

Final Evaluation Report

of the European Early Intervention Project “FreD goes net”

- Appendix -

Commissioned by Landschaftsverband
Westfalen-Lippe, Koordinationsstelle
Sucht

FOGS

FOGS
Gesellschaft für
Forschung und Beratung
im Gesundheits- und
Sozialbereich

Prälat-Otto-Müller-Platz 2
50670 Köln
Tel.: 0221-973101-0
Fax: 0221-973101-11

E-Mail: kontakt@fogs-gmbh.de
www.fogs-gmbh.de

Editors:

Wilfried Görgen (Dipl. Psychology)

Rüdiger Hartmann (MA Sociology)

Sarah Karim (BA Sociology)

Cologne, August 2010

Project No. 723/2007

Content

<u>No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	PROJECT COORDINATION AND PROJECT EVALUATION	1
2	IMPLEMENTATION AND COORDINATION IN THE PILOT COUNTRIES	7
3	DOCUMENTATION OF USER DATA	9
4	SURVEY OF COURSE PARTICIPANTS	15
5	SURVEY OF PROJECT MANAGERS	16

List of tables

<u>No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
Tab. 1:	Evaluation of the kick-off conference in terms of content and organisation	1
Tab. 2:	Evaluation of workshop I in terms of content and organisation	2
Tab. 3:	Evaluation of workshop II in terms of content and organisation	3
Tab. 4:	Evaluation of RAR	4
Tab. 5:	Realisation of RAR (sum of items)	4
Tab. 6:	Satisfaction with the course of ...	4
Tab. 7:	Satisfaction with the contents of the kick-off conference and workshops I and II (sum of items)	4
Tab. 8:	Satisfaction with the evaluation-related content of the kick-off conference and workshops I and II (sum of items)	5
Tab. 9:	Satisfaction with the organisation and realisation of the kick-off conference and workshops I and II (sum of items)	5
Tab. 10:	Satisfaction with the course of the kick-off conference and workshops I and II (sum of items)	5
Tab. 11:	Evaluation of the train the trainer seminar in terms of content and organisation	6
Tab. 12:	Degree of expected difficulties in achieving the set project targets (as established during the kick-off-conference)	7
Tab. 13:	Status and outcomes of the RAR investigation (Workshop I)	8
Tab. 14:	Status of implementation in own country (Workshop II)	8
Tab. 15:	Gender	9
Tab. 16:	Gender by country	9
Tab. 17:	Age by gender	10
Tab. 18:	Average age by country	10
Tab. 19:	Housing situation	11
Tab. 20:	Referring institution by country	12
Tab. 21:	Consumption ever in life – by country and substances	13
Tab. 22:	Course utilisation by country	14
Tab. 23:	Distribution by country	15
Tab. 24:	Gender	15
Tab. 25:	Age	15
Tab. 26:	Satisfaction with FreD goes net's contribution to exchanging technical knowledge between participating countries	16
Tab. 27:	Satisfaction with FreD goes net's contribution to fostering mutual understanding and more in-depth information on legal provisions, prevention and support	16
Tab. 28:	Evaluation of aspects of implementation	16
Tab. 29:	Evaluation of cooperation	17
Tab. 30:	Evaluation of framework conditions	17

1 Project coordination and project evaluation¹

Tab. 1: Evaluation of the kick-off conference in terms of content and organisation

Content of FreD goes net (5 items)	fully agree		partly agree		don't quite agree		disagree	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
The aims of the project FreD goes net were comprehensively presented.	10	62.5	6	37.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Structures and processes of FreD goes net were explained comprehensively.	13	81.3	3	18.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
The first steps for implementing FreD goes net in my country are clear.	5	31.3	11	68.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
The method "Rapid Assessment and Responses" (RAR) ¹ was presented.	11	68.8	5	31.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Requirements for applying the method of RAR are now clear.	3	18.8	13	81.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
SUM of items	42	52.5	38	47.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Evaluation (2 items)								
The evaluation concept for FreD goes net was comprehensively shown.	8	50.0	7	43.8	1	6.3	0	0.0
Initial steps to be taken for implementing the evaluation are clear.	5	31.3	10	62.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
SUM of items	13	41.9	17	54.8	1	3.2	0	0.0
Organisation and realisation of the conference (3 items)								
The atmosphere of the kick-off conference was good.	15	93.8	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
The timeframe was appropriate.	11	68.8	3	18.8	2	12.5	0	0.0
I had ample opportunity to ask questions and to make suggestions.	11	68.8	5	31.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
SUM of items	37	77.1	9	18.8	2	4.2	0	0.0

¹ Note on analysis: Not all respondents answered all the questions. Analysis is always based on the total number of *valid* answers that were supplied for each question.

Tab. 2: Evaluation of workshop I in terms of content and organisation

Workshop content (5 items)	fully agree		partly agree		don't quite agree		disagree	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Country RAR results were comprehensively presented.	7	41.2	10	58.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
The key subjects to be covered by the manual were identified and agreed.	7	46.7	6	40.0	2	13.3	0	0.0
The next working steps are clear und unambiguous.	10	58.8	7	41.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ideas on public relations were collected and exchanged.	10	66.7	4	26.7	1	6.7	0	0.0
I obtained helpful suggestions for implementing FredD goes net in my country.	7	41.2	7	41.2	3	17.6	0	0.0
SUM of items	41	50.6	34	42.0	6	7.4	0	0.0
Workshop organisation and realisation (3 items)								
The atmosphere of Workshop I was good.	15	88.2	1	5.9	1	5.9	0	0.0
The time frame was appropriate.	9	52.9	6	35.3	2	11.8	0	0.0
I had ample opportunity for asking questions and making suggestions.	14	82.4	3	17.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
SUM of items	38	74.5	10	19.6	3	5.9	0	0.0

Tab. 3: Evaluation of workshop II in terms of content and organisation

Workshop content (6 items)	fully agree		partly agree		don't quite agree		disagree	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
The draft of the manual "FreD goes net" (Part I) was provided on time.	8	57.1	5	35.7	1	7.1	0	0.0
Chapter 2 (introduction) of the manual was sufficiently discussed.	8	57.1	6	42.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
Chapter 3 (theoretical and methodical bases) of the manual was sufficiently discussed.	10	71.4	4	28.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Chapter 4 (implementation) of the manual was sufficiently discussed.	11	78.6	2	14.3	1	7.1	0	0.0
Practical questions related to implementing the courses were sufficiently discussed.	9	64.3	5	35.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
The contents of the flyer for course participants were sufficiently discussed so that I can create a flyer for my country.	9	64.3	3	21.4	2	14.3	0	0.0
SUM of items	55	65.6	25	29.8	4	4.8	0	0.0
Evaluation (1 item)								
The instruments for evaluating FreD goes net were introduced and sufficiently discussed.	13	92.9	0	.0	1	7.1	0	0.0
Workshop organisation and realisation (3 items)								
The atmosphere of Workshop II was good.	11	78.6	3	21.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
The timeframe was appropriate.	12	85.7	2	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
I had ample opportunity to ask questions and make suggestions.	9	64.3	3	21.4	2	14.3	0	0.0
SUM of items	32	76.2	8	19.0	2	4.8	0	0.0

Tab. 4: Evaluation of RAR

	fully agree		partly agree		don't quite agree		disagree	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
In my country internet and literature research were carried out successfully.	12	70.6	5	29.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
In my country research results have delivered important knowledge on national conditions.	7	41.2	8	47.1	2	11.8	0	0.0
In my country research results have delivered important knowledge on the current state of early intervention measures.	5	29.4	10	58.8	1	5.9	1	5.9
In my country research results on the current state of early intervention have been (will be) helpful for implementing Fred goes net.	4	23.5	7	41.2	4	23.5	2	11.8
SUM of items RAR I	28	41.2	30	44.1	7	10.3	3	4.4

Tab. 5: Realisation of RAR (sum of items)

	fully agree		partly agree		don't quite agree		disagree	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Sum of items, realisation of RAR	28	41.2	30	44.1	7	10.3	3	4.4

Tab. 6: Satisfaction with the course of ...

	highly satisfied		quite satisfied		less satisfied		dissatisfied	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Kick-off-conference	8	50.0	8	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Workshop I	7	41.2	9	52.9	1	5.9	0	0.0
Workshop II	9	64.3	5	35.7	0	0.0	0	0.0

Tab. 7: Satisfaction with the contents of the kick-off conference and workshops I and II (sum of items)

	very high		high		not very high		low	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Sum of items, satisfaction with the contents of the kick-off conference and workshops I and II	138	56.3	97	39.6	10	4.1	0	0.0

Tab. 8: Satisfaction with the evaluation-related content of the kick-off conference and workshops I and II (sum of items)

	very high		high		not very high		low	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
sum of items, satisfaction with the content of the kick-off conference and workshops I and II in terms of the evaluation concept	26	57.8	17	37.8	2	4.4	0	0.0

Tab. 9: Satisfaction with the organisation and realisation of the kick-off conference and workshops I and II (sum of items)

	very high		high		not very high		low	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Satisfaction with the organisation and realisation of the kick-off conference and workshops I and II	107	75.9	27	19.1	7	5.0	0	0.0

Tab. 10: Satisfaction with the course of the kick-off conference and workshops I and II (sum of items)

	very high		high		not very high		low	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Satisfaction with the overall course of the kick-off conference and workshops I and II	24	51.1	22	46.8	1	2.1	0	0.0

Tab. 11: Evaluation of the train the trainer seminar in terms of content and organisation

	fully agree		partly agree		don't quite agree		disagree	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
The method of Motivational Interviewing (MI) was presented and sufficient training was provided.	8	32.0	12	48.0	2	8.0	3	12.0
The methods used to implement the courses were presented and sufficiently explained.	9	36.0	14	56.0	2	8.0	0	0.0
Other basic concepts (e.g. salutogenesis, TCI) were presented and sufficient explanation was given.	5	20.0	12	48.0	6	24.0	2	8.0
I feel well prepared to run the FreD goes net courses.	8	32.0	14	56.0	1	4.0	2	8.0
SUM of items	30	30.0	52	52.0	11	11.0	7	7.0
I expect the method Motivational Interviewing (MI) to be helpful in working with the FreD goes net participants.	20	80.0	4	16.0	0	0.0	1	4.0
I expect the methods presented to be helpful in running the courses.	19	76.0	5	20.0	1	4.0	0	0.0
SUM of items	39	78.0	9	18.0	1	2.0	1	2.0
The evaluation instruments to accompany the FreD goes net courses were introduced and sufficiently discussed.	21	84.0	4	16.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
The atmosphere of the train the trainer seminar was good.	21	84.0	3	12.0	1	4.0	0	0.0
The time frame was appropriate.	9	36.0	15	60.0	0	0.0	1	4.0
I had ample opportunity to ask questions and to make suggestions.	21	84.0	4	16.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
SUM of items	51	68.0	22	29.3	1	1.3	1	1.3

2 Implementation and coordination in the pilot countries

Tab. 12: Degree of expected difficulties in achieving the set project targets (as established during the kick-off-conference)

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	mean
Adapting the project "Early Intervention For First Time Drug Users – FreD", which was developed, tested and evaluated in Germany, to the specific conditions of my country.	1	1	0	6	1	4	1	1	1	0	0	4.0
Establishing structured cooperation between addiction prevention and treatment agencies and public institutions (e.g. police, judicial authorities).	1	3	1	2	1	3	2	0	2	1	0	4.2
Establishing structured cooperation between addiction prevention and treatment agencies and social institutions (e.g. school, workplace).	0	2	3	3	3	2	1	0	2	0	0	3.8
Improving access to adolescent high-risk drug consumers by means of the FreD project.	1	0	2	2	5	1	1	0	2	2	0	4.7
Encouraging young drug users to reflect on their use of psychoactive substances and motivate them to change their attitude and behaviour.	0	0	0	5	3	1	4	2	1	0	0	4.9
Testing the revised selective prevention programme "FreD" as a pilot project in my country.	1	0	2	3	5	1	1	1	1	1	0	4.3
total	4	6	8	21	18	12	10	4	9	4	0	
total %	4.2	6.3	8.3	21.9	18.8	12.5	10.4	4.2	9.4	4.2	0.0	

Scale: from 0 = not at all difficult to 10 = very difficult

Tab. 13: Status and outcomes of the RAR investigation (Workshop I)

	correct		mostly correct		not quite correct		incorrect	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
In my country key persons were identified and interviewed as planned.	10	83.3	2	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
In my country the key persons have delivered important information with respect to implementing "FreD goes net".	5	41.7	5	41.7	1	8.3	1	8.3
In my country the focus group has delivered important information with respect to implementing "FreD goes net"	1	12.5	4	50.0	0	0.0	3	37.5
SUM of items RAR 2	16	50.0	11	34.1	1	3.1	4	12.5

Tab. 14: Status of implementation in own country (Workshop II)

	correct		mostly correct		not quite correct		incorrect	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
In my country the locations of "FreD goes net" are set.	10	90.9	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0
In my country the access paths of „FreD goes net“ are set.	8	72.7	3	27.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
I primarily acted "top down" when choosing cooperation partners.	5	45.5	5	45.5	1	9.1	0	0.0
In my country talks were carried out at the respective locations between the institutions concerned.	8	72.7	3	27.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
In my country specific cooperation partners (e.g. schools) are fixed.	6	54.5	5	45.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
In my country employees who will carry out the courses have been selected.	8	80.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
In my country locations have control teams to help implement FreD goes net.	4	36.4	4	36.4	2	18.2	1	9.1
SUM of items	49	64.5	22	28.9	4	5.3	1	1.3

3 Documentation of user data

Tab. 15: Gender

	number of persons	%
female	320	24.9
male	964	75.1
total	1,284	100.0

Tab. 16: Gender by country

	female		male		total	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Austria	1	7.1	13	92.9	14	100.0
Belgium	35	15.0	199	85.0	234	100.0
Cyprus	4	4.4	87	95.6	91	100.0
Germany	29	19.2	122	80.8	151	100.0
Ireland	32	39.5	49	60.5	81	100.0
Iceland	53	44.2	67	55.8	120	100.0
Latvia	49	39.5	75	60.5	124	100.0
Poland	35	20.5	136	79.5	171	100.0
Sweden	7	11.9	52	88.1	59	100.0
Slovenia	27	31.4	59	68.6	86	100.0
Romania	39	37.1	66	62.9	105	100.0
Luxembourg	9	18.8	39	81.3	48	100.0
total	320	24.9	964	75.1	1,284	100.0

Tab. 17: Age by gender

... years old	female	%	male	%	total	%
12	0	0.0	2	0.2	2	0.2
13	3	0.9	13	1.4	16	1.3
14	30	9.4	56	5.9	86	6.8
15	74	23.3	111	11.7	185	14.6
16	86	27.0	222	23.3	308	24.3
17	65	20.4	250	26.3	315	24.8
18	32	10.1	111	11.7	143	11.3
19	13	4.1	67	7.0	80	6.3
20	5	1.6	34	3.6	39	3.1
21	6	1.9	30	3.2	36	2.8
22	2	0.6	22	2.3	24	1.9
23	0	0.0	14	1.5	14	1.1
24	1	0.3	16	1.7	17	1.3
25	1	0.3	2	0.2	3	0.2
28	0	0.0	1	0.1	1	0.1
29	0	0.0	1	0.1	1	0.1
total	318	100.0	952	100.0	1,270	100.0

Tab. 18: Average age by country

	female	male	total
Austria	18.00	17.62	17.64
Belgium	15.94	16.32	16.26
Cyprus	20.25	20.58	20.57
Germany	17.68	18.26	18.15
Ireland	17.03	16.57	16.75
Iceland	16.40	16.63	16.53
Latvia	15.18	15.80	15.55
Poland	16.21	16.99	16.83
Sweden	16.71	16.62	16.63
Slovenia	16.30	17.07	16.83
Romania	16.23	17.36	16.94
Luxembourg	15.67	15.13	15.23
total	16.33	17.14	16.94

Tab. 19: *Housing situation*

	female	%	male	%	total	%
lives alone	13	4.1	44	4.6	57	4.4
lives with parents	250	78.4	829	86.2	1,079	84.2
lives with partner	4	1.3	10	1.0	14	1.1
lives with friends	2	.6	8	.8	10	.8
lives in an institution (e.g. home)	45	14.1	50	5.2	95	7.4
other	5	1.6	21	2.2	26	2.0
total	319	100.0	962	100.0	1,281	100.0

Tab. 20: Referring institution by country

country	referring institution															
	police		judiciary		school		workplace		family		other		no referral, direct access		total	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Austria	6	42.9	7	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.1	0	0.0	14	100.0
Belgium	137	58.5	1	0.4	58	24.8	0	0.0	22	9.4	15	6.4	1	0.4	234	100.0
Cyprus	89	97.8	2	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	91	100.0
Germany	1	0.7	37	24.7	17	11.3	35	23.3	14	9.3	40	26.7	6	4.0	150	100.0
Ireland	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	16.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	15.0	55	68.8	80	100.0
Iceland	1	0.8	0	0.0	58	49.2	2	1.7	11	9.3	30	25.4	16	13.6	118	100.0
Latvia	38	31.4	0	0.0	42	34.7	0	0.0	3	2.5	20	16.5	18	14.9	121	100.0
Poland	32	18.7	40	23.4	57	33.3	0	0.0	26	15.2	16	9.4	0	0.0	171	100.0
Sweden	32	54.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	30.5	9	15.3	0	0.0	59	100.0
Slovenia	7	8.1	0	0.0	51	59.3	0	0.0	13	15.1	14	16.3	1	1.2	86	100.0
Romania	0	0.0	0	0.0	101	96.2	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	3	2.9	105	100.0
Luxembourg	24	52.2	9	19.6	10	21.7	0	0.0	3	6.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	46	100.0
total	367	28.8	96	7.5	407	31.9	37	2.9	111	8.7	157	12.3	100	7.8	1,275	100.0

Tab. 21: Consumption ever in life – by country and substances

country	substance																	
	alcohol		cannabis		ampheta- mines		benzodiace- pine		LSD		cocaine		heroin		inhalants		other drugs	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Austria	13	100.0	14	100.0	3	23.1	1	8.3	2	16.7	2	16.7	2	15.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Belgium	224	97.4	219	93.6	101	50.2	7	3.9	27	14.7	39	21.2	3	1.7	1	0.6	24	13.3
Cyprus	87	96.7	89	98.9	14	17.9	7	9.3	10	13.5	25	32.1	1	1.4	3	4.1	2	2.7
Germany	141	97.9	134	92.4	57	51.4	3	3.1	15	15.0	37	34.6	5	5.2	10	10.5	8	8.7
Ireland	79	97.5	58	71.6	27	33.8	17	21.5	11	13.9	20	25.6	0	0.0	32	39.5	0	0.0
Iceland	114	95.0	63	53.4	38	32.5	13	11.4	11	9.6	13	11.3	4	3.5	14	12.2	5	4.5
Latvia	124	100.0	75	61.0	16	13.1	7	5.8	4	3.3	1	0.8	0	0.0	61	49.6	3	2.5
Poland	168	98.8	124	73.4	68	40.7	19	11.4	8	4.8	1	0.6	2	1.2	15	9.0	23	13.8
Sweden	58	98.3	58	98.3	10	20.0	5	10.0	4	7.8	8	16.0	1	2.0	10	20.0	23	46.9
Slovenia	86	100.0	68	79.1	15	17.6	3	3.5	5	5.9	8	9.4	0	0.0	5	5.9	5	5.8
Romania	104	99.0	57	54.3	1	1.0	2	2.0	2	2.0	4	4.0	4	4.0	0	0.0	11	10.8
Luxembourg	43	95.6	47	97.9	2	4.7	1	2.4	2	4.9	3	7.1	1	2.4	3	7.1	12	29.3
total	1,241	97.9	1,006	79.1	352	30.2	85	7.6	101	9.0	161	14.1	23	2.1	154	13.8	116	11.2

Tab. 22: Course utilisation by country

country	number of intake users	course participation recommended	participation in course "yes"	number of course participants interviewed in follow up survey
Austria	14	13	0	0
Belgium*	234	123*	106	105
Cyprus	91	80	76	75
Germany	151	149	103	92
Ireland	81	50	50	50
Iceland	120	116	116	105
Latvia	124	113	95	82
Poland	171	142	131	130
Sweden	59	57	47	52
Slovenia	86	85	76	72
Romania	105	105	92	79
Luxemburg	48	46	47	59**
total	1,284	1,079	939	901

* Belgian sites offered a group course as an alternative to FreD goes net for addicts

** In case of Luxemburg more completed participant surveys were available than user documentation sheets.

4 Survey of course participants

Tab. 23: *Distribution by country*

	number of persons	%
Belgium	105	11.7
Cyprus	75	8.3
Germany	92	10.2
Ireland	50	5.5
Iceland	105	11.7
Latvia	82	9.1
Poland	130	14.4
Sweden	52	5.8
Slovenia	72	8.0
Romania	79	8.8
Luxembourg	59	6.5
total	901	100.0

Tab. 24: *Gender*

	no.	%
female	237	26.3
male	664	73.7
total	901	100.0

Tab. 25: *Age*

	N	min.	max.	mean	standard deviation
female	236	13	24	16.30	1.592
male	664	12	25	17.22	2.238
total	900	12	25	16.98	2.216

5 Survey of project managers

Tab. 26: Satisfaction with FreD goes net's contribution to exchanging technical knowledge between participating countries

	no.	%
highly satisfied	10	83.3
rather satisfied	1	8.3
rather dissatisfied	1	8.3
very dissatisfied	0	0.0
total	12	100.0

Tab. 27: Satisfaction with FreD goes net's contribution to fostering mutual understanding and more in-depth information on legal provisions, prevention and support

	no.	%
highly satisfied	8	66.7
rather satisfied	4	33.3
rather dissatisfied	0	0.0
very dissatisfied	0	0.0
total	12	100.0

Tab. 28: Evaluation of aspects of implementation

	entirely correct		partly correct		not quite correct		incorrect	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Interventions could be carried out in the pilot regions as planned.	7	58.3	4	33.3	0	0.0	1	8.3
The expected number of young drug users was reached.	10	83.3	1	8.3	0	0.0	1	8.3
Sufficient numbers of FreD courses could be provided in the pilot regions to meet needs.	7	58.3	4	33.3	0	0.0	1	8.3
total	24	66.7	9	25.0	0	0.0	3	8.3

Tab. 29: Evaluation of cooperation

	entirely correct		partly correct		not quite correct		incorrect	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Implementing FreD goes net required great cooperative efforts.	7	58.3	4	33.3	1	8.3	0	0.0
Cooperation partners regularly exchanged information.	6	50.0	6	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Partners cooperated in a constructive way.	6	50.0	6	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
We felt the lack of a coordinating steering group.**	0	0.0	2	16.7	2	16.7	8	66.7
We felt the lack of binding and written cooperation agreements.**	1	8.3	3	25.0	2	16.7	6	50.0
total	33	55.0	20	33.3	6	10.0	1	1.7

** scale inverted for total

Tab. 30: Evaluation of framework conditions

	entirely correct		partly correct		not quite correct		incorrect	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
The legal framework in my country was favourable for implementing FreD goes net.	3	25.0	5	41.7	2	16.7	2	16.7
In my country sufficient support was given to FreD goes net by the responsible administrative bodies.	5	41.7	6	50.0	1	8.3	0	0.0
It was difficult to reach the target group in the pilot regions	1	8.3	6	50.0	1	8.3	4	33.3
total	12	33.3	12	33.3	9	25.0	3	8.3

** scale inverted for total