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which EU and national activities address the following themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Groups at risk:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Children, single parents, large families; - Youth; - Elderly; - Women; - People with disabilities; - Migrants and ethnic minorities; - Homeless people and other vulnerable groups. ○ <i>Building solutions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusive labour markets, making work pay; - Education and training; - Housing. • Services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Social protection, income support; ○ Multidimensional, integrated strategies. 	<p>EU level: survey questionnaire, documents.</p> <p>National level: survey questionnaire, documents.</p>

Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which EU level and national activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Promote coordination and involvement of all levels of government; ○ Involve all stakeholders; ○ Involve people experiencing poverty and social exclusion. 	<p>EU level: interviews.</p> <p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>
		<p>Procedures used by NIBs to chose national strategic priorities e.g. on the basis of previous assessments, studies, surveys, consultations of stakeholders, etc.</p>	<p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>

Table A.I.2 Evaluation questions and examples of indicators for effectiveness and impact

Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
<p>To what extent did the EY2010 deliver its expected outcomes?</p>	<p>How far where the following immediate outcomes/results achieved?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU's role in combating poverty and social exclusion publicised; • Information on the reality of poverty and social exclusion questioning stereotypes disseminated; • Messages on collective responsibility delivered; • Occasions for personal commitment by citizens offered; • Fora for public authorities taking steps towards strengthened political commitment provided; • Decentralised initiatives undertaken; • Non traditional actors involved in initiatives; • Links with different policy areas highlighted in initiatives involving public authorities; • Innovative projects developed by public authorities and/or stakeholders; • Mutually reinforcing approaches proposed by public authorities; • Satisfying coverage of the EY2010 by media achieved; • Initiatives for wider and more accurate coverage of poverty and social exclusion 	<p>(EU and national output-level)</p> <p>Extent to which, and how, EY2010 activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarified EU's role in combating poverty and social exclusion; • Provided better information on the reality of poverty and social exclusion; • questioned stereotypes; • Conveyed messages on collective responsibility (poor and non-poor); • Proposed to citizens opportunities to commit; • Provided fora for public authorities to strengthen their commitments; • Concerned decentralised (i.e. regional and local) initiatives by public authorities. <p>Extent to which, and with which response, EY2010 activities involved different target groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General public; • Public authorities in the social policy field; • Media; • NGOs in the social policy field; • People experiencing poverty and social exclusion. 	<p>EU level: interviews, survey questionnaire, documents.</p> <p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>

Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
	<p>taken;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder commitment to participate in social inclusion policy process achieved; • Occasions for voice and visibility of people experiencing poverty in the public debate provided; • Occasion for social and political participation by people experiencing poverty provided; • Information on rights disseminated to people experiencing poverty. 	<p>(‘non traditional actors’):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGOs out of the social policy field; • The business world; • Utilities (energy, transport, water, etc.); • Public authorities beyond those of the social policy field; • Other non traditional actors. <p>Extent to which, and how, EY2010 activities concerned initiatives by public authorities linking poverty and social exclusion and other policy areas (energy, environment, transport, urban development, innovation, etc.).</p> <p>Extent to which, and how, EY2010 activities involved experiments with innovative approaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed by public authorities; • Developed by stakeholders. <p>Extent to which, and how, EY2010 activities proposed links between different approaches to poverty and social exclusion in public policy initiatives (e.g. labour market insertion, income support, access to social services):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed by public authorities; • Developed by stakeholders. 	

Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
		Extent to which activities aimed at improving media coverage of poverty and social exclusion were organised and their success (in terms of participation, feedback, etc.).	
		Data on media coverage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N. of press clippings (daily newspapers, magazines, journals, etc.); • N. of TV and radio reports; • Audience data on TV and radio reports (if available); • N. and type of blogs, pages of social networks, etc.; • N. interventions in discussions held by the Social Europe Facebook Group; • N. of visits to EU and national websites. 	EU level: documents from the media contractor, web pages. National level: phone (24 countries) or face-to-face (5 countries) interviews with representative of national communication sub- contractor.
		Extent to which and how EY2010 activities gave voice, visibility and information on their rights to people experiencing poverty and social exclusion, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invited people experiencing poverty to publicly voice their experiences and views; • Supported the activities of organisations of people experiencing poverty and social exclusion; • Spread out information on rights of people experiencing poverty and social exclusion. 	EU level: grid for observation of events, interviews, survey questionnaire. National level: grid for observation of events, phone (24 countries) or face-to-face (5 countries) interviews.

Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
	How far were the intermediate and ultimate outcome(s) achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are agreements between NGOs and NIBs to continue the cooperation after the end of the Year in regular policy processes and initiatives against poverty and social exclusion; • There are plans to involve people experiencing poverty in policy initiatives after the end of the Year; • NGOs report an increased citizens interest in volunteering and donating after some initiatives taken during the Year; • There are plans to apply elsewhere good practice examples made known during the Year; • Some initiatives have been started by media professionals to achieve a more widespread and correct media coverage of poverty and social exclusion; • New networks addressing social exclusion have been created during the Year; • The existing networks have been strengthened in terms of visibility, resources, knowledge base, etc.; • New policies, funding programmes addressing social exclusion have been launched and will be implemented after the Year; 	<p>EU level: survey questionnaire, interviews.</p> <p>National level: survey questionnaire.</p>

Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New and better indicators have been proposed and will be implemented after the Year; • Gender disaggregated data have been disseminated; • New structures and bodies have been created by the EU, national or regional governments to address poverty and social exclusion; • The existing structures and bodies have been strengthened in terms of visibility, resources, knowledge base, etc.; • New partnerships between public and private actors have been established and will continue functioning after the Year; • New services for socially excluded people have been conceived and will be tested after the Year; • New legislation proposals and action plans have been announced and will be developed after the end of the Year (public authorities); • Charters and declarations have been approved and will be further disseminated after the end of the Year (by stakeholders, social partners, NGOs, etc.). 	

Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
	How far were the specific objectives of the EY2010 attained?	<p>Opinion on representatives of NIBs and Stakeholders on the overall degree of attainment of objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of rights; • Shared responsibility and participation; • Cohesion; • Commitment and concrete actions. 	<p>EU level: interviews, survey questionnaire.</p> <p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>
Which target groups were reached best? At which level?	How was the participation of target groups to the various EU and national initiatives?	<p>See previous page.</p> <p>General public data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audience data on TV and radio programmes; • Readers' data on newspapers; • Visit to websites. 	<p>EU level: survey questionnaire, documents, interview and documents from the media contractor, web pages.</p> <p>National level: phone (24 countries) or face-to-face (5 countries); phone interviews with and documents from representative of national communication sub- contractor.</p>
	Was accessibility of activities and events ensured to everybody?	<p>Extent of which EU and national level activities and events ensured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility of built environment; • Transportation; • Accessible document formats and web pages, easy read version; • Sign language interpreters; • Speech to text facilities. 	<p>EU level: grid for observation of events, documents on events.</p> <p>National level: observation and analysis of printed materials at events.</p>
More specifically, how did major European events contribute to achieving the EY2010's objectives?		<p>Opinion of participants in EU events on the success of the event in contributing to the EY2010 objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of rights; 	<p>EU level: short questionnaire for interviews at events, documents from events.</p> <p>National level: observation and analysis of</p>

Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared responsibility and participation; • Cohesion; • Commitment and concrete actions. <p>Motivations for these opinions (examples).</p>	printed materials at events.

Table A.I.3 Evaluation questions and examples of indicators for efficiency

Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
Was the distribution of resources between EU and national level appropriate?	Was the distribution of tasks between EU and National appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities decentralised at the national level that could have been carried out with less effort if centralised at EU level; • Activities centralised at EU level that could have been better carried out with less effort if decentralised at national level; • Existence of gaps and/or overlaps in tasks be e.g. on the management of media relations, a and tools; • Extent to which material produced for the EU campaign has been used in the Member States (by NIBs and other actors). 	<p>EU level: interviews.</p> <p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>
How efficient was the relationship between resources (human, financial) and outcomes?	<p>How many human resources were necessary to produce EU and national outputs?</p> <p>What national programmes/activities present a good ratio between costs and outputs?</p>	<p>European level:</p> <p>Number of people working stably at EU level for the EY2010:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EY2010 task force; • Communication contractor. <p>Other resources and tools contributing to EY2010 activities and importance/quality of their contribution for the overall success of the EY2010 organisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within DG EMPL; • In other EC directorates; • In other EU institutions. 	<p>EU level: interviews.</p> <p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries), questionnaire to NIBs.</p>

Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
		<p>Data on the use of funding available from the financial reporting system, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and cost of meetings at EU level (e.g. stakeholder group, consultative committee); • Number and costs of meetings between communication contractor's national agencies and the NIBs; • Number and type of EU level outputs (totally and partially) produced with EU funding. <p>National level:</p> <p>Number of people employed in the National Implementing Bodies working for the EY2010.</p> <p>Examples of national activities realised with limited funding and great impact.</p> <p>Amount and importance of activities carried out under the moral support formula (i.e. without EY2010 funding).</p>	

Table A.I.4 Evaluation questions and examples of indicators for sustainability

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
Is the EY2010 likely to provide a lasting effect?	To which extent were contributions from the EY2010 incorporated in policy planning and, when relevant, implementation?	<p>Results (proposals, cooperations, partnerships, etc.) of the EY2010 activities that have been incorporated in policy planning and implementation of initiatives going beyond 2010 regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESF; • EU2020; • PROGRESS; • Social Inclusion OMC. <p>Results (proposals, cooperations, partnerships, etc.) of the EY2010 activities that have been incorporated in national policy planning and implementation of initiatives going beyond 2010 in the field of poverty and social exclusion.</p>	<p>EU level: interviews, survey questionnaire.</p> <p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
	To which extent have other organisations endowed with resources and/or authority committed to give continuity to the EY2010 results?	<p>(national level)</p> <p>Commitments to give continuity to EY2010 results (in terms of funding, human resources, political support, partnership etc.) taken by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government ministries; • Municipalities; • Regional authorities; • Business companies; • Trade unions; • Industry associations; • Charities, NGOs and foundations; • Media organisations. 	<p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>
	Was there a leverage effect?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New projects to which the EY2010 projects and activities gave birth (national level); • Existence and number of planned events concerning poverty and social exclusion issues after 2010. 	<p>EU level: interviews, survey questionnaire.</p> <p>National level: survey questionnaire, face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
	<p>To what extent have the results of the actions been properly disseminated within the country to the Ministries in charge of Social protection and inclusion & to external stakeholders & the public?</p>	<p>(National level) Existence of methods and for a used for the further (i.e. beyond activities planned within the Year) dissemination of EY2010 results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To public authorities; • To media; • To other stakeholders (social partners, NGOs); • To people experiencing poverty and social exclusion; • To the general public. 	<p>EU level: interviews, survey questionnaire.</p> <p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>
<p>What recommendations can be drawn with regard to 1) social protection and social inclusion policies 2) future European Years?</p>	<p>What are the empirical elements (obstacles, facilitating factors, lessons learnt, good practices) which can help in the formulation of recommendations, besides the overall results of the assessment?</p>	<p>Content recommendations: Innovative practices that have been adopted in the Year and are considered replicable and worth being shared by NIBs and stakeholders, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-traditional media and means of communication utilised; • Non-traditional settings used to spread out the message of the EY2010; • Non-traditional target groups addressed/involved; • Other. <p>Design recommendations: Facilitating factors which helped in the implementation of the Year (e.g. media</p>	<p>EU level: interviews, survey questionnaire.</p> <p>National level: survey questionnaire, face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
		<p>coverage, creation of partnerships/networks, institutionalisation of results, etc.) as reported by NIBs and stakeholders.</p> <p>Lessons learned from the Year as reported by NIBs and stakeholders.</p> <p>Obstacles encountered by participants and stakeholders, preventing the smooth functioning of the programme at both European and national level.</p>	

Table A.I.4 Evaluation questions and examples of indicators for complementarity

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
<p>How complementary was the EY2010 with regard to other EU policies and programmes, in particular the EU social protection and social inclusion process, the PROGRESS programme, and the European Social Fund?</p>	<p>Was complementarity made explicit in EY2010 activities?</p> <p>Did the EY2010 contribute to fill already known gaps in the Social inclusion OMC? (e.g. stakeholder involvement, regional and local involvement, visibility, political commitments, as referenced in the Communication¹).</p>	<p>(EU and national level)</p> <p>Extent to which, and how, EY2010 initiatives explicitly discussed improvements to be brought in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESF; • PROGRESS; • Social Inclusion OMC. <p>Agreements taken with regional and local authorities on their further inclusion in the social inclusion OMC.</p> <p>Agreements taken with stakeholders on their further involvement in the social inclusion OMC.</p> <p>The extent to which NIBs coincided with the national structures implementing the ESF, or involved in the Social OMC and PROGRESS.</p> <p>Regularity of meetings/talks/discussions on complementarity between officials involved in ESF, PROGRESS and Social Inclusion OMC, on the one hand, and those in charge of the EY2010, on the other hand.</p>	<p>EU level: interviews, grid for observation of events.</p> <p>National level: grid for observation of events, phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>

¹ Ibidem.

Table A.I.5 Evaluation questions and examples of indicators for gender mainstreaming

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
How was the gender dimension taken into account in the activities of the EY2010, both at the European and national level?	Was there a gender balance in the management of the EY2010?	Gender composition of structures set up for the planning and management of the Year at European and national level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EY2010 Task Force; • Consultative Committee; • Stakeholders Committee. 	EU level: interviews, documents. National level: survey questionnaire, documents.
	Was the gender dimension taken into account for financing activities under EY2010?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of gender disaggregated data and information on gender differences in the extent of poverty and social exclusion in the materials disseminated at the EY2010 events; • Gender balance among participants and speakers in key EU events. 	EU level: grid for collecting documents and observation at events. National level: grid for collecting documents and observation at events.
	Was the gender dimension stressed in the contents of the messages delivered with the EY2010?		
	Does participation in the activities of the EY2010 appear satisfactory in terms of equality between men & women?	Existence of good practices on mainstreaming the gender approach in projects funded under the EY2010.	EU level: interviews. National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).

Table A.I.6 Evaluation questions and examples of indicators on the implementation process and delivery mechanisms

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
How relevant and effective were the management structure and delivery mechanisms at EU and national levels?	Was the organisation and staffing of the European management structure adequate?	Adequacy of staffing and organisation of the Task Force as perceived by its members and by NIBs.	EU level: interviews. National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).
	How was the assistance of the communication contractor used?	Frequency and quality of the relationship with the communication contractor perceived by the EY task force, the communication contractor and NIBs.	EU level: interviews. National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).
	How was the assistance of the Consultative Committee used?	Frequency and quality of the relationship with the Consultative Committee (NIBs) perceived by the EY task force and NIBs.	EU level: interviews. National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).
	How was the assistance of the EU stakeholders group used?	Frequency and quality of the relationship with the EU Stakeholder group perceived by the EY Task force and the members of the Stakeholder Group.	EU level: interviews, survey questionnaire. National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).
	How was the association with the Social Protection Committee run?	Frequency and quality of the consultations with the Social Protection Committee perceived by the EY task force and members of the Social Protection Committee.	EU level: interviews. National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).
	To what extent were partnerships with other EU structures (within and outside DG-EMPL) put in place and used to boost the impact of the Year?	Activities conducted in partnership with other EU structures.	EU level: interviews. National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
	Was the organisation and staffing of the NIBs adequate?	Adequacy of staffing and organisation of the NIBs as perceived by the EU Task force and NIBs members.	<p>EU level: interviews.</p> <p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>
	How smooth, efficient and effective were the delivery mechanisms envisaged under the centralised indirect management procedure?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall satisfaction of EU and NIBs staff for the procedures and mechanisms put in place; • Presence of gaps and/or overlaps in responsibilities of NIBs and EY task force; • Presence of bottlenecks and time gaps in the transfer of funding (according to EY task force and NIBs); • Presence of unclear procedures which generated significant delays (according to EY task force and NIBs); • Presence of bottlenecks and time gaps in the implementation of decisions at national level. 	<p>EU level: interviews.</p> <p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>
	How was the relationship between the EC Task Force and National Implementing Bodies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency of meetings and contacts between the Task Force and NIBs; • Satisfaction with the quality of the relationship of the EU Task Force staff and of the NIBs staff. 	<p>EU level: interviews.</p> <p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
	Could alternatives be envisaged?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceived advantages and disadvantages of a more decentralised management by EY task force and NIBs staff; • Perceived advantages and disadvantages of a more centralised management by EY task force and NIBs staff; • Suggestions on possible alternative mechanisms by Task force and NIBs staff. 	<p>EU level: interviews.</p> <p>National level: phone interviews (24 countries), face-to-face interviews (5 countries).</p>

Annex II Activities organised by NIBs²

Table A.II.1 Activities organised by the NIBs

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
Austria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: Opening Conference, Salzburg (22 February 2010); Activity No. 2: 16 funded projects, nationwide; Activity No. 3: 3 Regional Conferences in Graz, Linz, Innsbruck; Activity No. 4: 3-day Film Festival ('seeing poverty'), Vienna; Activity No. 5: Closing Conference, Vienna (8 November 2010). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 6: Development of Regional Strategy Plans to combat poverty and social exclusion; Activity No. 7: website www.2010gegenarmut.at including event calendar; Activity No. 8: 26 national ambassadors; Activity No. 9: Media Conference (21 January 2010); Activity No. 10: Press Breakfasts; Activity No. 11: Promotion of the EY2010 on Public Television (ORF); Activity No. 12: 'Armutsgrenze?' ('poverty line?') - Interactive discussion game for children/young people developed by Science Center Netzwerk and supported by BMASK; Activity No. 13: 'Ideentag Straßenzeitungen' (follow-up meeting of street newspapers published by homeless people); Activity No. 14: Research Study 'Single Parents in Austria'; Activity No. 15: This Human World Film Festival (2-11 December 2010).
Belgium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: Book 'Poverty: 15 actors, 1 fight' containing the portraits of 15 anonymous citizens engaging on a daily basis through their profession (a bailiff, municipal guard, a nurse, a hotel manager) and far beyond what is expected in the fight against poverty. T; Activity No. 2: Media training for NGO's: free media training offered to all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 6: with support from the Secretary of State P.Courard, SPP IS and 160 CPAS acted to sensitize the public opinion and highlight their emancipatory (preventive and curative); Activity No. 7: Organisation of a call for projects & selection of projects; Activity No. 8: Organisation of meetings of the Steering group 2010 & follow-up. 16

² This document is based on responses to the NIB survey and might not reflect the whole scope of activities developed by NIBs

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
	<p>NGOs, including the 253 NGOs having introduced a project following the call for proposals. More than 60 NGOs have attended the media training. Type of activity: training/workshop;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 3: Participation to the Belgian National Day on July 21st. Various stands held by NIB, financed projects, anti-poverty network and other stakeholders attracted many visitors. Type of activity: event. Location: Brussels, Parc Royal; • Activity No. 4: 13 prominent Belgian personalities expressed their indignation. A poster with quotes, a video declaration and an Internet forum were developed to carry the message. Type of activity: communication; • Activity No. 5: The NGO FLORA organised a participative event with 250 women from all over the country. The NIB contributed to the press conference where two young women expressed their life situations and aspirations in front of the press. 	<p>meetings in total.</p>
Bulgaria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: National week for combating poverty and social exclusion, 27 – 30 September 2010, Sofia, Bulgaria; • Activity No. 2: National meeting of people living in poverty and social exclusion, 23 November, Sofia, Bulgaria; • Activity No. 3: National competitions for children's essays and drawings; • Activity No. 4: Local campaign (round tables; local meetings with people living in poverty and social exclusion; public debates; information days); • Activity No. 5: National meeting 'Childhood for everyone', 10 - 11 September 2010, Sofia, Bulgaria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 6: National round table 'Long-term priorities of the policy for combating poverty and social exclusion; Social dimensions of the Europe 2020 strategy', 18 October 2010, Sofia, Bulgaria; • Activity No. 7: Closing conference for the EY2010, 14 December 2010, Sofia, Bulgaria; • Activity No. 8: Theater for visually impaired people, 10 December 2010, Sofia, Bulgaria; • Activity No. 9: Debates with children and students, June - December 2010, Sofia, Bulgaria; • Activity No. 10: Festival of dance, music and sports for children from the specialised institutions, 29 June - 2 July 2010, sea resort Albena, Bulgaria; • Activity No. 11: National conference on the role of the European Open Method of Coordination on social protection and social inclusion and the European Social Fund

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
		<p>in combating poverty and social exclusion, 27 April 2010, Sofia, Bulgaria;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 12: Development of 28 local action plans for combating poverty and social exclusion; • Activity No. 13: Sociological research – ‘Poverty and social exclusion in Bulgaria – dissemination, causes and public attitudes’; • Activity No. 14: Review and analysis of the Bulgarian legislation which regulates the issues of poverty and social exclusion; • Activity No. 15: Exhibition of works made by children from the specialised institutions, 1-2 December 2010, Sofia, Bulgaria.
Cyprus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: Opening Ceremony; • Activity No. 2: Closing Ceremony; • Activity No. 3: Elementary school of Saint Andrea; • Activity No. 4: High School of Drosias; • Activity No. 5: European Music Festival ‘Music Against Poverty.’ 	Activity No. 6: A mobile unit distributed informational material for the EY2010.
Czech Republic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: Grant programme (16 projects supported), NIB delivered grant programme focused in 5 priorities; • Activity No. 2: Communication campaign, content: web site of EY2010, web banners, CLV and billboard campaign in 13 cities of the Czech Republic, brochures, PR activities, organising of closing conference, advertising materials. Location: whole Czech Rep; • Activity No. 3: Event, Travelling Exhibition in 13 regional cities with information about EY2010 + true stories of people in need and examples where they found help (good practice examples), connected with happenings in the biggest cities featuring a ‘homeless theatre’; • Activity No. 4: Official TV spot about EY2010 (available at 3 public broadcasting channels); 	Activity No. 6: Event, Prague International Marathon – charity relay race of Ministry of Labour (NIB) teams with the logo of EY2010, connected with beneficence for charities, aimed to raise awareness.

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 5: Information materials, leaflets with practical information on 5 priorities of the EY2010 in CR (over-indebtedness, social housing, work, education and active help). Printing 10 000 pieces, distributed to regional administrations, social services and social protection. 	
Denmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: 2010.04.07 - Launched a call for proposal in which 38 projects of a total of 139 projects were selected for financing; Activity No. 2: 2010.04.04 - Opening Event, Axelborg Venue, Copenhagen; Activity No. 3: 2010.08.01 – 2010.08.07 – Social Inclusion Games in Nederland, a huge sports event for socially marginalised people; Activity No. 4: 2010.09.06 – Essay competition on poverty and social exclusion for pupils in primary school; Activity No. 5: 2010.10.02 – Published a rapport on indicators of poverty and social exclusion in cooperation with key stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 6: 2010.11.02 – Interviews with stakeholders published on Youtube; Activity No. 7: 2010.11.30 – Closing event, Hotel Scandic Copenhagen; Activity No. 8: 2010.11.30 – Published a rapport with testimony from people experiencing poverty and social exclusion.
Estonia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: Analytical review 'Poverty in Estonia' - collection of results of surveys and studies, published together with Statistics Estonia, scientists from different Universities, Ministry of Social Affairs; available at http://www.stat.ee/38021; Activity No. 2: Opening Seminar and Mini Mess that brought together politicians, civil servants and NGOs; Activity No. 3: Small-project call for proposals for NGOs - there were 96 projects submitted, 24 of them got financing; Activity No. 4: Special issue of the journal 'Sotsiaaltöö' ('Social work') http://www.sm.ee/fileadmin/meedia/Dokumendid/V2ljaanded/Sotsiaaltoojajakiri/2010/Sotsiaaltoojajakiri_2010_5.pdf; Activity No. 5: TV programme 'Tööleidja' ('Job finder') - special 30 min TV programme about youth unemployment, including suggestions on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 6: EY2010 Estonian closing conference - 10. December 2010; Activity No. 7: 4 regional seminars for social workers and social sector NGOs - main presentation was about poverty in Estonia, materials:http://www.sm.ee/tegevus/sotsiaalhoolekanne/hoolekande-regionaalsed-seminarid-2010.html; Activity No. 8: Day to give thanks to the elderly who are active volunteers in promoting social inclusion in their community, August 2010.

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
	<p>how to be successful, broadcasted on primetime in Estonian Television on 10 January 2011.</p>	
Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: Opening ceremony in Kemi (February); • Activity No. 2: Good Practices Competition; • Activity No. 3: Theme day in Joensuu (September); • Activity No. 4: Poverty in metro: support campaign for the EU advertisement campaign, Helsinki (November); • Activity No. 5: Seminar for members of the parliament (November). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 6: Night for the homeless in Helsinki (March); • Activity No. 7: Prison event (November); • Activity No. 8: Law seminar (May).
France	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: Opening ceremony – 18 February (Cité universitaire de Paris); • Activity No. 2: Rennes Seminar – 20 May (<i>'Parcours d'insertion'</i>); • Activity No. 3: Marseille – 11 June (<i>'Accès aux droits'</i>); • Activity No. 4: Lille Seminar – 16 September (<i>'Gouvernance'</i>); • Activity No. 5: Closing ceremony – 30 November (Cinémathèque de Paris). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 6: 'La gare, lieu de mobilisation pour l'insertion sociale' ('The station, mobilisation place for social insertion'), 31 March, organised by SNCF. Conference; • Activity No. 7: Journées de l'Europe. 7,8,9 mai : 'Comment lutter contre la pauvreté en Europe' (Europe Days 7,8,9 May: 'How to struggle against poverty in Europe'). Representation of the European Commission in France, cooperation DGCS, - Paris Hôtel de ville. Event; • Activity No. 8: Journée des oubliés des vacances 'Soleil d'Europe' (Day of the forgotten by holidays 'Sun of Europe'), 19 August 2011. 40 000 young people of which 3000 young Europeans, Secours populaire. Event; • Activity No. 9: Ethical Fashion Show. 25, 26 September, EFS + DGCS. Event; • Activity No. 10: Rencontres de Cluny 'L'Europe de tous' (Cluny meetings 'Europe for all'), 2 and 3 October, Secours catholique, 800 participants. Event; • Activity No. 11: 'Combattre la pauvreté et l'exclusion en France et au Portugal' (Combating poverty and exclusion in France and Portugal), 30 October, Hôtel de ville de Paris, organised by the Portuguese Embassy in France. Conference; • Activity No. 12: 'Le Mans solidaire' (Solidary Mans), 19 November, Mans. Organised by the Municipality of Mans. Seance and signature of a partnership charter; • Activity No. 13: 'Colloque international sur les précarités énergétique et hydrique' (International conference on energetic and water precariousness), 23 November -

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
		<p>GDF/SUZ. Conference;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 14: Fashion défilé at the CHRS 'La cité du refuge', organised with the residents of three CHRS of the Fondation de l'Armée du salut, Paris, 16 December. Event.
Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: National Opening conference on February 25 2010; Activity No. 2: 40 projects over all regions and topics; Activity No. 3: 2 workshops with streetpapers; Activity No. 4: National journalist award; Activity No. 5: development and care of a website. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Activity. 6: 10 prominent representatives of culture, sport and science have been recovered as a national ambassador. No Activity. 7: Circuit of TV commercials and a newspaper supplement to the notice of the EY 2010 No Activity. 8: Conduct a final national conference
Greece	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: Inauguration event; Activity No. 2: Call for proposals; Activity No. 3: Publicity; Activity No. 4: Conference; Activity No. 5: Closing event. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 6: Youth Event; Activity No. 7: Conference on discrimination; Activity No. 8: Conference on volunteering.
Hungary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: Opening event, Budapest, 22 March 2010; Activity No. 2: 'ARC' Poster Exhibition, Budapest, 2-22 September 2010; Activity No. 3: Closing conference and exhibition, Budapest, 8 December 2010. 	
Iceland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: A radio show, 'Hardship of poverty'. Six radio shows where broadcasted in the national radio. Each show looked at poverty and social exclusion from a different perspective. Various individuals were interviewed in the show; Activity No. 2: 'Join together in Role centre'. The main goal of the project was to assist people to get on track in life and reduce social exclusion. The project assisted people which lacked self-esteem to take the first 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 6: Health and condition of unemployed people in the time of recession. In the research it was looked at what is the impact of unemployment on health and then especially mental health. It looked at the impact social support has on unemployed people; Activity No. 7: Condition, situation and response to the economic situation in Iceland – a survey; Activity No. 8: A project aimed at empowering single mothers in Reykjanesbær which

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
	<p>step into society again after having being unemployed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 3: Act project. A course in Iceland Academy of the arts on poverty and social exclusion. A five week course was held in the Iceland Academy of arts where students were linked with people which experienced poverty and social exclusion; • Activity No. 4: Poverty and social situation amongst invalidity pensioners: activity in cooperation between the University of Iceland and The Organisation of Disabled in Iceland; • Activity No. 5: National meeting on solutions on poverty and social exclusion, with participation of people which lived in poverty and social exclusion, employees from various sectors which work on combating poverty and social exclusion and politicians. 	<p>is in the rural area of Iceland;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 9: The film 'Children', which is about a single mother of four children who desperately tries to make ends meet was shown in Ísafjörður and Reykjavík.
Ireland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: 5 Regional Seminars: Half day seminars in the following locations: Galway 11th May, Dundalk 13th May, Wexford 18th May, Cork 3rd June and Donegal 28th September; • Activity No. 2: 2 Social Inclusion Weeks May 15-21 and Oct 17-22. The latter coincided with UN Day for Eradication of Poverty. Weeks were focused on locally based activities; • Activity No. 3: Annual Social Inclusion Forum 17 Nov in the National Convention Centre Dublin. Event was put in place by Govt to support the development of the NAP inclusion. Forum for wider discussion on social issues particularly with people experiencing poverty; • Activity No. 4: Specialist half day seminars focusing on particular issues and groups. Two research seminars focused on the area of poverty data, 1 June and 3 Nov, Dublin; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 6: Launch of the Irish Programme for the European Year, 5th Feb 2010, Dublin Castle; • Activity No. 7: European Anti-Poverty Network International Conference: Building Social Europe: From Crisis to Opportunity, 19th Feb 2010, Dublin Castle; • Activity No. 8: A Tale of Two Cities, Half Day Seminar on Urban Disadvantage, 19th May 2010, Fatima F2 Centre, Dublin; • Activity No. 9: Young Social Innovators Showcase, 5th May 2010, Croke Park Conference Centre, Dublin 2; • Activity No. 10: 20th anniversary of EAPN Ireland & book launch, 1 Jul Dublin; • Activity No. 11: Making the link: why equality and social inclusion matter for migrants and ethnic minorities, 27th September, Dublin; • Activity No. 12: New Ideas, New Directions An All-Island Conference on Combating Rural Poverty and Social Exclusion, 21st Oct 2010, Drogheda, Co. Louth;

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 5: Four funding Initiatives were supported under the EU Year. The vast majority of groups funded were at local level. Popular activities included conferences, seminars, meetings and workshops other events included capacity building workshops and exhibitions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 13: Traveller Focus Week 29 Nov-10 Dec. Three regional half day workshops hosted by the National Traveller Money Advice and Budgeting Service.
Italy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: In the villages of arrival of the eighteen Italian stages of the Tour of Italy from 12 to 30 May 2010, a stand of the Ministry was present, to provide materials, information and suggestions on how to promote solidarity; Activity No. 2: The communication campaign: 'Helps Italy which helps'; Activity No. 3: Mobilisation campaign in schools: 'The school player in the fight against poverty'; Activity No. 4: Workshop: 'Journey to social exclusion: the national and local policies to combat poverty and marginalisation. ', Roma – CNEL; Activity No. 5: Series of meetings: 'Local Strategies for combating poverty: a comparison between cities' (3 workshops), Roma (ANCI) and Rimini, as part of the ANCI National Assembly. 	
Latvia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: Opening Press conference of the EY 2010; Activity No. 2: Regional seminars; Activity No. 3: VIVA Europa 2010, The possibility free of charge to see the opera 'Karmena'; Activity No. 4: Riga Unites. Social event for 2 days. First day - the social event in Central Station, second day - international conference on the theme 'Making the better society without social exclusion nad poverty'; Activity No. 5: Closing event of the EY 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 6: Opportunity map; Activity No. 7: Celebration of the European Day on May 9th; Activity No. 8: Competition of the journalists.
Lithuania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: The Opening Event of European Year against Poverty and Social Exclusion 2010 on 19th of March in the Presidency of Lithuania; 	

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 2: Project – Creation of the Social Performance ‘Travelling to the Stars’ in Panevėžys theatre ‘The Art’ and in the A. Bandzos child care institution; • Activity No. 3: The Closing Event of European Year against Poverty and Social Exclusion in the Centre of Children and Youth in Vilnius; • Activity No. 4: The Documentary movie ‘Travelling to the Stars’ about creation of the social performance. 	
Luxembourg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: Conference and Workshop ‘Poverty Impact Assessment’; • Activity No. 2: Roundtable ‘Intergenerational transmission of poverty and social exclusion’; • Activity No. 3: National Competition ‘School project against exclusion’; • Activity No. 4: National Competition Journalist Award II – sensitisation of the general public on the UN ‘Millennium Development Goals’. 	
Malta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: Official Opening – Malta had its EY2010 Official Launch on the 3rd of February 2010 under the patronage of the President of the Republic of Malta, H.E. Dr. George Abela and the then Minister for Social Policy, the Hon. John Dalli; • Activity No. 2: Round Table Event – Representatives from constituted bodies, local councils, NGOs, organisations representing the Church, Members of Parliament and EY 2010 Ambassadors; • Activity No. 3: Focus Week. Seven days of activities all aimed at raising awareness on poverty. These activities involved several NGOs, Government entities, policy makers, EY2010 Ambassadors, local councils and members of Parliament, and the general public; • Activity No. 4: Press Breakfast: Long-term Unemployment and Persons with Disability, which was held in Gozo. Several NGOs, Government entities, policy makers, EY2010 Ambassadors, Local Councils and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 6: Press Breakfast ‘Persons with Addiction and Ex-Prisoners’. Several NGOs, EY2010 Ambassadors, Government entities, policy makers, local councils and Members of Parliament; • Activity No. 7: Press Breakfast: ‘Emerging Types of Poverty’. Several NGOs, EY2010 Ambassadors, Government Entities, policy makers, local councils and Members of Parliament; • Activity No. 8: Press Breakfast: ‘Mental Health and the Children’. Several NGOs, Government entities, EY2010 Ambassadors, policy makers, local councils and Members of Parliament; • Activity No. 9: Press Breakfast: ‘Domestic Violence and the Elderly’. Several NGOs, Government entities, policy makers, EY2010 Ambassadors, local councils and Members of Parliament; • Activity No. 10: Press Breakfast: ‘Homeless people and Asylum Seekers’. Several NGOs, EY2010 Ambassadors, Government entities, policy makers, local councils and

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
	<p>Members of Parliament;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 5: Closing Event: attended by the Hon. Dolores Cristina, Minister of Education, Employment and the Family, representatives of the National Implementing Body, EY2010 Ambassadors, NGOs, other stakeholders and media representatives. 	<p>Members of Parliament.</p>
Norway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: National Opening Conference; Activity No. 2: Seminar; Child and youth poverty; Activity No. 3: Mutual learning seminar; The Qualification Programme; Activity No. 4: Price-award; Best local implementation of the Qualification Programme; Activity No. 5: National Closing Conference. 	
Poland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: The official inauguration of the ER- conference (Warsaw); Activity No. 2: Combating Social Exclusion of Older People - Strategies and Practice - conference (Warsaw); Activity No. 3: Poverty and Exclusion. Economic, Social and Political Aspects - conference (Warsaw); Activity No. 4: Extreme Poverty and Human Rights - Challenge for Poland, Challenge for Europe - conference (Warsaw); Activity No. 5: Closing of the ER in Poland - conference (Warsaw). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 6: Equal Together- picnic for families (Warsaw); Activity No. 7: A series of TV programmes ('Integration' Magazine) - all Poland; Activity No. 8: A series of 5 articles in the free newspaper 'Echo Miasta' (City's Echo) (main cities); Activity No. 9: A series of programmes in public television (all Poland); Activity No. 10: A series of 15 programmes 'Europejczycy' (Europeans) in regional television; Activity No. 11: X Convention of Movement against Social Helplessness (Warsaw); Activity No. 12: Counteracting of social exclusion of older people in local environment – study.
Portugal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 1: Nine Monthly Thematic Meetings (Poverty, Women, Youth, Employment, Migrants, Volunteering, Elderly, People with disabilities, Homeless People), that took place in different cities involving local actors, citizens authorities, public/ private stakeholders; Activity No. 2: Neighbourhood Cinema: 5 short scripts and films written and produced by young people from 5 vulnerable neighbourhoods, with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity No. 6: EY's Opening and Closing Events; Activity No. 7: Weekly publication of a page dedicated to the EY and the thematic of fighting against poverty and social exclusion by the media partner of the EY (Newspaper Jornal de Notícias); Activity No. 8: 5 EY Studies (Homeless Immigrants in Portugal; Working Low Income Families; Child poverty; Young Unqualified Workers; Poverty of Portuguese Emigrants

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
	<p>the support of professionals, showing the reality of each neighbourhood from the point of view of the socially excluded youngsters;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 3: Relay race 'Poverty and Exclusion: I pass': for 30 days, 1.800 km were ran by 70.000 people, representing students from special classes, public and private entities, municipalities, parents, teachers, politicians, and athletes, all wearing EY t-shirts; • Activity No. 4: Summer Festivals: Participation in 4 big events, such as Rock in Rio, with a stand with the shape of a real sized stall with the slogan: 'Bigger poverty is to stay indifferent'. Participants were invited to leave messages about fighting against poverty; • Activity No. 5: 'Walking and jogging against Poverty' Sporty event on October 17th, International Day for the Eradication of Poverty, that took place in 5 different cities simultaneously, across the country, and involved 1739 participants. 	<p>Living in Poor Countries);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 9: Presence of the EY in Fairs (Futuralia; Europe Circus; Family Guide; Copa Foot; Integration Mini World Cup); • Activity No. 10: The Train of the Children's Rights, gathering children aged 6-10, from all over the country for a musical show in Lisbon; • Activity No. 11: The Choices Ship, gathering young people from vulnerable families, that succeeded in school, for an adventurous week in Madeira; • Activity No. 12: Edition of a book of novels about Poverty and Social Exclusion ' Do Concerto do Mundo', written by 18 Portuguese writers; • Activity No. 13: Production and distribution of merchandising materials (pencils: 27.500; pens: 28.000; bag packs: 35.000; folders: 6.500; Post-it: 20.000; badges: 15.000; balloons: 4.000; t-shirts: 60.000; stickers: 107.500; Posters: 14.500).
Slovakia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: Call for proposal (projects) Slovakia; • Activity No. 2: Conferences in Bratislava; • Activity No. 3: Seminar on 'Effectiveness of social inclusion tools for MRC' Spišská Kapitula; • Activity No. 4: Campaign Slovakia; • Activity No. 5: Film festival Jeden svet (One World) Slovakia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 6: Medzinárodný maratón mieru (International Peace Marathon) Košice; • Activity No. 7: Football tournament of homeless people Košice; • Activity No. 8: Sticker campaign on trash cans Košice; • Activity No. 9: Olympiáda ľudských práv (Human Rights Olympics) Slovakia, Liptovský Ján; • Activity No. 10: School Paralympics Trnava; • Activity No. 11: Študenti proti chudobe (Students against Poverty) Bratislava; • Activity No. 12: Bratislavský undergroundový festival (music festival) Bratislava; • Activity No. 13: competitions Slovakia; • Activity No. 14: Via Bona Slovakia, Slovakia, Bratislava; • Activity No. 15: Press conference in Resoty (shelter for the homeless) Bratislava.
Slovenia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: MOLFSA as NIB has published 5 different brochures: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 6: Conference on Homelessness in June 2010 in Ljubljana, organised by

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
	<p>(1)The rights of Youth, (2) The rights of Elderly; (3) On NGOs financed by MOLFSA in Slovenia and two on various legal changes of law in the social area. All brochures are available on the website;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 2: A study on homelessness, print and e-version; available on the Slovenian website; • Activity No. 3: A study on living and working conditions of migrant workers (not finished yet); • Activity No. 4: The establishment of a Roma Information Center in Ljubljana by the support of Radio Student; • Activity No. 5: The 4th Congress of Social Work, Conference in Ljubljana in April 2010. 	<p>the The Association for the self-support of the homeless 'Kings of the Street' and the Faculty on Education;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 7: Activities within the project of Cooperative POMELAJ: workshops and concrete help services to the unemployed (individual advice, registration of personal jobs, acquiring the national qualification certificates etc.; • Activity No. 8: Different activities done by the Center of Autism: international conference 'Inclusion: Switch From Minus To Plus', May 2010, various promotional leaflets and a spot produced; • Activity No. 9: The Days of Social Economy - international conference, organised by ŠENT; • Activity No. 10: Activities of Altra - special movie on homeless drug abusers produced and round tables; • Activity No. 11: The literary competition on EY2010: more than hundred articles produced and published in a special publication etc; done by the Public Fund for Cultural Activities; • Activity No. 12: Other activities within their project 'WIN - WIN' carried out by ŠENT; • Activity No. 13: Project 'With Game Against Stigma' carried by ŠENT; • Activity No. 14: Project 'Europe at School'; • Activity No. 15: Project 'The Week of the Long Life Learning'.
Spain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: National Seminar on Social Intervention with Homeless People; • Activity No. 2: Seminar on Positive Parenthood and Social Inclusion; • Activity No. 3: Seminar on the Image of Elderly People on Mass Media and its Impact in Social Inclusion; • Activity No. 4: Workshop on Law and Poverty: Answers to the social inclusion from the regulatory inclusion and the Justice Administration; • Activity No. 5: Project: Design and Poverty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 6: Report: Strategies on Active Inclusion on the European Union; • Activity No. 7: Seminar on Mental Health and Social Exclusion in Elderly People; • Activity No. 8: Seminar on Hawking and Roma Population: present and future; • Activity No. 9: Seminar on the Objectives and Measures Analysis of Equality Treatment, Employment and Social Intervention aimed to the Roma Community; • Activity No. 10: 100 Arguments and Proposals to shape a Local Network for the Attention to Homeless People.

Country	Key five NIB activities	Other activities
Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: 21 projects; • Activity No. 2: Start-up and final conferences; • Activity No. 3: Consultation with the target group; • Activity No. 4: Web page; • Activity No. 5: Regional conferences. 	Activity No. 6: Publications.
The Netherlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: Start Conference on February 4th 2010, Utrecht; • Activity No. 2: Subsidised projects EY 2010, seven projects; • Activity No. 3: Closing Conference on November 25th, the Hague. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 6: Thematical week 1 'Kinderen doen mee', April 19-23 (Assen, Bergen, Den Helder, Eindhoven en Goes), organised by the policy direction and municipalities; • Activity No. 7: Thematical week 2 'Week van het geld 2010', September 13-19th (Amsterdam, Utrecht), organised by interdepartemental organisations.
The United Kingdom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity No. 1: UK Launch, Conference, Bristol; • Activity No. 2: Scottish Launch, Conference, Glasgow; • Activity No. 3: Northern Ireland Launch, Conference, Belfast; • Activity No. 4: Wales Be Heard Conference, Swansea; • Activity No. 5: 14 Awareness Raising Roadshows, UK wide. 	








Annex III Survey on EU stakeholders: overview of responses

Stakeholder Survey – Evaluation of the European Year 2010

Status:	Closed	Panel size:	169
Start date:	16-2-2011	Bounced:	1 (0,6%)
End date:	4-3-2011	Declined:	1 (0,6%)
Live:	17 days	Partial completes:	11 (30,6%)
Questions:	53	Screened out:	0 (0%)
Languages:	en	Reached end:	25 (69,4%)
		Total responded:	36 (21,3%)

















SECTION 1: Your organisation

1. *What type of organisation do you represent? Select from the following options.*
(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Social NGO	18		50 %
2 Other NGO	3		8 %
3 Foundation	1		3 %
4 Service provider	1		3 %
5 Business/employer	0		0 %
6 Trade union organisation	0		0 %
7 Media	0		0 %
8 Regional/Local public authority (and organisations representing them)	8		22 %
9 International organisation	5		14 %
10 University or research centre	0		0 %
11 Think tank	0		0 %
12 Other	0		0 %
Total respondents: 36 Skipped question: 0			

2. In general, which of the following thematic areas correspond to your organisation's areas of interest? You may tick more than one.











(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Poverty and social exclusion in general	27		75 %
2 Children,	14		39 %
3 Families, single parents	10		28 %
4 Young people	16		44 %
5 Elderly	16		44 %
6 Women	14		39 %
7 People with disabilities	17		47 %
8 Migrants and ethnic minorities	20		56 %
9 Homeless people	15		42 %
10 Inclusive labour markets	21		58 %
11 Education and training	16		44 %
12 Housing	14		39 %
13 Services	16		44 %
14 Social Protection, income support	14		39 %
15 Cross-thematic strategies	18		50 %
Total respondents: 36 Skipped question: 0			

SECTION 2: Your involvement in the EY2010






3. What was your involvement with the EY2010... ..in terms of activities and outputs (with a primarily pan-EU focus)? Please highlight from the following options in terms of: Tools

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Website	28		85 %
2 Pages on social networks	13		39 %
3 Press, TV and radio advertisements	6		18 %
4 Information, training and educational materials (no. originals created)	10		30 %
5 Posters (no. originals created)	7		21 %
6 Films, videos (no. originals created)	7		21 %
7 Leaflets, brochures, publications (no. originals created)	20		61 %
8 Research studies, data collections	15		45 %
9 No involvement in this particular area	3		9 %
Total respondents: 33 Skipped question: 0			








4. Policy initiatives

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Manifestos, declarations, charters, policy recommendation documents	28		85 %
2 Action plans	6		18 %
3 Pieces of legislation	2		6 %
4 No involvement in this particular area	3		9 %
Total respondents: 33 Skipped question: 0			







5. What was your involvement with the EY2010... ..in terms of activities and outputs (with a primarily pan-EU focus)? Please highlight from the following options in terms of: Events and activities

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Conferences, meetings, workshops and seminars	30		97 %
2 Other awareness raising activities	17		55 %
3 Training courses	5		16 %
4 Grassroot initiatives and pilot projects	6		19 %
5 Competitions	4		13 %
6 Exhibitions	9		29 %
7 No involvement in this particular area	0		0 %
Total respondents: 31 Skipped question: 1			






6. Media activity

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Printed or online press articles	13		42 %
2 Audiovisual programmes	3		10 %
3 Radio programmes	2		6 %
4 Other outputs	4		13 %
5 No involvement in this particular area	15		48 %
Total respondents: 31 Skipped question: 1			






7. What was your involvement with the EY2010.....in terms of partnership working (with a primarily pan-EU focus)? Please highlight from the following options in terms of:

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Member of NGO Coalition for the Year	19		61 %
2 Working with EU institutions (e.g. European Commission, Economic and Social Committee, Spanish and/or Belgian EU Presidencies)	24		77 %
3 Working with other stakeholders at EU level	19		61 %
4 Working with national-level stakeholders	17		55 %
5 No involvement in this particular area	0		0 %
Total respondents: 31 Skipped question: 1			

8. How would you rate the extent of your involvement?






(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Limited	3		10 %
2 Moderate	9		29 %
3 Significant	16		52 %
4 Intensive	3		10 %
Average: 2,61 — Median: 3			
Total respondents: 31 Skipped question: 1			

SECTION 3: Relevance of the EY2010 to your needs


9. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?'Organising a specific European Year was an appropriate and relevant mechanism for raising awareness on social exclusion and poverty across Europe'

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Strongly agree	7		22 %
2 Agree	18		56 %
3 No strong view	3		9 %
4 Disagree	3		9 %
5 Strongly disagree	1		3 %
Average: 2,16 — Median: 2			
Total respondents: 32 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

10. Please explain:







(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	9		25 %
Total respondents: 9 Skipped question: 23		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

11.1. How relevant do you consider the EY2010 was in terms of:

- The economic and social challenges facing Europe?







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very relevant	11		34 %
2 Quite relevant	16		50 %
3 Not very relevant	4		12 %
4 Not at all relevant	1		3 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 1,84 — Median: 2			
 Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	7		19 %
Total respondents: 32 Skipped question: 0			

11.2. How relevant do you consider the EY2010 was in terms of:

- Your field of work/sector/area of interest?







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very relevant	11		34 %
2 Quite relevant	16		50 %
3 Not very relevant	4		12 %
4 Not at all relevant	1		3 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 1,84 — Median: 2			
 Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	8		22 %
Total respondents: 32 Skipped question: 0			

12.1. How relevant do you consider the EY2010 was in terms of mobilising interest amongst:

- The general public?






(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very relevant	1		3 %
2 Quite relevant	8		25 %
3 Not very relevant	16		50 %
4 Not at all relevant	7		22 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 2,91 — Median: 3			
 Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	7		19 %
Total respondents: 32 Skipped question: 0			

12.2. How relevant do you consider the EY2010 was in terms of mobilising interest amongst:

- Public authorities?








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very relevant	5		16 %
2 Quite relevant	17		53 %
3 Not very relevant	10		31 %
4 Not at all relevant	0		0 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 2,16 — Median: 2			
 Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	5		14 %
Total respondents: 32 Skipped question: 0			

12.3. How relevant do you consider the EY2010 was in terms of mobilising interest amongst:

- Media?






(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very relevant	1		3 %
2 Quite relevant	14		44 %
3 Not very relevant	13		41 %
4 Not at all relevant	3		9 %
- Don't know	1		3 %
Average: 2,58 — Median: 2,50			
 Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	6		17 %
Total respondents: 32 Skipped question: 0			

12.4. How relevant do you consider the EY2010 was in terms of mobilising interest amongst:

- Stakeholders including NGOs?








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very relevant	14		44 %
2 Quite relevant	16		50 %
3 Not very relevant	2		6 %
4 Not at all relevant	0		0 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 1,62 — Median: 2			
 Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	7		19 %
Total respondents: 32 Skipped question: 0			

12.5. How relevant do you consider the EY2010 was in terms of mobilising interest amongst:






- People experiencing poverty and social exclusion?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very relevant	3		9 %
2 Quite relevant	12		38 %
3 Not very relevant	14		44 %
4 Not at all relevant	2		6 %
- Don't know	1		3 %
Average: 2,48 — Median: 2,50			
 Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	6		17 %
Total respondents: 32 Skipped question: 0			

13. To what extent do you agree that the following aims of the EY2010 itself (formulated from the legal basis and other sources for the purposes of this evaluation) were relevant to your needs as a stakeholder? The overall objective to broaden popular and political support to the fight against poverty and social inclusion in the EU.







(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Strongly agree	8		27 %
2 Agree	18		60 %
3 No strong view	2		7 %
4 Disagree	2		7 %
5 Strongly disagree	0		0 %
Average: 1,93 — Median: 2			
Total respondents: 30 Skipped question: 0			

14.1. The specific objectives to:

- Promote recognition of the fundamental right of people in a situation of poverty and social exclusion to live in dignity and to play a full part in society.







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Strongly agree	10		33 %
2 Agree	11		37 %
3 No strong view	8		27 %
4 Disagree	1		3 %
5 Strongly disagree	0		0 %
Average: 2 — Median: 2			
 Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 30 Skipped question: 0			

14.2. The specific objectives to:

- Promote the sharing of responsibility and widespread participation in the fight against poverty and social exclusion by public and private collective actors, individual citizens and people experiencing poverty and social exclusion.







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Strongly agree	9		30 %
2 Agree	11		37 %
3 No strong view	9		30 %
4 Disagree	1		3 %
5 Strongly disagree	0		0 %
Average: 2,07 — Median: 2			
 Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 30 Skipped question: 0			

14.3. The specific objectives to:

- Raise awareness of benefits for all of a cohesive society where poverty is eradicated, fair distribution is enabled and no one is marginalised






(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Strongly agree	11		37 %
2 Agree	11		37 %
3 No strong view	7		23 %
4 Disagree	1		3 %
5 Strongly disagree	0		0 %
Average: 1,93 — Median: 2			
 Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 30 Skipped question: 0			

14.4. The specific objectives to:

- Intensify political commitment and concrete action to make a decisive impact on the eradication of poverty and social exclusion by Member States and EU.







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Strongly agree	10		33 %
2 Agree	14		47 %
3 No strong view	6		20 %
4 Disagree	0		0 %
5 Strongly disagree	0		0 %
Average: 1,87 — Median: 2			
 Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	5		14 %
Total respondents: 30 Skipped question: 0			

15.1. To what degree have you found the EY2010 to be complementary to other Community policies and programmes?

- European Social Fund







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very complementary	3		10 %
2	2		7 %
3	11		38 %
4	7		24 %
5 Not at all complementary	1		3 %
- Don't know	5		17 %
Average: 3,04 — Median: 3			
Total respondents: 29 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

15.2. To what degree have you found the EY2010 to be complementary to other Community policies and programmes?

- PROGRESS programme







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very complementary	5		17 %
2	9		31 %
3	5		17 %
4	6		21 %
5 Not at all complementary	1		3 %
- Don't know	3		10 %
Average: 2,58 — Median: 2			
Total respondents: 29 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

15.3. To what degree have you found the EY2010 to be complementary to other Community policies and programmes?



- EU Social Protection and Social Inclusion Process

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very complementary	5		17 %
2	9		31 %
3	8		28 %
4	4		14 %
5 Not at all complementary	0		0 %
- Don't know	3		10 %
Average: 2,42 — Median: 2			
Total respondents: 29			
Skipped question: 0			







16. Please explain:

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	7		19 %
Total respondents: 7			
Skipped question: 0			



17. To what extent do you consider that the various types of activities supported under the EY2010 were relevant and appropriate in the context of issues of social exclusion across the EU?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very relevant/ appropriate	1		3 %
2	8		28 %
3	13		45 %
4	4		14 %
5 Completely irrelevant/ appropriate	0		0 %
- Don't know	3		10 %
Average: 2,77 — Median: 3			
Total respondents: 29 Skipped question: 0			

18. Please explain:

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)








Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	9		25 %
Total respondents: 9 Skipped question: 0			

SECTION 4: Effectiveness of EY2010 activities

19.1. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?EU level events:

- Workshops and seminars








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	4		14 %
2	13		45 %
3	10		34 %
4	1		3 %
5 Completely inappropriate	0		0 %
- Don't know	1		3 %
Average: 2,29 — Median: 2			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	2		6 %
Total respondents: 29 Skipped question: 0			

19.2. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?EU level events:

- Conferences and exhibitions









(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	4		14 %
2	8		28 %
3	14		48 %
4	2		7 %
5 Completely inappropriate	0		0 %
- Don't know	1		3 %
Average: 2,50 — Median: 3			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 29 Skipped question: 0			

19.3. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?EU level events:

- Focus Days or Weeks








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	4		14 %
2	13		45 %
3	4		14 %
4	4		14 %
5 Completely inappropriate	2		7 %
- Don't know	2		7 %
Average: 2,52 — Median: 2			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 29 Skipped question: 0			

20.1. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?
Projects:

- Case studies and best practice compilations








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	8		28 %
2	12		41 %
3	6		21 %
4	2		7 %
5 Completely inappropriate	0		0 %
- Don't know	1		3 %
Average: 2,07 — Median: 2			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 29 Skipped question: 0			

20.2. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?
Projects:

- EU-level studies, surveys or other research








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	7		24 %
2	15		52 %
3	4		14 %
4	2		7 %
5 Completely inappropriate	0		0 %
- Don't know	1		3 %
Average: 2,04 — Median: 2			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 29 Skipped question: 0			

20.3. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?
Projects:

- Toolkits on specific aspects









(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	4		14 %
2	13		45 %
3	7		24 %
4	2		7 %
5 Completely inappropriate	0		0 %
- Don't know	3		10 %
Average: 2,27 — Median: 2			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 29 Skipped question: 0			

21.1. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?
 Information and communication activity:

- Magazine, newsletter, leaflets etc.









(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	4		14 %
2	8		29 %
3	9		32 %
4	5		18 %
5 Completely inappropriate	1		4 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,67 — Median: 3			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	2		6 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0			

21.2. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?
 Information and communication activity:

- Audio-visual material (DVD, video clips etc.)









(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	5		18 %
2	10		36 %
3	7		25 %
4	3		11 %
5 Completely inappropriate	2		7 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,52 — Median: 2			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	2		6 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0			

21.3. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?
 Information and communication activity:

- Websites, web pages or online publications









(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	6		21 %
2	12		43 %
3	6		21 %
4	2		7 %
5 Completely inappropriate	1		4 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,26 — Median: 2			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	2		6 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0			

21.4. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?
Information and communication activity:

- Publicising the EY2010 in the press, including TV and radio









(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	9		32 %
2	5		18 %
3	8		29 %
4	3		11 %
5 Completely inappropriate	1		4 %
- Don't know	2		7 %
Average: 2,31 — Median: 2			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0			

21.5. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?
 Information and communication activity:

- EU-wide campaigns, including advertising








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	9		32 %
2	7		25 %
3	5		18 %
4	3		11 %
5 Completely inappropriate	3		11 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,41 — Median: 2			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0			

21.6. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?
 Information and communication activity:

- Journalists Competitions








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	4		14 %
2	7		25 %
3	11		39 %
4	5		18 %
5 Completely inappropriate	1		4 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 2,71 — Median: 3			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0			

22.1. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?
Partnership working and policy activity:

- Working with EU institutions (e.g. European Commission, Economic and Social Committee, Spanish and/or Belgian EU Presidencies)








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	15		54 %
2	8		29 %
3	2		7 %
4	2		7 %
5 Completely inappropriate	0		0 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 1,67 — Median: 1			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	5		14 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0			

22.2. Given the purpose of the EY2010, to what extent do you think the following activities it supported were appropriate (i.e. likely to lead to the achievement of the EY2010's objectives)?
Partnership working and policy activity:

- Manifestos, declarations, charters, policy recommendation documents, action plans







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very appropriate	8		29 %
2	10		36 %
3	6		21 %
4	3		11 %
5 Completely inappropriate	0		0 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,15 — Median: 2			
Please comment on the balance of types of activity:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0			

23.1. To what extent do you consider that EU-level activities addressed the issues associated with the following at risk groups.

- Children, single parents, large families







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	7		26 %
2	12		44 %
3	4		15 %
4	1		4 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	3		11 %
Average: 1,96 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

23.2. To what extent do you consider that EU-level activities addressed the issues associated with the following at risk groups.

- Youth








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	3		11 %
2	10		37 %
3	7		26 %
4	3		11 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	4		15 %
Average: 2,43 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

23.3. To what extent do you consider that EU-level activities addressed the issues associated with the following at risk groups.

- Elderly








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	1		4 %
2	8		30 %
3	10		37 %
4	3		11 %
5 Not at all	1		4 %
- Don't know	4		15 %
Average: 2,78 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

23.4. To what extent do you consider that EU-level activities addressed the issues associated with the following at risk groups.

- Women








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	2		7 %
2	8		30 %
3	9		33 %
4	3		11 %
5 Not at all	1		4 %
- Don't know	4		15 %
Average: 2,70 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

23.5. To what extent do you consider that EU-level activities addressed the issues associated with the following at risk groups.

- People with Disabilities







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	3		11 %
2	7		26 %
3	9		33 %
4	4		15 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	4		15 %
Average: 2,61 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0			

23.6. To what extent do you consider that EU-level activities addressed the issues associated with the following at risk groups.

- Migrants and Ethnic Minorities







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	0		0 %
2	8		30 %
3	10		37 %
4	6		22 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	3		11 %
Average: 2,92 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0			

23.7. To what extent do you consider that EU-level activities addressed the issues associated with the following at risk groups.

- Homeless people









(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	7		26 %
2	16		59 %
3	3		11 %
4	0		0 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 1,85 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0			

24.1. To what extent do you think the EY2010 reached the following final and intermediary target groups?

- People experiencing poverty and social exclusion







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	1		4 %
2	4		15 %
3	12		44 %
4	7		26 %
5 Not at all	2		7 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 3,19 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0			

24.2. To what extent do you think the EY2010 reached the following final and intermediary target groups?

- The general public







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	1		4 %
2	2		7 %
3	9		33 %
4	10		37 %
5 Not at all	5		19 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 3,59 — Median: 4			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

24.3. To what extent do you think the EY2010 reached the following final and intermediary target groups?

- Media professionals and organisations






(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	1		4 %
2	7		26 %
3	11		41 %
4	7		26 %
5 Not at all	1		4 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 3 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

24.4. To what extent do you think the EY2010 reached the following final and intermediary target groups?

- Public authorities





(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	5		19 %
2	12		44 %
3	7		26 %
4	3		11 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 2,30 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

24.5. To what extent do you think the EY2010 reached the following final and intermediary target groups?

- Stakeholders (NGOs, social partners etc.)








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	13		48 %
2	11		41 %
3	3		11 %
4	0		0 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 1,63 — Median: 1,50			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

24.6. To what extent do you think the EY2010 reached the following final and intermediary target groups?

- Employers and the business sector








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	0		0 %
2	3		11 %
3	6		22 %
4	10		37 %
5 Not at all	5		19 %
- Don't know	3		11 %
Average: 3,71 — Median: 4			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0			

24.7. To what extent do you think the EY2010 reached the following final and intermediary target groups?

- Member State governments









(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	3		11 %
2	13		48 %
3	6		22 %
4	4		15 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,42 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0			

24.8. To what extent do you think the EY2010 reached the following final and intermediary target groups?






- Educational institutions

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	1		4 %
2	1		4 %
3	8		30 %
4	12		44 %
5 Not at all	2		7 %
- Don't know	3		11 %
Average: 3,54 — Median: 4			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0			


25. To what extent did the EY2010 achieve the goal of involving people experiencing poverty?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a very large extent	0		0 %
2 To a significant extent	5		19 %
3 To a moderate extent	14		52 %
4 To a limited extent	7		26 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 3,08 — Median: 3			
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0			






26. Please explain:

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	5		14 %
Total respondents: 5 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	


27. To what degree do you think that the EY2010 has taken into account the gender dimension of poverty and social exclusion?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	0		0 %
2	3		12 %
3	14		54 %
4	6		23 %
5 Not at all	1		4 %
- Don't know	2		8 %
Average: 3,21 — Median: 3			
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

28. Please explain:

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	2		6 %
Total respondents: 2 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

29. Can you cite any examples of ways in which EY2010 supported activity has aimed to address the unbalanced impact of poverty and social exclusion across genders? If so, how effective these attempts have been?

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 2000 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	7		19 %
Total respondents: 7 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

30. To what degree do you think that the EY2010 has taken into account the disability dimension of poverty and social exclusion?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	1		4 %
2	4		15 %
3	7		27 %
4	5		19 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	9		35 %
Average: 2,94 — Median: 3			
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

31. Please explain:

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)







Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 4 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

32. How effective do you think the EY2010 activities have been overall in terms of achieving against the following indicators of success?

Promoting and supporting the existence of activities that produce added value since they:


- Would not be eligible for funding under PROGRESS and the ESF or Target different groups (eg. citizens, the media) or creating best practice examples
- Produce innovation and learning, by Improve the process of implemented the other initiatives.

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very effective	1		4 %
2	5		19 %
3	11		42 %
4	2		8 %
5 Completely ineffective	2		8 %
- Don't know	5		19 %
Average: 2,95 — Median: 3			
Total respondents: 26		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	
Skipped question: 0			

33. Please explain:






(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	5		14 %
Total respondents: 5		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	
Skipped question: 0			

34.1. To what degree do you believe that the EY2010 activities have:

- Clarified the EU's role in combating poverty and social exclusion






(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	3		12 %
2	15		58 %
3	6		23 %
4	2		8 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 2,27 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

34.2. To what degree do you believe that the EY2010 activities have:

- Provided good quality information on the reality of poverty and social exclusion







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	4		15 %
2	9		35 %
3	9		35 %
4	4		15 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 2,50 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

34.3. To what degree do you believe that the EY2010 activities have:

- Helped people to question stereotypes








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	2		8 %
2	5		19 %
3	10		38 %
4	7		27 %
5 Not at all	2		8 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 3,08 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

34.4. To what degree do you believe that the EY2010 activities have:

- Conveyed messages on collective responsibility







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	2		8 %
2	7		27 %
3	8		31 %
4	6		23 %
5 Not at all	2		8 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,96 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

34.5. To what degree do you believe that the EY2010 activities have:

- Provided opportunities and fora for public authorities to strengthen their commitments







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	4		15 %
2	11		42 %
3	6		23 %
4	4		15 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,40 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	5		14 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

SECTION 5: Delivery of the EY2010


35. How effective do you think the delivery mechanisms and procedures of the EU2010 have been (i.e. the way the year was implemented)?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very effective	1		4 %
2	9		35 %
3	8		31 %
4	6		23 %
5 Completely ineffective	1		4 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,88 — Median: 3			
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	





36. Please explain:

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	6		17 %
Total respondents: 6 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	


37. How efficient do you think the management structures at EU level (the Commission) were for the EY2010?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Very efficient	2		8 %
2 Moderately efficient	19		76 %
3 Not very efficient	2		8 %
4 Not at all efficient	2		8 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 2,16 — Median: 2			
Total respondents: 25 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	


38. Please explain:

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 3 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	


39. How clear was the role of the EU Expert Stakeholder Group and how effective was this mechanism (for example how it was structured, terms of reference, relationships and engagement with stakeholders and the Commission)?

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 2000 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	12		33 %
Total respondents: 12 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

40. Do you have any comments about the efficiency and effectiveness of the EY2010 at national level (including the delivery mechanism, funding, communication campaigns etc)? What was your role in making the link between the European and national levels?

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 2000 characters.)








Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	13		36 %
Total respondents: 13 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

SECTION 6: Impact and added value of the EY2010

41.1. To what degree do you consider that the EY2010 has led to: (linked to the EY2010 outcomes for the EY2010)

- Increased citizen volunteering









(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	0		0 %
2	1		4 %
3	7		27 %
4	7		27 %
5 Not at all	4		15 %
- Don't know	7		27 %
Average: 3,74 — Median: 4			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	2		6 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			

41.2. To what degree do you consider that the EY2010 has led to: (linked to the EY2010 outcomes for the EY2010)

- The introduction of new policies or new funding programmes addressing social exclusion









(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	1		4 %
2	7		27 %
3	10		38 %
4	2		8 %
5 Not at all	2		8 %
- Don't know	4		15 %
Average: 2,86 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	6		17 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			

41.3. To what degree do you consider that the EY2010 has led to: (linked to the EY2010 outcomes for the EY2010)

- The development of new and better indicators eg.concerning various form of poverty or social exclusion








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	1		4 %
2	6		23 %
3	13		50 %
4	1		4 %
5 Not at all	2		8 %
- Don't know	3		12 %
Average: 2,87 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			

41.4. To what degree do you consider that the EY2010 has led to: (linked to the EY2010 outcomes for the EY2010)

- Increased sharing of good practice









(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	1		4 %
2	13		50 %
3	9		35 %
4	2		8 %
5 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,48 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			

41.5. To what degree do you consider that the EY2010 has led to: (linked to the EY2010 outcomes for the EY2010)

- More widespread and accurate media coverage of poverty and social exclusion








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	1		4 %
2	5		19 %
3	12		46 %
4	5		19 %
5 Not at all	1		4 %
- Don't know	2		8 %
Average: 3 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			

41.6. To what degree do you consider that the EY2010 has led to: (linked to the EY2010 outcomes for the EY2010)

- Increased participation of NGOs and other stakeholders in policy processes








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	4		15 %
2	11		42 %
3	7		27 %
4	2		8 %
5 Not at all	1		4 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,40 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

41.7. To what degree do you consider that the EY2010 has led to: (linked to the EY2010 outcomes for the EY2010)

- New networks addressing social exclusion/ strengthening of existing networks









(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	4		15 %
2	8		31 %
3	6		23 %
4	2		8 %
5 Not at all	2		8 %
- Don't know	4		15 %
Average: 2,55 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	4		11 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

41.8. To what degree do you consider that the EY2010 has led to: (linked to the EY2010 outcomes for the EY2010)








- New partnerships between public and private actors

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great degree	4		15 %
2	5		19 %
3	8		31 %
4	4		15 %
5 Not at all	1		4 %
- Don't know	4		15 %
Average: 2,68 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			



42. To what extent do you think that the EY2010 has broadened popular and political support for the fight against poverty and social exclusion?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large extent	1		4 %
2	7		28 %
3	10		40 %
4	4		16 %
5 To no extent	2		8 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,96 — Median: 3			
Total respondents: 25 Skipped question: 0			

43. Please explain:







(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	8		22 %
Total respondents: 8 Skipped question: 0			

44.1. What elements of 'Added Value' do you believe have been brought about by the EY2010?

- Added value achieved on account of the scale and volume of supported activities







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large degree	2		8 %
2 To a moderate degree	8		31 %
3 Not very much	11		42 %
4 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	5		19 %
Average: 2,43 — Median: 2,50			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			

44.2. What elements of 'Added Value' do you believe have been brought about by the EY2010?

- Extending across a wider scope than other initiatives







(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large degree	2		8 %
2 To a moderate degree	10		38 %
3 Not very much	9		35 %
4 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	5		19 %
Average: 2,33 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	1		3 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			

44.3. What elements of 'Added Value' do you believe have been brought about by the EY2010?

- Promoting innovation and learning






(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large degree	1		4 %
2 To a moderate degree	10		38 %
3 Not very much	14		54 %
4 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	1		4 %
Average: 2,52 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	1		3 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			

44.4. What elements of 'Added Value' do you believe have been brought about by the EY2010?

- Helping to set and define agendas in the area of addressing social exclusion and poverty








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large degree	6		23 %
2 To a moderate degree	18		69 %
3 Not very much	2		8 %
4 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 1,85 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			

44.5. What elements of 'Added Value' do you believe have been brought about by the EY2010?

- Targeting different groups to those addressed under alternative provision/ programmes








(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large degree	1		4 %
2 To a moderate degree	10		38 %
3 Not very much	11		42 %
4 Not at all	1		4 %
- Don't know	3		12 %
Average: 2,52 — Median: 2,50			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			

44.6. What elements of 'Added Value' do you believe have been brought about by the EY2010?

- Improving the process of implementing other initiatives






(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large degree	1		4 %
2 To a moderate degree	5		19 %
3 Not very much	11		42 %
4 Not at all	2		8 %
- Don't know	7		27 %
Average: 2,74 — Median: 3			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	3		8 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			

44.7. What elements of 'Added Value' do you believe have been brought about by the EY2010?







- Created synergies between different players (national governments, local governments, social partners, NGOs, journalists and the media)

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a large degree	7		27 %
2 To a moderate degree	15		58 %
3 Not very much	4		15 %
4 Not at all	0		0 %
- Don't know	0		0 %
Average: 1,88 — Median: 2			
Please explain:	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	1		3 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 0			



45. To what degree do you consider that the EY2010 will bring about long-term and lasting impacts?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 To a great extent	0		0 %
2	9		35 %
3	9		35 %
4	4		15 %
5 Not at all	2		8 %
- Don't know	2		8 %
Average: 2,96 — Median: 3			
Total respondents: 26			
Skipped question: 0			



46. Please explain:

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	10		28 %
Total respondents: 10			
Skipped question: 0			

47. Can you cite any examples of actions which have sought to prolong the impact of the EY2010 beyond 2010 in terms of follow-up support, or ensuring that the activities can be sustained into the future?


(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 2000 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	11		31 %
Total respondents: 11			
Skipped question: 0			

SECTION 7: Learning


48. Are there any aspects of the EY2010 that could have been improved?

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 2000 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	14		39 %
Total respondents: 14 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	


49. What lessons do you think can be drawn from the EY2010 and what could be your recommendations for future European Years?

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 2000 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	13		36 %
Total respondents: 13 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	


50. Any other general comments that you would like to add?

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 2000 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	5		14 %
Total respondents: 5 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	


51. What is your name? Please note that this information will be kept confidential but will help us keep a record of who has responded to the survey.

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	18		50 %
Total respondents: 18 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	



52. What is your position within your organisation?

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of total respondents	%
Open answer	18		50 %
Total respondents: 18 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	

53. Would you be willing to be contacted at a further date in relation to this evaluation

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Yes	12		50 %
2 No	12		50 %
Total respondents: 24 Skipped question: 0		<input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 40% <input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> 80%	



Annex IV Survey on National Implementing Bodies: overview of responses

This annex is based on National Implementing Bodies' responses to the common online questionnaire. It only includes responses that contribute to an overall understanding of NIBs' activities and views: introductory and open-ended questions are not reported, which explains why the numbering of questions is not continuous.

46.1. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- There are agreements between NGOs and NIBs to continue the cooperation after the end of the Year on a regular basis




(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	19		68 %
2 No	9		32 %
- Do not know	0		0 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.2. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- There are plans to involve people experiencing poverty in policy initiatives after the end of the Year




(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	21		75 %
2 No	5		18 %
- Do not know	2		7 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.3. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- NGOs report an increased citizens interest in volunteering and donating after some initiatives taken during the Year




(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	14		50 %
2 No	4		14 %
- Do not know	10		36 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.4. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- There are plans to apply elsewhere good practice examples made known during the Year

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	23		82 %
2 No	2		7 %
- Do not know	3		11 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.5. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- Some initiatives have been started by media professionals to achieve a more widespread and correct media coverage of poverty and social exclusion

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	16		57 %
2 No	5		18 %
- Do not know	7		25 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.6. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- New partnerships with media and journalists were established during the EY

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	18		64 %
2 No	5		18 %
- Do not know	5		18 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.7. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- New networks addressing social exclusion have been created during the Year



(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	19		68 %
2 No	4		14 %
- Do not know	5		18 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.8. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- The existing networks have been strengthened in terms of visibility, resources, knowledge base, etc.




(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	27		96 %
2 No	0		0 %
- Do not know	1		4 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.9. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- New policies, funding programmes addressing social exclusion have been launched and will be implemented after the Year




(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	14		50 %
2 No	9		32 %
- Do not know	5		18 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.10. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- New and better indicators have been proposed and will be implemented after the Year




(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	14		50 %
2 No	10		36 %
- Do not know	4		14 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.11. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- Gender disaggregated data have been disseminated




(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	9		32 %
2 No	14		50 %
- Do not know	5		18 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.12. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- New structures and bodies have been created by the EU, national or regional governments to address poverty and social exclusion




(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	11		39 %
2 No	13		46 %
- Do not know	4		14 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.13. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- The existing structures and bodies have been strengthened in terms of visibility, resources, knowledge base, etc.




(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	24		86 %
2 No	3		11 %
- Do not know	1		4 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.14. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- New partnerships between public and private actors have been established and will continue functioning after the Year




(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	16		57 %
2 No	7		25 %
- Do not know	5		18 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.15. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

- New services for socially excluded people have been conceived and will be tested after the Year




(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	18		64 %
2 No	8		29 %
- Do not know	2		7 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

46.16. Which of the following results have been achieved to date through the EY2010 implementation in your country? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):



- Other, please specify

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	2		22 %
2 No	3		33 %
- Do not know	4		44 %
Total respondents: 9 Skipped question: 19		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	



47. Can you mention any projects or activities that have been conceived in the context of EY2010 activities and will be implemented from 2011 onwards? (consider both NIB and stakeholder-initiated activities, with or without EY2010 funding):

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	25		89 %
2 No	3		11 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 19		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	




51. Can you mention any events that have been planned in the context of EY2010 activities and will have a lasting effect after 2010?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes	21		75 %
2 No	7		25 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 19		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	












55. Did the EY2010 involve any actors that were not previously engaged in social inclusion issues?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Yes, many	8		29 %
2 Yes, a few	18		64 %
3 No	2		7 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 20		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	




56. Please specify to which categories these actors belong to (tick all that apply)

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 NGOs	15		58 %
2 People experiencing poverty	16		62 %
3 Business sector	16		62 %
4 Educational institutions	16		62 %
5 EU Representations	8		31 %
6 Other central Government ministries	9		35 %
7 Regional government	9		35 %
8 Local government (including city authorities)	12		46 %
9 Media organisations	16		62 %
10 Cultural actors	16		62 %
11 Other, please specify	7		27 %
Total respondents: 26 Skipped question: 20		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

58. Did the EY2010 strengthen or reactivate any existing actors of the fight against poverty and social exclusion?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Yes, many	15		54 %
2 Yes, a few	12		43 %
3 No	1		4 %
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 20		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

59. Please specify to which categories these actors belong to (tick all that apply)

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 NGOs	27		100 %
2 People experiencing poverty	20		74 %
3 Business sector	6		22 %
4 Trade unions	11		41 %
5 Educational institutions	12		44 %
6 EU Representations	11		41 %
7 Central Government ministries	12		44 %
8 Regional government	8		30 %
9 Local government (including city authorities)	17		63 %
10 Media organisations	17		63 %
11 Other, please specify	1		4 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 20		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	





61. Can you provide any examples of how the EY2010 produced or strengthened any partnerships working in new ways to bring together public, private and non-profit actors in the fight against poverty and social exclusion? If so, please describe fully below.

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 2000 characters.)

Response	Number of responses	% of total respondents	%
Yes	20		71 %
Total respondents: 20 Skipped question: 20		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

62. How would you assess the cooperation with the communication contractor correspondents in your country?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Number of responses	% of responses	%
1 Excellent	9		32 %
2 Good	10		36 %
3 Average	7		25 %
4 Poor	2		7 %
5 Very poor	0		0 %
Average: 2,07 — Median: 2			
Total respondents: 28 Skipped question: 20		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	



P.O. Box 4175
3006 AD Rotterdam
The Netherlands

Watermanweg 44
3067 GG Rotterdam
The Netherlands

T +31 (0)10 453 88 00
F +31 (0)10 453 07 68
E netherlands@ecorys.com

W www.ecorys.nl

Sound analysis, inspiring ideas