Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Promoting Healthy Ageing across the Life Cycle (JA-CHRODIS)

Work Package 5:

Good practices in the field of health promotion and chronic disease prevention across the life cycle

Recommendations report on applicability and transferability of practices into different settings and countries

Report on work done

10 February 2017

Co-funded by
the Health Programme
of the European Union

THIS PUBLICATION ARISES FROM THE JOINT ACTION CHRODIS, WHICH HAS RECEIVED FUNDING FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION, IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE HEALTH PROGRAMME (2008-2013). SOLE RESPONSIBILITY LIES WITH THE AUTHOR AND THE CONSUMERS, HEALTH, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD EXECUTIVE AGENCY IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY USE THAT MAY BE MADE OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED THEREIN.

CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT 3
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 5
2. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION 7
2.1. The burden of chronic diseases across Europe and aim of this report 7
2.2. European Action on Health Promotion and Disease Prevention becomes a "Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Promoting Healthy Ageing across the Life Cycle" 7
2.3. Good practices in the field of health promotion and chronic disease prevention across the life cycle 9
2.4. Five tasks to move forward health promotion and disease prevention 9
3. THE PROCESS TO DEFINE KEY SUCCESS FACTORS FOR TRANSFERABILITY AND SCALABILITY OF GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES 11
4. SUCCESS FACTORS FOR TRANSFERABILITY AND SCALABILITY OF GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES 12
4.1. Four key steps for consideration in a transfer or scaling-up of good practices 13
5. SUCCESS FACTORS FOR THE TRANSFERABILITY AND SCALABILITY OF GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES 15
5.1. Four main success factors for transferability and scalability 15
5.2. Balance of bottom-up and top-down approach with inclusion of target population 16
5.3. Intersectoral, multi-level and multi-professional approach with strong commitment at highest level 17
5.4. Qualified and highly committed human resources, detailed documentation, monitoring & evaluation 18
5.5. Long-term engagement with stable funding 21
6. FINAL THOUGHTS AND OUTLOOK 21
7. APPENDIX 24
Overview of the seven study visits 24

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

Acknowledgement

This document derives from the work on Health Promotion and Disease Prevention (WP5) of the EU Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Healthy Ageing Across the Life Cycle (JA-CHRODIS).

WP5 leaders: Alexander Haarmann, Katarzyna Mletzko, Thomas Kunkel
German Federal Centre for Health Education (BZgA), Germany

WP5 co-leaders: Anne Pierson, Anna Gallinat, EuroHealthNet, Belgium

Partner institutions within this work package were the following:
Associated Partners:

- Andalusian Regional Ministry of Equality, Health and Social Policies (CISPSJA), Spain
- Center for Health Education and Disease Prevention (SMLPC), Lithuania; Task leader 4
- Directorate General of Health (DGS), Portugal
- European Institute of Womens Health (EIWH), Ireland
- Directorate of Health (DOHI), Iceland
- EuroHealthNet, Belgium, Task leader 1 and 5
- German Federal Centre for Health Education (BZgA), Germany, Task leader 2
- Health Promotion Documentation Centre' (DoRS), Italy
- Health Service Executive (HSE), Ireland
- Institute of Health Carlos III (ISCIII), Spain
- Institute of Public Health in Ireland (IPH), Ireland
- Ministry of Health (YPE), Greece; Task Leader 3
- Ministry of Health (MINSAL), Italy
- Directorate of Health (HOD), Norway
- National Centre of Public Health and Analysis (NCPHA), Bulgaria
- National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge (INSA), Portugal
- National Institute of Health (ISS), Italy
- National Institute for Health Development (NIHD), Estonia
- National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), the Netherlands
- Progress and Health Foundation (FPS), Spain
- Regional Ministry of Health of Cantabria, Spain

Collaborating Partner:

- BioCruces, Spain
- Consejería de Sanidad y Asuntos Sociales, Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha, Spain
- Dirección General de Asistencia Sanitaria, Agencia Valenciana de Salud, Spain
- European Health Futures Forum (EHFF), UK
- European Wound Management Association, Denmark
- Ministry of Health, Cyprus
- National Board of Health and Welfare (SoS), Sweden
- Pharmaceutical Group of the EU (PGEU)
- Platform for Better Oral Health in Europe
- Canary Islands Health Service, Spain
- University of Coimbra, Portugal
- University of Deusto, Spain

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

- WHO Regional Office for Europe, Denmark

We would like to thank all partners who contributed to this report, in particular:

- Partners who took minutes at study visits, wrapped up summaries or commented on the present report: Teresa Bennett, Clotilde Cattaneo, Luciana Costa, Caroline Costongs, Djoeke van Dale, Kenneth Eaton, Anna Gallinat, Gígja Gunnarsdóttir, Alexander Haarmann, Marieke Hendriksen, Ignas Keras, Thomas Kunkel, Katarzyna Mletzko, Lars Münter, Clive Needle, Astrid Nylenna, Jesus de Pedro-Cuesta, Anne Pierson, Francisco Ruiz Dominguez, Dimitri Varsamis, Evelina Voitonis
- Sibylle Gerstl, who accompanied the project at several stages and contributed the main analysis of the categories and the draft of this report.
- The representatives of the German and the Spanish Ministry of Health as members of the Governing Board for commenting on the draft.
- Colleagues of the Aragon Health Science Institute, Spain who conducted the Delphi analysis on practices in the area of health promotion and primary prevention of chronic diseases and the designated experts' panel.

Final Draft

1. Executive Summary

The objective of the work on health promotion and disease prevention (WP5) reflects the general objective of JA-CHRDOIS and seeks to identify, exchange, and promote the scaling-up and transfer of good practices on health promotion and chronic disease prevention, focusing primarily on cardiovascular diseases, stroke and type 2 diabetes.

The aim of this report is to provide recommendations to project managers, policy makers, stakeholders and practitioners on what needs to be taken into consideration when scaling-up or transferring existing practices and what factors help to make the implementation successful in different contexts.

To arrive at the recommendations, partners reviewed the existing work, situation and needs in health promotion and primary prevention, at the start of the Joint Action. Subsequently, an approach to identify good practice examples was defined and good practice examples were identified. A conference was organised to join forces in health promotion and primary prevention. Finally, partners held study visits on selected good practice examples.

The identified recommendations from this report should be taken into account and incorporated into an implementation plan when considering a transfer or scaling-up of a good practice. They consist of four key steps to be taken, once implementers have identified a good practice that shows results and can be cost-effective to transfer or scaling-up.

1) Implementers need to know the original good practice. This knowledge should be combined with a needs analysis at the new place.
2) They should perform a feasibility study that analyses external factors, which can help or impede a successful transfer (e. g. support, funding, whether additional training is needed or whether the transfer is ethically acceptable).
3) Implementers should assess the adaptations that will be needed to transfer the good practice.
4) They should assess the transferability and the potential for success. This report lists several identified success factors, which can be used as an additional guiding tool to support decision-making for project managers and practitioners in particular.

The suggested key success factors for transferability have been organised in four categories. For each category, questions have been formulated to simplify the assessment of the transferability or scalability. The categories consist of:

- A bottom-up approach with inclusion of target population and strong commitment at highest level;
- Intersectoral, multi-level and multi-professional approach;
- Qualified and highly committed human resources, detailed documentation, monitoring and evaluation;
- Long-term engagement with stable funding.

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

Overall, these recommendations provide a useful overview of steps and factors to examine, when considering the transfer or scaling-up of an existing good practice – or elements thereof –, which in turn may contribute to more sustainable health systems and to lowering the burden of chronic diseases in Europe.

Final Draft

Co-funded by
the Health Programme
of the European Union

2. Background and introduction

2.1. The burden of chronic diseases across Europe and aim of this report

Chronic diseases represent the major share of the burden of disease in Europe.[1] They heavily affect individuals and their quality of life – most often for years or even decades. In turn, this affects also their families and places a huge burden on healthcare and social systems. Even though many chronic diseases could be prevented or their onset and progression be delayed more effectively, the focus is often still more on the treatment and management of manifest chronic diseases. Where health promotion and the prevention of chronic diseases are employed, most often the focus is on developing new programmes (at a national, regional or local level), while the exchange of good practices in the field is rather limited.

Lack of experience of existing good practices and of how to adapt, scaling-up, and transfer them are the major barriers preventing a higher take up of existing good practices. Therefore, the aim of this report is to provide recommendations on what needs to be considered when scaling-up or transferring existing good practices and what factors help to make the implementation a successful one.

2.2. European Action on Health Promotion and Disease Prevention becomes a "Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Promoting Healthy Ageing across the Life Cycle"

Already in 2011, the General Assembly of the United Nations, with EU support, acknowledged the problem and adopted a political declaration on the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases (NCDs).[2] There was unanimous commitment to collaborative partnerships in support of national, regional, and global plans for the prevention and control of NCDs, through the exchange of good practices.

Definition of some terms used in JA-CHRODIS

Good practice

A good practice is not only a practice that is good, but a practice that has been proven to work well and produce good results, and is therefore recommended as a model. It is a successful experience, which has been tested and validated, in the broad sense, which has been repeated and deserves to be shared so that a greater number of people can adopt it.

Source: Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2013 (9). Good practices at FAO: Experience capitalization for continuous learning. http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/ap784e/ap784e.pdf (accessed on 3 January 2017)

[1] Busse, Reinhard, Blümel, Miriam, Scheller-Kreinsen, David & Zentner, Annette. 2010. *Tackling chronic disease in Europe*. Observatory Studies Series, 20. WHO European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies. Copenhagen. http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/96632/E93736.pdf (accessed on 3 January 2017).

[2] Unites Nations General Assembly. 2011. *Political declaration of the High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on the Prevention and Control of Non-communicable Diseases*. 66th session, Follow-up to the outcome of the Millenium Summit. http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/66/L.1 (accessed 21 December 2016).

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

Final Draft

Transferability

The extent to which the result of an intervention in a given context can be achieved in another setting.

Source: Cambon, Linda, Minary, Laetitia, Ridde, Valery, & Alla, François. 2013. A tool to analyze the transferability of health promotion interventions. *BMC Public Health*, *3*, 1184. http://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2458-13-1184 (accessed on 3 January 2017).

Scalability

The potential of an intervention in a given context to be enlarged (in a different region) in order to increase the impact of the intervention elsewhere and/ or to handle a growing amount of needs.

Source: Cambon, Linda, Minary, Laetitia, Ridde, Valery, & Alla, François. 2013. A tool to analyze the transferability of health promotion interventions. *BMC Public Health*, *3*, 1184. http://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2458-13-1184 (accessed on 3 January 2017).

In 2013, the European Commission's Directorate General Health and Consumers published the final report of the 'Reflection process on chronic diseases'.[3] It states that the burden of chronic diseases is of central priority for the European Union and its member states and emphasizes the need for sustainable and coordinated approaches which fully explore the potential of disease prevention and build upon the identification and dissemination of good practices.

In 2014, the first European Summit on chronic diseases stressed the need for a coalition involving all relevant sectors across society, patients, and citizens to prevent chronic diseases, to preserve the best state of health and sustainability of a modern healthcare system. The overall aim is to maximize the healthy life years of European citizens.

In January 2014, the European Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Promoting Healthy Ageing across the Life Cycle (JA-CHRODIS) was launched following the recommendations of the reflection process on chronic conditions of the European Commission and member states. JA-CHRODIS contributes to improve the effectiveness of actions taken by policy makers, health professionals and citizens in tackling the determinants of chronic diseases and associated functional and quality of life limitations.

Next to three horizontal work packages (WPs 1 to 3), which cover the coordination, dissemination, and evaluation of the Joint Action, JA-CHRODIS is divided into four core WPs (WPs 4 to 7). Three of these 4 core WPs are thematic: "Good practices in the field of health promotion and chronic disease prevention across the life cycle" (WP5), "Development of common guidance and methodologies for care pathways for multimorbid patients" (WP6), and "Diabetes: a case study on strengthening health care for people with chronic diseases" (WP7). The fourth core WP is cross-cutting with a platform for knowledge exchange (WP4), the CHRODIS platform.

[3] Council of the European Union. 2013. Reflection process on chronic diseases. http://www.eular.org/myUploadData/files/EU_contibution_reflection_process_Chronic_Diseaseas_final_report.pdf (accessed 21 December 2016).

Final Draft

2.3. Good practices in the field of health promotion and chronic disease prevention across the life cycle

The general objective of JA-CHRODIS is to facilitate the exchange of good practices in tackling chronic diseases between different European countries and regions. This objective is reflected in the work package on health promotion and disease prevention (WP5). It sought to **identify, exchange, and promote the scaling-up and transfer of good practices and effective practices on health promotion and chronic disease prevention**, focusing on cardiovascular diseases, stroke and type 2 diabetes. The work package is comprised of 33 organisations (20 associated and 13 collaborating partners) from 14 member states of the European Union, Norway, and Iceland.

The work consisted of five consecutive tasks, all building upon one another. The tasks helped to provide recommendations on what needs to be taken into consideration when scaling up or transferring existing practices. The subsequent chapters will shortly describe the tasks in order to give a broader idea of the context of this report and the process of defining key factors for transferability and scaling-up.

2.4. Five tasks to move forward health promotion and disease prevention

1	Review of existing work, situation and needs in the area of health promotion and primary prevention
2	Defining an approach to identify good practice examples
3	Identification of good practice examples
4	Conference to join forces in health promotion and primary prevention
5	Study visits on good practice examples

2.4.1. Review of existing work, situation and needs in the area of health promotion and primary prevention

In task 1, country reports focusing on the health promotion and primary prevention landscapes in partner countries were developed. They identified good practices, strategies, and programs and revealed gaps and needs in this area. The 14 country reports can be downloaded here: http://chrodis.eu/our-work/05-health-promotion/wp05-activities/country-reports/.

The overview report showed that there is a strong need for further consistent investment in health promotion and primary prevention in order to reduce the burden of chronic diseases and to make healthcare systems more sustainable. Further needs included among others capacity and capacity development, monitoring and evaluation. The dissemination of highly promising and evidence based good practices and approaches should be used as a basis in advocating for dedicated and sustained funding streams.

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

2.4.2. Defining an approach to identify good practice examples

The description of health promotion landscapes in European countries laid the foundation for the subsequent work. It defined key criteria for identifying good practices, based on existing approaches, a review of existing databases, and literature key criteria.

This was carried out through a consultation in a format of a modified Delphi methodology, developed by RAND.[4] The process involved a group of more than 25 European health promotion experts in collaboration with the leaders of the work packages 5 and 4.

The final result was a list of key criteria for the identification of good practices in health promotion and primary prevention of chronic diseases (HPPP). These criteria can be ranked and weighted in order to allow for both a comparison of practices and an assessment of the overall practice. The full report that includes a detailed description of the Delphi method and the final set of weighted criteria can be downloaded here: http://www.chrodis.eu/wpcontent/uploads/2015/08/INTERIM-REPORT-1_Delphi-on-Health-promotion-and-prevention-1.pdf.

2.4.3. Identification of good practice examples

Based on the list of ranked and weighted criteria, all involved partners agreed on a final set of inclusion and exclusion criteria to identify and assess good practices in the field of HPPP in order to facilitate a more effective cross-country exchange. A template was established, which allows a unique assessment and description of the different practices for HPPP.

Partners set out to collect, describe, and assess existing practices according to the template. As a result, 41 detailed examples of local, regional or national good practices (i. e. policies, programmes, and clinical or public health interventions) in health promotion and primary prevention of chronic diseases were identified. They derive from 13 partner countries in Europe with a main focus on cardiovascular diseases, stroke and type 2 diabetes. They target different life stages (childhood, ageing, all age cycles) as well as different target groups (incl. vulnerable populations).

The summary report on the 41 good practice examples can be downloaded here: http://www.chrodis.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Summary-Report-CHRODIS-WP5-Task-3_Version-1.3.pdf or here: http://chrodis.eu/outcomes-results/

The link to the annex outlining all 41 good practice examples in full detail can be downloaded here: http://chrodis.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Annex-Report-CHRODIS-WP5-Task-3_Version-1.3-.pdf#page=227

[4] http://www.rand.org/topics/delphi-method.html

Final Draft

2.4.4. Conference to join forces in health promotion and primary prevention

A conference “Joining Forces in Health Promotion to Tackle the Burden of Chronic Diseases in Europe” was organized in Vilnius, Lithuania, on 24-25 November 2015. The conference gave JA-CHRODIS partners and stakeholders on all levels the opportunity to discuss the state of health promotion and primary prevention in Europe and to share examples of good practices.

Materials and documentation relating to the conference can be downloaded here: http://chrodis.eu/event/joining-forces-in-health-promotion-to-tackle-the-burden-of-chronic-diseases-in-europe/.

2.4.5. Study visits on good practice examples

In the final task of the work package, partners conducted a series of study visits on selected good practice examples out of the 41 identified in task 3. Seven study visits took place in six partner countries – Iceland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom – between April and June 2016.

The main results of the study visits were threefold.

- To exchange experiences and knowledge between the partners who are implementing the good practice examples and the partners interested in investigating whether the good practices could be implemented in their specific context
- To identify how a certain good practice could potentially be transferred and/ or scaled up
- To discuss core elements as well as other components that need to be adapted to the situation of the new area if transferred and/ or scaled-up

An overview of the seven study visits is given in appendix 5. Links to the various study visits and more information can be found here: http://chrodis.eu/our-work/05-health-promotion/wp05-activities/transfer/.

3. The process to define key success factors for transferability and scalability of good practice examples

The process to define key success factors for transferability and scalability involved several steps, in which the majority of the work package’s partners actively participated. The criteria serve to assess both the transferability of a good practice example and its possible scalability, as no differences could be determined. These included the following:

- A literature review was conducted in order to identify strategies and frameworks for possible transfer and scaling-up of health promotion practices, such as “ASTAIRE”

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

("Assessment of transferability and adaptation of health promotion practices")[5] and the European Scaling-Up Strategy in active and healthy ageing.[6]

- The list of criteria developed by experts and JA members in task 3 helped identify good practices in health promotion and primary prevention of chronic diseases (HPPP). Good practice examples that were selected for the study visits included as broad a range of criteria as possible.

- The selection of 41 good practice examples acted as another source of information. `Good practices' can be programmes, policies, and projects that are carried out at national, regional, and local level. Practices that have been scaled-up or transferred already were of particular interest. The selection also served as the basis for the choice of study visits.

- Of the 41 good practice examples, seven were chosen for study visits. They were selected in a consultative approach with all WP5 partners and combined different examples of life stage (childhood, ageing, all age cycles), geographic-administrative levels (national, regional, local), as well as target groups (incl. vulnerable populations) and approaches (policy, programme, project). They also cover a huge range of the Delphi criteria defined in task 2.

- Exchange between partners to identify categories of success factors when considering the transfer of a proven good practice into another area.

- Analysing and comparing the documents of the different study visits to assess key success factors for transferability and scalability according to the study visits. Documents for the analysis were the minutes of the different study visits and their key lessons to assess transferability and scalability.

4. Success factors for transferability and scalability of good practice examples

There is a wealth of good practices to be found across Europe. Therefore, new practices do not need to be designed from scratch but can rather be inspired by other practices. Quite often, however, it is difficult to decide what needs to be considered when transferring or scaling-up existing good practices. This recommendation report will highlight some of the points that should be taken into account. It should be understood as a guiding tool for project managers, policy makers, stakeholders, and practitioners rather than absolute requirements. In that sense, the list of factors should be studied carefully and as a general rule all factors should be incorporated into the implementation plan. Even though all factors *need to be*

5 Cambon, Linda, Minary, Laetitia, Ridde, Valery, & Alla, François. 2013. A tool to analyze the transferability of health promotion interventions. BMC Public Health, 3, 1184. http://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2458-13-1184 (accessed on 3 January 2017).

6 The European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing. 2015. *European scaling-up Strategy in Active & Healthy Ageing*. https://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/pdf/active-healthy-ageing/scaling_up_strategy.pdf (accessed 21 December 2016).

Final Draft

considered there might be exemptions where the implementation of a single factor is not feasible.

A positive impact of practices in the field of health promotion and chronic disease prevention can be direct outcomes of the practices themselves but positive impact can also be related to external factors which cannot be influenced by the practice (e. g. the context, the policy framework, legal competencies, or social acceptance where the practices are embedded). Successful practices in one setting might per se not be transferable with the same positive results to another setting.

When assessing good practice examples, different criteria were identified, which can influence transferability and scalability and the practices' capacity to produce the same positive effects in the new setting.

4.1. Four key steps for consideration in a transfer or scaling-up of good practices

The transfer or scaling-up of an existing and assessed practice consists of several steps.

4.1.1. Knowing the good practice

Based on our experience and relevant literature, a good *first* step is to **get to know more about the practice**. For this, an extensive description is needed. Furthermore, even though the direct exchange of information and experience can occur via modern telecommunication media a thorough **study visit to the existing practice** is recommended. The latter is more than helpful in case the description shows a promising candidate practice can be transferred.

This should be done in combination with a **needs analysis** of the area where the practice is intended to be scaled-up or transferred to. It is important to note in this context that good practices do not necessarily need to be transferred in their entirety, but that **also single elements of practices can be transferred**. It needs to be borne in mind, however, that evaluations and assessments of the existing practices were conducted as a whole. Transferring and implementing single elements requires a thorough analysis in order to not jeopardise the success of the new addition. If, for instance, there is a well-designed practice that needs improvement in one respect, which can be found in another existing practice, a transfer may include only a number of or one single module of the practice in question.

In order to assess the different elements of a practice, the abovementioned good practice criteria developed in task 2 can help.[7] The criteria facilitate both the overall comparison between different good practices with (weighted) sum scores as well as identifying single elements that may serve as particularly good examples. Furthermore, the list of criteria of success factors for transferability and scalability can help to identify elements that require attention. For this purpose, the perspective needs to be slightly changed from a focus on the implementation of a transfer process to one designing/ adapting a practice.

[7] http://www.chrodis.eu/wpcontent/uploads/2015/08/INTERIM-REPORT-1_Delphi-on-Health-promotion-and-prevention-1.pdf

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

Final Draft

4.1.2. Feasibility study

Once it is decided whether the existing practice in question or elements thereof are actually tackling existing needs in the new area, a **feasibility study** can follow as a *second* step. This should primarily focus on "external" factors such as:

- support by politicians, stakeholders, and network partners,
- (sustainable) funding,
- the questions of how mature the organisation to implement the transfer actually is, i. e. whether it is sufficiently experienced and has the capacity to implement it, and to what extent additional training is necessary,
- to what extent the transferred practice is perceived acceptable and ethical by significant partners and stakeholders,
- to what extent competing programmes and (political) targets interfere with the target of the practice and thereby hamper its implementation.[8]

4.1.3. Adaptation

The question of adaptation should be tackled in parallel with the feasibility study as a *third* step. Most often, practices cannot be transferred as they are, but **(functional) equivalents need to be found, taking into account different context variables**. This applies to both key elements as well as any other adaptations. As long as equivalents can be found that make sense in the interaction with other components of the practice, different context factors should not pose a problem. This requires thorough consideration, since the impact of different equivalents vary. For example, if there is another type of sponsor available, which likewise guarantees the practice's independence, this is less tricky compared to finding a proper equivalent for specific type of network partner. Overall, the guiding principle should be that having functional and functioning equivalents adapted to the new area is more important than transferring elements as such.

4.1.4 Assessment of transferability

A list of success factors were identified to influence transferability and scalability of good practice examples into different contexts, both within the same country but also across borders. The factors and its underlying criteria serve to assess both the transferability of a good practice example and its possible scalability, as no differences could be determined. These success factors are described in the next chapter.

Bringing together these four aspects (information and knowledge about the practice in combination with a needs analysis; feasibility of implementation; necessity to adapt elements; possibility to transfer the practice) is a good basis upon which to decide whether the practice in question is likely to bring about change in the new place and whether this can be done in a cost-effective way.

[8] On these and related points cf. e. g. Ciliska. 2007. *Tool for Assessing Applicability and Transferability of Evidence*. www.nccmt.ca/pubs/A&T_Tool_-_FINAL_English_Oct_07.pdf (accessed on 3 January 2017).
The European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing. 2015. *European scaling-up Strategy in Active & Healthy Ageing*.
Wang, Shuhong, Moss, John R., & Hiller, Janet E. 2005. Applicability and transferability of interventions in evidence-based public health. Health Promotion International, 21(1), 76–83.

Final Draft

5. Success factors for the transferability and scalability of good practice examples

5.1. Four main success factors for transferability and scalability

The criteria serve as a checklist once the decision about transferring an existing practice is taken. The list is intended to help transfer and organise an existing practice. At the same time, altering the perspective from a focus on the implementation of a transfer process to one designing/ adapting a practice, it can also help to get a better understanding of the existing practices that are considered for transfer. It supports the decision making process on whether to implement the practice in its entirety, to implement single elements, or to not implement it at all.

The criteria are organized in four categories:

- Balance of bottom-up and top-down approach with inclusion of target population
- Intersectoral, multi-level and multi-professional approach with strong commitment at highest level
- Qualified and highly committed human resources, detailed documentation, monitoring and evaluation
- Long-term engagement with stable funding.

These four categories are neither balanced against each other nor listed in any particular order. The study visits did not reveal any evidence that any category has more influence on successful transferability and scalability than others, but it is rather the specific combination of criteria that yield the success of practices. The categories have been designed to apply to all good practice examples. However, it is evident that some criteria are more applicable to one setting or another.

The four main categories have been broken down into sub-categories. For each of the sub-categories, questions have been formulated as a tool to analyse the transferability or scalability of a practice. Similar to the steps mentioned above, a stepwise approach can be applied to each of the criteria. They can be used to:

a) get a better idea about the existing practice (*How were things done at the existing implementation site(s)?*).
b) determine congruency between the existing practice and the one to be transferred (*Can the existing design be applied? To what extent does it cover the problems and targets in the new area?*).
c) help to identify essential elements for which equivalents need to be found (*Which essential structural elements cannot be transferred as they are? What equivalents can be found for them?*). What constitute essential elements for the practice in question can vary. For instance, this can be a certain type of funding, network partners, a specific target group, or the involvement of certain actors or population etc.

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

d) assess the necessity of adaptations of additional, more general elements (*What elements need to be adapted to increase the fit?*).

5.2. Balance of bottom-up and top-down approach with inclusion of target population

- Apply the entire practice to local settings and customs
  Does the existing practice suit the context in which it shall be transferred?
  Is the overall practice designed in a way to be adaptable to different local settings and customs?

- Be flexible at local level when implementing and adapting the programme
  This *criterion* applies to the practice's capacity to be flexible to specific needs *on* the lowest level of implementation. This would e. g. apply to different neighbourhoods of a practice in one municipalities or different municipalities in a region etc.
  Does the existing practice show a high degree of flexibility on the local level?
  Is this flexibility transferrable and applicable to a new setting?
  Are adaptations possible during the duration of the project?

- Include 'all' (all ages, backgrounds), but think especially of the most vulnerable groups/areas
  Do all target groups (e. g. different age classes, socioeconomic status, gender) of the existing practice coincide with the ones in the target area? Is there a need to transfer all of them?
  Does the transferred practice adequately address vulnerable groups? Are any adaptations necessary?

- Involve target group(s) when doing the needs assessment
  Does the transferred practice include a needs assessment with the intended target groups?

- Involve communities in decision making on programmes and their practices
  In contrast *to* the previous criterion, this one focuses rather on the implementation of the practice and the decision-making process about its content.
  How was the decision making process conducted in the existing practice?
  In which way can this be transferred?
  Is the participatory approach together with the intended target group(s) and communities taken into account?

- Engage communities in planning and organising the programme
  In contrast to the previous two criteria, this one is less of a one-time involvement, but a continuous process to adapt and recalibrate the implementation (also) according to

Final Draft

ideas, wishes, and expressed needs by the population of the lowest level of implementation.

How was regular community engagement facilitated in the existing practice?

In which way will this develop strengths and resources in the intended target population?

Is there any need for additional or differing engagement?

- Entirely voluntary participation

  Can the existing practice be transferred and rely on an entirely voluntary participation?

  Are there any negative implications for people not participating in the transferred practice?

  What differing context factors need to be considered that may create negative outcomes?

  Is there a perception of coercion to take part?

- Support of programme in communities

  In how far is the broad and voluntary support of the existing practice in the target population and in the communities safeguarded?

- Strong commitment at highest level within relevant institutions and political support

  This point focuses rather on the governance aspect and general political support.

  Is there a commitment at the respective highest level to support the transferred practice at all levels involved?

  Is top-down commitment assured?

  Is there political support in the relevant area where the practice is to be implemented?

- Think big, but start small

  Looking at the existing practice's creation: how was the process in terms of size?

  Does the intended transferred practice still have a manageable size in its new context?

  Is it possible to concentrate the common efforts and not to disperse them?

  Is the practice designed to later transfer it to further regions and/ or scaling it up?

5.3. Intersectoral, multi-level and multi-professional approach with strong commitment at highest level

- Health in all policies approach (inter-sectoral linkage, multi-level)

  Can all relevant sectors be transferred into the new context to achieve positive results?
  What additional sectors need to be taken into account?

  Is this comprehensible approach feasible in the new context?

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

- Think broadly – Collaborative, partnership approach at all levels (work with everybody at all levels)

  Is it possible to include the same stakeholders at all levels as in the existing practice?

  Will people at all levels (from national government to municipalities) feel equally responsible for the transferred practice?

  Are equivalent partnerships on all levels and alliances (local, national, international), intersectoral (public-private), and multidisciplinary (different professional backgrounds with different areas of expertise) possible for the transferred practice?

- Strong political commitment and support at highest level

  This point focuses rather on the political and professional commitment.

  Is there political commitment in the relevant area where the practice is to be implemented?

  Is there support of the transferred practice by the highest level of the involved sectors, professions, and levels?

- Programme embedded in national plans/curricula/policies and/ or specific legislation and regulation

  Is the transferred practice already aligned with policy plans/curricula/policies and/ or specific legislation and regulation at various levels?

  Did the specific practice transform specific policies into legally defined rights? Would that be equally possible in the transferred practice?

- Transparency of the programme to shape trust

  Is the existing dissemination strategy transferrable in a way to ensure transparency of the practice's objectives, aims, and strategies to stakeholders and the general public?

  Does the practice ensure that everyone interested knows what is done by whom, with whom, and why?

Final Draft

5.4. Qualified and highly committed human resources, detailed documentation, monitoring & evaluation

- Committed, persistent, and stable human resources with high social skills including volunteers

  Can the transferred practice rely on the equivalent amount of well-qualified, clearly defined and committed human resources as the existing one?

  Does the new context require a shift of human resources to different institutions and/ or stakeholders?

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

Is there a key person with high social skills available in the practice to be transferred in order to drive the process and foster networks?

Are volunteers involved in the practice to be transferred?

Is the new context suitable to engage them?

Final Draft

Co-funded by
the Health Programme
of the European Union

- Define terms used in the practice clearly

  Are the definitions and technical terms used (such as transparency, inclusiveness, community involvement and engagement) the same ones as in the existing practice in order to arrive at the same foundation for the practice?

  Are all technical terms and definitions transparent, clearly defined, and understandable for everybody involved in the transferred practice?

  Are there any indispensable prerequisites that require a modification of these definitions?

- Document practice right from its start with positive and highly visible reporting

  This includes all kinds of documents throughout the project cycle.

  Can the documentation strategy be entirely transferred?

  What kind of documents need to be adapted to the new context?

  In what way can positive and empowering reporting be transferred?

- Monitor practice continuously with appropriate indicators

  This includes all kinds of documents for quality assurance of the ongoing project.

  Can the monitoring system be entirely transferred?

  What kind of objectively verifiable performance indicators need to be adapted or added in the transferred practice?

- Evaluation framework existing

  Three different kinds of evaluation need to be taken into account here: a) the evaluation (ideally) conducted in the existing practice, b) the planned evaluation for the transferred practice in order to find out how things have been implemented in the new context, and c) an evaluation of the transfer process itself. While the first should be existing already, the second is absolutely recommended. The latter is optional but may be enlightening not only for other practitioners but also for the ones implementing the transfer. Common recommendations regarding evaluations (e. g. preferably external evaluation, preferably process, outcome, and impact evaluation) as well as the documentation of key processes apply.

  Can the existing evaluation framework be transferred to assess process and outcomes of the practice, including sufficient funding and time?

  Is an evaluation by people not directly involved feasible in the new context?

  Is there willingness in the transferred practice to readapt elements of the practice based on the recommendations of the evaluation?

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

- Knowledge transfer group
  This relates predominantly to the existing good practice even though it might make sense to establish a separate group also in the new area. Both, the existing as well as the to be implemented practice team can form a "community of practice", [9] thereby not only closely exchanging information and experience but also motivating each other and further improve the practice in question.

  Is there a knowledge transfer strategy with a knowledge transfer process team available in the existing practice?

  To what extent can a knowledge transfer process team be of help in the transferred practice?

  Is a knowledge transfer process team indispensable for the success of the transferred practice?

5.5. Long-term engagement with stable funding

- Think ahead – Commitment to long-term programmes and/ or approach
  Is (the same) long-term planning guaranteed in the transferred practice as in the existing one?

  In which way can institutional ownership in the practice be transferred?

- Stability of funding for several years
  Is funding of the transferred practice secured over several years on a regular and continuous basis?

There are projects that are meant to pilot or introduce a new concept into everyday practice. They are often designed for a shorter period of time only. For most other practices, however, usually long-term or mid-term funding is sought. If a long-term assurance of funding is not available – a situation many practices are facing – long-term commitment or a long-term perspective is the more important of the two, since the perspective of time strongly influences the whole approach

6. Final thoughts and outlook

The four categories to analyse factors that can influence a good practice example's transferability and scalability into different contexts are not intended to be used instead of the usual planning and management processes. Literature on the planning and implementation of projects on the organisational, managerial, financial, and many practical parts primarily focused on *new* projects, while literature on transferring from one place to another was scarce.[10] In that sense, the four factors mentioned here fill this gap and complement the existing literature.

[9] Hasanali, F., C. Hubert, K. Lopez, B. Newhouse, C. O'Dell, & W. Vestal. 2002. *Communities of Practice: A Guide For Your Journey to Knowledge Management Best Practices* (Passport to Success, 1). Amer Productivity Center.

[10] For a selection of these cf. e. g.

Final Draft

In consequence, this report focuses on the practical experience with internal processes of practices. The categories can be used as an *additional* tool supporting decision making for project managers, policy makers, stakeholders, and practitioners. As the four categories derive from the analysis of study visits of good practice examples, they are reflecting practical experience from practice-internal processes on the ground. The decision-support tool should, thus, be part of the project development process as well as incorporated in the implementation process throughout the entire life cycle of a project.

The categories cover a broad range of factors and criteria and support the transfer and implementation of good practices. In that sense, the intention of this report is to offer a guiding tool for stakeholders and practitioners that supports decision making, transfer, and implementation. This neither substitutes an assessment based on experience gained in transferring and implementing good practices nor assessment of factors that are external to the practice: even if ideal circumstances are encountered, they will not make a transfer succeed if, for example, it is perceived socially unacceptable, it does not fit into the legal framework, is perceived unethical, or essential network partners do not have the time to invest into a collaboration.[11] Competing programmes or competing political targets can, of course, impose obstacles as well. All this, however, needs to be taken into consideration to arrive at an overall decision whether or not to transfer an existing practice.

Looking at different approaches on transferring and implementing practices and despite many differences on a more detailed level, there seems to be a more abstract core set of factors that is derived no matter what field of practice they have been developed for (targeting specific treatments, prevention, exchange of strategies etc.) and to some degree according to the underlying view of what organisations should look like: the ASTAIRE framework,[12] for instance, following a rather theoretical approach, was designed to draft practices with a later transfer in mind as well as to actually transfer it. The European Innovation Partnership on

Final Draft

Hartmann, Arntraud & Linn, Johannes F. 2008. Scaling up – a Framework and Lessons for Development Effectiveness from Literature and Practice. Working paper, 5. Wolfensohn Center for Development. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/10_scaling_up_aid_linn.pdf (accessed 3 February 2017).
The European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing. 2015. European scaling-up Strategy in Active & Healthy Ageing. https://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/pdf/active-healthy-ageing/scaling_up_strategy.pdf (accessed 21 December 2016).
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2011. Program Performance and Evaluation Office (PPEO) – Program Evaluation. https://www.cdc.gov/EVAL/steps/index.htm (accessed on 3 February 2017).
European Project Getting Evidence into Practice. 2005. European Quality Instrument for Health Promotion (EQUIHP). http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_projects/2003/action1/docs/2003_1_15_a10_en.pdf (accessed on 3 February 2017).
IEMAC-ARCHO. Assessment of Readiness for Chronicity in Health Care Organizations. http://www.iemac.es/data/docs/Formulario_IEMAC_english_version.pdf (accessed 3 February 2017).
Highly Adoptable Improvement. http://www.highlyadoptableqi.com/guide.html (accessed on 3 February 2017).
Lavis, John N, Oxman, Andrew D, Simon Lewin, & Fretheim, Atle. 2009. SUPPORT Tools for evidence-informed health Policymaking. Health Research Policy and Systems, 7, 1 http://health-policy-systems.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1478-4505-7-S1-I1 (accessed on 3 February 2017).

[11] Considering these aspects cf. e. g. Ciliska. 2007. *Tool for Assessing Applicability and Transferability of Evidence*. www.nccmt.ca/pubs/A&T_Tool_-_FINAL_English_Oct_07.pdf (accessed on 3 January 2017).
Wang, Shuhong, Moss, John R., & Hiller, Janet E. 2005. Applicability and tranferability of interventions in evidence-based public health. Health Promotion International, 21(1), 76–83.

[12] Cambon, Linda, Minary, Laetitia, Ridde, Valery, & Alla, François. 2013. A tool to analyze the transferability of health promotion interventions. BMC Public Health, 3, 1184. http://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2458-13-1184 (accessed on 3 January 2017).

Active and Healthy Ageing[13] also provides recommendations on transfer and implementation of good practices. What differs from them is that this report approaches transferability from a more practical point of view, taking in the perspective of implementers

, and based on the experience gained in most different practices across Europe. Nevertheless, at a general level, core factors regarding the transfer and scaling-up of good practices arrive at broadly similar results, which also applies with regard to the findings of the Joint Action's Work Packages on multimorbidity and diabetes (WP6 and WP7). Despite differences in detail, this applies in particular to the recommendations given about early detection, prevention, and quality of care for diabetes serving as a case study for chronic diseases in general.[14] Among the key messages, the following points can be found: "Promote the empowerment of the target population", "Define an evaluation and monitoring plan", "Comprehensiveness of the practice", "Interaction with regular and relevant systems", and "Governance approach" (pp. 6-7), which easily translate into the abovementioned factors of this recommendation report. This means that the recommendations given here can prove useful beyond health promotion and prevention of chronic diseases, too. In a next step, it would be would be needed to find out whether it makes sense to synthesise them or whether recommendations would be too general to be of any use for practitioners and stakeholders. It needs to be borne in mind that specific components, which are usually not part of practices within health promotion and disease prevention, require additional consideration. For any healthcare setting, for instance, this could imply that criteria touching for example reimbursement policies, joint IT standards, or a stricter definition and distribution of responsibilities need to be added.

A central priority for the European Union and its member states is to minimize chronic disease across Europe. There is a high need to identify, share and transfer good practice examples on health promotion and chronic disease prevention. National databases of good practices can provide a first overview. The disadvantage is that different languages and assessment criteria hamper the access to such information. The CHRODIS-platform (http://platform.chrodis.eu) is an attempt to collect good practices, which over time has the potential to become the first address to get a broad overview of what practices exist at European level. Uniform assessment criteria are another advantage of this approach, which enables practitioners seeking to transfer (elements of) a good practice to easily compare between different options.

Furthermore, use of the factors that can influence the transferability and scalability of good practices listed in this report might contribute to lower the burden of chronic diseases in Europe. In that sense, these recommendations hopefully provide a helpful decision making tool for practitioners when considering the transfer or scaling-up of an existing good practices. However, further support to ease this transfer or scaling-up should be considered, as the challenge at this point is not the unwillingness of practitioners to transfer or to be ambitious for the future health in Europe.

Final Draft

[13] The European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing. 2015. *European scaling-up Strategy in Active & Healthy Ageing*. https://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/pdf/active-healthy-ageing/scaling_up_strategy.pdf (accessed 21 December 2016).

[14] JA-CHRODIS. 2016. *Diabetes: a case study on strengthening health care for people with chronic diseases. Recommendations to improve early detection, preventive interventions, and the quality of care for people with diabetes. Definition and agreement on a common minimum set of indicators*.

7. Appendix

Overview of the seven study visits

JOGG – Young People at a Healthy Weight (The Netherlands)

PNPAS – National Programme for the Promotion of Healthy Eating (Portugal)

Welfare Watch (Iceland)

NGL– Icelandic National Curriculum Guides for schools, health and wellbeing (Iceland)

Lombardy Workplace Health Promotion Network (Italy)

Well London (Well communities) Programme (United Kingdom)

Norwegian Public Health Act (Norway)

Final Draft

Co-funded by
the Health Programme
of the European Union

Overview on the seven health promotion study visits

Project	JOGG - Young People at a Healthy Weight	PNPAS - National Programme for the Promotion of Healthy Eating	Welfare watch	NGL- Icelandic National Curriculum Guides for schools, health and wellbeing	Lombardy Workplace Health Promotion Network	Well London (Well communities) Programme	Norwegian Public Health Act
Country	The Netherlands	Portugal	Iceland	Iceland	Italy	United Kingdom	Norway
Study Visits	20.-21.4.2016	23.-24.5.2016	1.-2.6.2016	1.-2.6.2016	23.-24.6.2016	28.-30.6.2016	13.-14.6.2016
Project Aim	To reverse the increasing trend of young people with overweight / obesity	To improve the nutritional status and health of the Portuguese population in order to prevent common chronic diseases	To reduce the impact of economic crisis on health	To improve physical, mental and social health	To improve health and welfare in the workplace	To improve healthy living	Improve public health
Level of intervention	National strategy, projects implemented in municipalities	National policy locally implemented	National strategy	National school policy	Regional project	Community intervention	National policy
Location / setting	Schools and communities	Population level	Population level	Schools and communities	Workplaces	Communities	Population level
Target group(s)	Children, parent, local communities	All age groups; deprived neighbourhoods	All age groups (focus on children/youth, long-term unemployed, unemployed young people)	Children, youth and staff in pre-schools and schools	Adults (employees)	All age groups	All age groups
Transfer / scaling-up	Transferred from EPODE (France), adapted to the Dutch situation	Based on key European and WHO policies	Built on the Icelandic Welfare Watch		European Workplace Health Promotion Network	Scaling-up	

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

	JOGG - Young People at a Healthy Weight
Type of good practice	Pre-natal environment, early childhood, childhood and adolescence
Country	The Netherlands
Aim	To reverse the increasing trend of young people with overweight/obesity
Objectives	- To increase the amount of young people that achieve the recommended level of daily physical activity - To reduce the intake of sugary drinks and increase the intake of water - To increase the amount of young people that consume a healthy breakfast - To increase the daily intake of fruit and vegetables - Every setting (neighbourhood, school, home and health care) offers a healthy option, and promotes physical activity
Level of intervention	National strategy, projects implemented in municipalities
Location / setting	Schools and community (07-2016: in 84 municipalities)
Target group(s)	- Children (1-19 years of age) - Parents - Local communities (e. g. shopkeepers, companies, schools, sport clubs, local authorities)
Transfer / scaling-up	Transferred from EPODE (France), adapted to the Dutch situation by adding an additional pillar (linking prevention and health care)
Major characteristics	- Integrated community-based approach - Targets on neighbourhoods (make the healthy choice the easy choice) - Advocacy and social marketing - Intervention activities adjusted to the local situation - Public Private Partnerships - Evaluation framework
Short description	JOGG is a movement which encourages all people in a city, town or neighbourhood to make healthy food and exercise an easy and attractive lifestyle option for young people. It focuses on children and adolescents themselves, along with their parents and the direct environment. The main aim is to reverse the increasing trend of young people (0-19 years) with overweight/obesity. JOGG advocates a local approach in which not just the parents and health professionals, but also shopkeepers, companies, schools and local authorities join hands to ensure that young people remain at a healthy weight. The Dutch JOGG approach is based on the successful French project EPODE and consists of five pillars: political and governmental support; cooperation between the private and public sector (public private partnership); social marketing; scientific coaching and evaluation; linking prevention and health care. Currently, 84 municipalities in the Netherlands are using the JOGG approach (of 390 municipalities) to promote healthy weight among their youth. JOGG is coordinated at national level by the national JOGG foundation in The Hague. The ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport supports and finally contributes to JOGG. Activities at the national level are: - Advice on creating political and managerial support - Training in the JOGG approach for locally involved parties - Information on successful interventions and best practices - Designing and providing municipalities with communication and information materials - Directions on how to implement the JOGG approach - Scientific research on how to measure the effects of the approach Activities at local level (among other things): - 'Drink water' campaigns at schools and at sport clubs - Healthy school canteen and healthy sport canteen - Discount access to sport clubs - Save walking and cycling routes to schools - Vegetable garden at schools

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

	- Integrated approach of the treatment of obesity (schools, youth health care, primary health care and hospital) - Lessons about healthy food

Study Visit	JOGG
Date	April 20 – 21, 2016
Inviting partner	National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM)
Visiting partners	Andalusian Regional Ministry of Health-CSJA (Spain), Directorate of Health-DOHI (Iceland), EuroHealthNet (Belgium), German Federal Centre for Health Education – BzgA (Germany), Health Service Executive-HSE (Ireland), Institute of Public Health in Ireland-IPH (Ireland), National Institute of Health-ISS (Italy), National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge-INSA (Portugal)
Elements of the original intervention to keep after transfer / scaling-up	National strategy is based on 5 pillars: - Monitoring and Evaluation - Public Private Partnership - Commitment at policy level and from a wide variety of sectors - Social Marketing - Connecting prevention and health care sectors Implementation of each pillar in the intervention differs according to local needs.
Essential elements of project management of original intervention	- National coordination of JOGG bureau - Customized support /advice for all municipalities - JOGG program manager at national level is responsible to overview implementation of all pillars at local level
Indispensable conditions for success of the original context	- Political commitment on national and local level - Support at the local level as well as from a bigger context - Community engagement - The use of well-known ambassadors for the dissemination of the program (for JOGG it is a Dutch Prince)
Necessary (and feasible) elements of a knowledge transfer process	- The establishment of a knowledge transfer process - To blend/implement JOGG activities on the background of pre-existing local programmes (open space for discussion with other actors and decision makers to highlight the added value)
What could be done better in a transferred project?	- Make the local interventions easy and small - Limit the number of goals - Manage the expectations for the evaluation results in time - Partners are motivated to evaluate their interventions, because it can improve their work
Good to know	Challenges for the project are budget constraints, time consuming procedures, lack of access to reliable data and skills and expertise and lack of local interest.
Further information on the project	- Annex of the Report on Good Practice examples in Health Promotion & Primary Prevention in Chronic Disease Prevention, page 43ff [http://chrodis.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Annex-Report-CHRODIS-WP5-Task-3_Version-1.3-.pdf] - www.jongerenopgezondgewicht.nl

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

Project	PNPAS - National Programme for the Promotion of Healthy Eating
Type of good practice	All life cycles
Country	Portugal
Aim	To improve the nutritional status and health of the Portuguese population in order to prevent common chronic diseases.
Objectives	- To increase the knowledge about food consumption by the Portuguese population, its determinants and consequences - To modify the availability of certain foods, namely in schools, workplaces and public spaces - To inform and empower the population in general, especially the most disadvantaged groups, on how to purchase, cook and store healthy foods - To identify and promote crosscutting actions to encourage the consumption of good nutritional quality foods with the collaboration of other public and private sectors, namely in the areas of agriculture, sports, environment, education, social security and municipalities - To improve the qualification and mode of action of the different professionals who, through their activity, may influence knowledge, attitudes and behaviours in the food area
Level of intervention	National policy locally implemented
Location / setting	Population level
Target group(s)	All age groups; deprived neighbourhoods
Transfer / scaling-up	Based on international documents and key European and WHO policies, strategies and recommendations in the area of food and nutrition.
Major characteristics	- Health education activities - Intersectoral collaboration - Collaboration with the food industry, catering, advertisement sectors etc. - Key stakeholders training
Short description	The PNAPS is a national policy for healthy eating, which was designed and coordinated by the Directorate General of Health. The PNPAS has five general goals that are reached by a set of activities: a) The systematic collection of indicators on nutritional status, food consumption and its determinants, the assessment of food insecurity situations, and the dissemination of best practices. b) The change in the offer of certain foods (with high sugar, salt and fat content), by controlling their supply and sales in schools, health and social support institutions and in the workplace, through a coordinated action with the food industry and the catering sector and as well through other activities. c) The increase in food and nutrition literacy, particularly the most disadvantaged ones, towards healthy choices and eating practices, and the encouragement of best practices on labelling, advertising and marketing of food products. d) The identification and promotion of cross-sectional actions with other sectors of society, namely agriculture, sports, environment, education, municipalities and social security, should encourage the consumption of foods of vegetable origin, develop electronic tools that enable planning healthy, easy-to-use and affordable menus with price information, and develop a network at municipality level for monitoring best practices and projects in the area of the promotion of healthy eating for citizens. e) The improvement of education, qualification and mode of action of different professionals who can influence quality eating habits, namely at the level of the health sector, schools, municipalities, the tourism and catering sector or social security. The PNPAS is articulated with National Health Plan 2012-2016. Monitoring in 2013 and 2014 shows that the indicators are reaching their targets. Monitoring and some evidence show a need

Final Draft

	for information about nutritional status, food and nutritional literacy campaigns, specifically to healthcare professional and the older population.

Study Visit	PNPAS
Date	May 23 - 24, 2016
Inviting partner	Directorate General of Health (DGS), Portugal
Visiting partners	European Platform for Better Oral Health in Europe, German Federal Centre for Health Education – BzgA (Germany), Health Service Executive-HSE (Ireland), Ministry of Health-MINSAL (Italy), National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge-NSA (Portugal)
Elements of the original intervention to keep after transfer / scaling-up	- Scientific evidence of the problem as starting point - Good personal networks and relations for effective communication - One key figure with passion, strong persistence (already for 20 years!), good negotiation and social skills with a vision - Large network of diverse partners from all public and private sectors - Flexibility for the local partners to adapt the programme according to the local needs
Essential elements of project management of original intervention	- The programme is governed under a central framework by the Directorate General of Health - Practical implementation with regional and local coordination teams - Proper documentation and constant mapping of the programme - Transparency of the program to open access to the data
Indispensable conditions for success of the original context	- Political commitment on national and local level - Looking for existing initiatives and focus on changing and improving current practice and approaches rather than designing new national health promotion programmes
Necessary (and feasible) elements of a knowledge transfer process	- Clear and detailed description of the methodology adopted to develop the strategy - Identification and documentation of strengths and weaknesses
Good to know	A key feature in the successful implementation of this programme is the establishment of public-private partnerships and the strong presence in social media.
Further information on the project	Annexe of the Report on Good Practice examples in Health Promotion & Primary Prevention in Chronic Disease Prevention, page 187ff [http://chrodis.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Annex-Report-CHRODIS-WP5-Task-3_Version-1.3-.pdf]

Final Draft

Project	Welfare watch
Type of good practice	All life cycles
Country	Iceland
Aim	To reduce the impact of economic crisis on health
Objectives	- Monitor social and financial consequences of the economic crises - Publish recommendations to the government on how to protect vulnerable groups - Getting together various stakeholders to have a realistic feel for what is going on - See that the ‘Social indicators’ are collected and published - Newest focus is especially on the very poor and children with families
Level of intervention	National strategy
Location / setting	Population level
Target group(s)	All age groups Focus on children/youth, long-term unemployed and unemployed young people
Transfer / scaling-up	The Nordic Welfare watch was a project that built on the Icelandic Welfare Watch and has three main components: (1) Nordic Welfare Indicators, (2) response to crisis and (3) welfare consequences of financial crises.
Major characteristics	- Focus on families and individuals in poverty - Coordination of policy and actions - Focus on living conditions - Intersectoral collaboration
Short description	The Welfare Watch was established in accordance with a cabinet resolution in 2009 as a response to the economic crisis and it was re-established in 2014. The Minister of Social Affairs and Social Security appointed the Welfare Watch, a Steering Committee, with the main role to monitor systematically the social and financial consequences of the economic situation for families and individuals in Iceland and to propose measures to help households and in particular vulnerable groups. Originally the Welfare Watch had representatives from 19 stakeholders, among others from six ministries, social partners, NGOs, Union of Local Authorities, The City of Reykjavik, the Directorate of Health, the Directorate of Labour and the Council of Equal rights of man and women. In 2014 the Welfare Watch expanded and is now a platform with 35 stakeholders represented from all sectors and levels of the society. The Welfare Watch is a governmental enterprise, with chairman and an employee provided by the Ministry of Welfare. Other stakeholders do not get special payment for their participation but donate the time of their representatives to the work (is considered a part of their daily work). The Welfare Watch established the Social Indicators which have been published every year since 2012. The Social Indicators are a collection of indicators regarding democracy and activities, standard of living and welfare, health and social cohesion. The Welfare Watch has frequent meetings and has smaller working task groups. Several proposals and reports have been delivered by the Welfare Watch. Social gradient in health is a fact in Iceland, like in other European countries. The report of the social determinants and the health divide in the WHO European Region informed the development of Health 2020, the European Policy framework for health and well-being. The report emphasises that without improvements in all the social determinants of health, there will be no significant reductions in health inequities. Health 2020’s ultimate goal is to achieve health equity by reducing the socially determined inequities in the WHO European Region. The key to success is engagement of stakeholders across sectors and levels, like is facilitated by the work of the Welfare Watch. Originally, the main aim was to monitor the social and financial consequences of the economic situation for families and individuals and propose measures to help households. In 2014 the objectives where narrowed to focus on families with children and those living in severe poverty. In January 2015 proposals regarding these groups were published and introduced to the Minister of Social Affairs and

Final Draft

	Housing. The main themes were: child benefits and child social insurance; criteria for the minimum subsistence; the housing situation; basic service; case coordinators; cooperation with NGOs and a project fund.

Final Draft

Study Visit	Welfare Watch
Date	June 1 – 2, 2016
Inviting partner	Directorate of Health (with an introduction from Ministry of Welfare)
Visiting partners	Carlos III Institute of Health – ISCIII (Spain), Centre for Health Education and Disease Prevention – SMLPC (Lithuania), City of Pori (Finland), Directorate General of Health – DGS (Portugal), EuroHealthNet (Belgium), Institute of Public Health – IPH (Ireland), National Centre of Health and Analyses (Bulgaria), National Institute for Health Development – NIHD (Estonia), National Institute for Health and Welfare (Finland), National Institute for Public Health and the Environment – RIVM (Netherlands), National Institute of Health Dr. Ricardo Jorge (Portugal)
Elements of the original intervention to keep after transfer / scaling-up	- Social development and equity should be preserved - Effective partnerships with all relevant stakeholders - Start in a small region and later expand to national level - Intersectoral and multi-level approach
Essential elements of project management of original intervention	- Organisational structures (responsibilities) are clearly defined - Sources of funding are specified - Management done by local authorities - Cross-sectional steering and working groups
Indispensable conditions for success of the original context	- Collaboration between different stakeholders across sectors and levels - Durable political will and support - The population's awareness about the problem
Necessary (and feasible) elements of a knowledge transfer process	- Documents and tools used in original intervention to fully understand this intervention - Report about the monitoring of implemented proposals, their results and impacts, strengths and weaknesses - Identification of existing matched elements (for instance in political/administrative institutions and services providers) between the populations of the original and replica intervention
What could be done better in a transferred project?	- Keep the objectives clear - Incorporate evaluation from the start - Include relevant stakeholders - Adjust to your own country but be aware not to lose touch with people in the field
Good to know	- Challenges to manage such a large group as we had and keep focus on the objectives. - Important to have good management and moderators. - Could be good to hear from the Nordic Welfare Watch about their experience of transference and adaption.
Further information on the project	- Annexe of the Report on Good Practice examples in Health Promotion & Primary Prevention in Chronic Disease Prevention, page 265ff [http://chrodis.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Annex-Report-CHRODIS-WP5-Task-3_Version-1.3-.pdf] - https://eng.velferdarraduneyti.is/media/velferdarvakt09/29042010The-Welfare-Watch_Report-to-the-Althingi.pdf

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

Project	NGL- The Icelandic National Curriculum Guides for Preschools, Compulsory Schools and Upper Secondary Schools: Health and Wellbeing One of Six Fundamental Pillars of Education
Type of good practice	Pre-natal environment, early childhood, childhood and adolescence
Country	Iceland
Aim	To improve physical, mental and social health
Objectives	From the national curriculum Key competence that students: - Are responsible for themselves and their actions - Show responsibility for their own health and wellbeing - Are aware of themselves as sexual beings - Are aware of the value of regular exercise, and that they exercise regularly - Are aware of the importance of varied and nutritious diet - Show responsibility towards intolerance, bullying and other forms of violence - Are aware of the damage caused by smoking and other use of tobacco, alcohol consumption and the use of other intoxicants.
Level of intervention	National school policy (for preschools, compulsory schools, upper secondary schools)
Location / setting	Schools and community
Target group(s)	Children, youth and staff in: - Pre-schools (2-5 years) - Compulsory Schools (6-15 years) - Upper Secondary Schools (mainly 16-19 years)
Transfer / scaling-up	It has been very helpful for Health Promoting School projects to build on the curriculum and use it as a foundation and reason for schools to participate. Health Promoting school projects (DOHI) are in fact a tool/way for schools to implement the curriculum.
Major characteristics	National curriculum guides as a foundation and Health promoting school projects (DOHI) as tool for implementation: - Whole school approach - Teachers' training - School health policy, checklists, action plan, health indicators and evaluation - Website as a working tool - Toolbox for themes - Health education - health literacy
Short description	The National Curriculum Guide is a policy framework for Icelandic schools across educational levels: children in pre-schools (2-5 years), compulsory schools (6-15 years) and upper secondary schools (mainly 16-19 years). In 2011, new National Curriculum Guides for pre-, compulsory and upper secondary schools were published in Iceland by the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture. In that policy a milestone was made by defining "health and wellbeing" as one of the six fundamental pillars of education, thereby confirming the importance of health and wellbeing for education and vice versa. The policy describes the role of education in schools according to Icelandic laws and regulations, the objectives and organization of school operations and the requirements and rights of everyone in the school community. Six fundamental pillars have been developed within this framework that forms the essence of the educational policy in Iceland. In addition to "health and wellbeing", the other pillars are "literacy", "sustainability", "democracy and human rights", "equality" and "creativity". The main health factors that are to be encouraged are: positive self-image, physical activity, nutrition, rest, mental wellbeing, positive communication, security, hygiene, sexual health and understanding of one's own feelings and those of others. How the Directorate of Health uses the curriculum: The National Curriculum Guide and particularly the pillar "health and wellbeing" is an important foundation for the Health Promoting

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

	School projects. The well-established Health Promoting School project likewise provides an important support for schools to implement the pillar "health and wellbeing" in all their work. The number of Health Promoting Communities (municipalities) is also increasing and one of their priorities is to encourage and motivate their schools to take part in the Health Promoting School projects.

Final Draft

Co-funded by
the Health Programme
of the European Union

Study Visit	NGL
Date	June 1 - 2, 2016
Inviting partner	Directorate of Health (with an introduction from the Ministry of Education)
Visiting partners	Carlos III Institute of Health – ISCIII (Spain), Centre for Health Education and Disease Prevention – SMLPC (Lithuania), City of Pori (Finland), Directorate General of Health (Portugal), EuroHealthNet (Belgium), Institute of Public Health – IPH (Ireland), National Centre of Health and Analyses (Bulgaria), National Institute for Health Development – NIHD (Estonia), National Institute for Health and Welfare (Finland), National Institute for Public Health and the Environment – RIVM (Netherlands), National Institute of Health Dr. Ricardo Jorge (Portugal)
Elements of the original intervention to keep after transfer / scaling-up	- Health in all policies approach (not a stand-alone model, but embedded within a healthy communities approach) - Formal support from the Ministry of Education - Start the implementation in a small region and later expanded to national level
Essential elements of project management of original intervention	- Organisational structures (responsibilities) are clearly defined, sources of funding are specified - Health Promoting School Projects (DOHI) as a framework/tool - The freedom of each school to adapt the implementation according to their needs
Indispensable conditions for success of the original context	- Willingness of the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture to advance the health promotion agenda in schools - Recognition of the important role of the Health Promotion School Projects (DOHI) in implementing the health and wellbeing theme - Available funding to develop supporting tools such as the website and training events
Necessary (and feasible) elements of a knowledge transfer process	- Availability of documents and tools used in the original intervention in order to avoid 'reinventing the wheel' if it is going to be implemented elsewhere
What could be done better in a transferred project?	- Involve relevant stakeholders from the start in making curriculum changes as these. - Make sure that the ones implementing it (school staff) have the means and time to do so. - Important to have a project manager in every school to ensure the implementation and have overview of what is being done.
Good to know	- The tool that we (DOHI) provide with Health Promoting School projects are free of charge but expects the schools to put resources to manage it and adapt it to each school. - It has been very helpful to have a curriculum to support Health Promotion on a national level.
Further information on the project	- Annexe of the Report on Good Practice examples in Health Promotion & Primary Prevention in Chronic Disease Prevention, page 38ff [http://chrodis.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Annex-Report-CHRODIS-WP5-Task-3_Version-1.3-.pdf] - https://eng.menntamalaraduneyti.is/publications/curriculum/

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

Project	The Lombardy Workplace Health Promotion Network
Type of good practice	Adulthood & Aging
Country	Italy
Aim	To improve health (diet, smoking, physical activity, road safety, alcohol etc.)and welfare in the workplace
Objectives	- Improvement in work organization and working environment - Encouragement for staff to take part in healthy activities - Promotion of healthy choices - Encouragement of personal development (empowerment)
Level of intervention	Regional project
Location / setting	Workplaces
Target group(s)	Adults (employees)
Transfer / scaling-up	European Workplace Health Promotion Network
Major characteristics	- Advocacy - Supportive organizational and environmental measures at workplaces - Promotion of an internal process of "continuous improvement" of the companies with the active participation of workers and managers, in order to facilitate the adoption of healthy lifestyles for the prevention of chronic diseases
Short description	The Lombardy Workplace Health Promotion Network (WHP) involves 284 workplaces, employing 139186 persons in November 2014. It is a public-private network, carried out by building partnerships and collaboration with all workplace main stakeholders: associations of enterprises, trade unions and the regional health system. The development of this Italian pilot project started in 2011 in Bergamo, by identifying and selecting good practices, and by experimenting the feasibility and effectiveness in two mid-sized companies before extending the project to other companies. A system of accreditation was later defined. Member companies should implement good practice activities over three years and four new activities every year to maintain the "Workplace Health Promotion Site"- logo. The areas of good practice are: nutrition, tobacco, physical activity, road safety, alcohol and substances, and well-being. The results were surprising in terms of network and adhesion. The WHP Network expanded on a regional scale during 2013 and is made up of companies ("workplaces") which recognize the value of corporate social responsibility and undertake to be an "environment conducive to health" systematizing, with the scientific support of Health Local Unit where necessary, evidence-based actions of different nature: informational (smoking cessation, healthy eating, etc.), organizational (canteens, snack vending machines, agreements with gyms, stairs health programmes, walking / biking from home to work, smoke-free environment, baby pit-stop, etc.) and collaboration with others in the local community (Associations, etc.). The "Lombardy WHP Network" programme is inserted in the Regional Prevention Plan for 2010-2013 and 2014-2018, in the National Prevention Plan 2014-2018 and fits into the strategies of EUROPEAN INNOVATION PARTNERSHIP on Active and Healthy Ageing (EIP-AHA). At the end of 2014 we can count the adherence of 284 companies to the network and a total of 139,186 employees are involved. From 2013 to 2014 the regional increase was equal to 103% in relation to the number of companies and 132% in relation to the number of employees. The chosen interventions and strategies influence multiple levels of the organization including the individual employee and the organization as a whole. The evidence based actions are continuously updated according to the literature data. The one year Bergamo impact evaluation showed that after 12 months there was a reduction in some important risk factors for chronic diseases in

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

	workers participating in the programme, particularly for fruit and vegetable intake and smoking cessation.

Study Visit	Lombardy Workplace Health Promotion Network
Date	June 23 – 24, 2016
Inviting partner	Ministry of Health
Visiting partners	Agenas (Italy), EuroHealthNet (Belgium), European Institute of Women's Health (Ireland), Fondacio IRCCS Istituto Neurologico C. Besta (Italy), FUNKA (Italy), Health Protection Agency (Italy), Health Services Executive – HSE (Ireland), Lombardy Region (Italy), Ministry of Health (Italy), Ministry of Health and Services (Norway), National Institute for Health Development – NIHD (Estonia), National Institute of Health Dr. Ricardo Jorge (Portugal), NHS (England), Piedmont Region (Italy), Sodalitas Foundation (Italy)
Lessons learnt	
Elements of the original intervention to keep after transfer / scaling-up	- Public and private network with a commitment from a wide variety of stakeholders - High levels of participation and communication between providers and participants - High standards of motivation ("fun theory approach"), people engagement process - Flexibility and adaptability on its implementation - Voluntary adhesion and freedom of choices - Clear structure once an employer is taking part, with clear methodology, feedback methodology - Utilization of data to inform policy and practice - Emphasise on a communications approach using social media - Availability of tools and important information for companies on the website - Recognition award from the Ministry of Health is highly valued by companies
Essential elements of project management of original intervention	- National platform on food, physical activity and tobacco that feeds into the work - Clearly defined organisational structures (responsibilities) - Specified sources of funding - High expression of flexibility on the governance rules which are adapted to each company context - Internal process of monitoring and evaluation for consistency of the programme and its continuous improvement
Indispensable conditions for success of the original context	- Collaboration between different stakeholders across sectors and levels - Durable political will and support, including commitment required in terms of a strategic national and regional plan - "Voluntary adhesion" of the companies involved, "self-decision" model
Necessary (and feasible) elements of a knowledge transfer process	- Availability of documents and tools used in original intervention to be shared with replica intervention - Exchange of key lessons learned - Continuous communication between providers of the original intervention and the potential replicator
What could be done better in a transferred project?	In the planning of the various initiatives with the enterprises involved the characteristics of the employees could be better assessed. The aim would be to customize the actions with regard to specific aspects such as gender, education, training, etc., to reduce or prevent inequalities, and to reach more specific objectives of health and wellbeing (for examples promoting a diet rich in folic acid for women, attention to pregnant or breast-feeding women, informational materials understandable for all education levels, etc.)
Good to know	Key lessons for a successful intervention include the participation of companies in the planning process, a voluntary adhesion, a comprehensive communication plan, the adaptability and freedom to choose priorities, and support to companies on a ongoing basis through the availability of online resources and tools.

Final Draft

Further information on the project	Annexe of the Report on Good Practice examples in Health Promotion & Primary Prevention in Chronic Disease Prevention, page 96ff
Further information on the study visit	

Project	**Well London (Well communities) Programme**
Type of good practice	All life cycles
Country	United Kingdom
Aim	Improve healthy living
Objectives	- Improving wellbeing and equality - Capacity building - Participation as delivery of better services
Level of intervention	Community intervention
Location / setting	Community
Target group(s)	All age groups (35% of total 'target' population)
Transfer / scaling-up	Scaling-up
Major characteristics	- Community mobilisation - Focus on poor urban areas - Multicultural activities - Social support - Focus on volunteers
Short description	The Well London Programme started in 2007 and has run since then. It has been funded by the national lottery and consists of a series of programmes run in 20 of London's most deprived areas. It was devised in the context of the Mayor of London's health inequalities strategy and was led by an alliance of representatives covering major development priorities for London. The Well London delivery team contributes to policy objectives such as improving wellbeing and equality, capacity building and participation as delivery of better services. Its aim is to improve all these areas. Each project recruits teams of volunteers from deprived areas who receive training in outreach and health promotion and then go out into their communities to signpost local residents to services and activities that promote health and wellbeing. Phase 1 ran from 2007 to 2011 and included a suite of 14 projects aimed at building community capacity and cohesion it focused on physical activity, healthy eating, mental wellbeing, local environments, arts and culture. Its collective aim was to improve health and wellbeing. Over 47000 people took part in phase 1. It was evaluated in 2011/2012 and was found to have had very positive impacts in improving diet and physical activities. The programme has been designed following community research carried out by the University of East London, which identified a need to provide local residents with skills to increase opportunities for volunteering to work in their communities to improve health and wellbeing and raising awareness around health issues. Relevant data showed that the residents in the areas targeted had worse than average health (for London). The project was based on the social marketing theory which recognises that a peer-to-peer approach is often effective in motivating people to take up activities and make lifestyle changes. There are a wide variety of activities to achieve the aims of the project. They included such

Final Draft

	activities as helping people to grow their own healthy food, to buy healthy food at low cost and cook it, physical activities, reaching out to hard to reach groups, etc. The Well London Phase 1 evaluation is freely available online and the plans for the phase 2 evaluation (www.info@welllondon.org.uk). The scale and complexity of the Well London programme mark it out as a nationally and internationally significant initiative applying a community development approach in neglected urban areas. It is generating learning and evidence not only to support its integration locally but also to inform wider policy and practice in a field of growing importance

Final Draft

Study Visit	Well London
Date	June 28 - 30, 2016
Inviting partner	*Greater London Authorities health team*
Visiting partners	Andalusian Regional Ministry of Equality, Health and Social Policies – CISPSJA (Spain), Centre for Health Education and Disease Prevention – SMLPC (Lithuania), Directorate General of Health – DGS (Portugal), Directorate of Health – DOHI (Iceland), EuroHealthNet (Belgium), German Federal Centre for Health Education – BzgA (Germany), Ministry of Health – YPE (Greece), Ministry of Health and Services (Norway), Institute of Public Health – IPH (Ireland), National Institute for Public Health and the Environment – RIVM (Netherlands), National Institute of Health – ISS (Italy), Platform for Better Oral Health in Europe (Belgium)
Lessons learnt	
Elements of the original intervention to keep after transfer / scaling-up	- Bottom up approach with strong elements of "basic democracy" - Clear partnership and collaboration between communities, all interested organisations and stakeholders - Capacity building, volunteering, community building - Members of the respective networks differ from one neighbourhood to the other in order to guarantee the best fit between need and measures - Stability of funding over many years - Social rather than medical basis
Essential elements of project management of original intervention	- Clear definition of following terms in the context of the project: transparent, inclusiveness, community involvement and engagement - Coordinating office based in local community to allow easy access - Socially aware and friendly coordinator - Evaluation (third party funded) with connection to an academic institution for impact
Indispensable conditions for success of the original context	- Programme has been designed with sustainability of outcomes - Knowledge exchange and shared learning (big learning events) - General support from high profile organisations/individuals - Engagement and empowerment of local people - Emphasis on how the approach influences and improves health - Long-term perspective is key
Necessary (and feasible) elements of a knowledge transfer process	- Original programme designed with scaling-up in mind - Well defined documentation of process - Continuous monitoring and documentation of barriers and supporting factors for success - Identification of weaknesses, such as pre-existing conflicts on the ground and the consequences, to understand them better in the future as a potential barrier to local collaboration and to overcome them - Knocking on doors and listening to people
What could be done better in a transferred project?	Issues of fidelity are very important. New programmes, particularly in new contexts, would have to be monitored and evaluated carefully to ensure the fidelity of the overall approach, and so that any new learning could be incorporated into the framework.
Good to know	Central funding (from the Big Lottery in England) will probably not be available in many other countries, where it is likely to be sought locally from municipalities. Networking prior to and during project to create an alliance of many interested groups each providing different expertise
Further information on the project	Annex of the Report on Good Practice examples in Health Promotion & Primary Prevention in Chronic Disease Prevention, page 273ff

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

Further information on the study visit	

Project	Norwegian Public Health Act
Type of good practice	All life cycles
Country	Norway
Aim	Improve public health
Level of intervention	National policy
Location / setting	Population level
Target group(s)	All age groups
Transfer / scaling-up	
Major characteristics	- Overview of public health and health determinants - Development of public health plans - Collaboration of key stakeholders - Focus on health inequities - Focus on living conditions

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

Short description	The new Public Health Act was introduced in Norway 1 January 2012. The purpose of this Act is to contribute to societal development that promotes public health and reduces social inequalities in health. Public health work shall promote the population's health, well-being and good social and environmental conditions, and contribute to the prevention of mental and somatic illnesses, disorders and injuries. The Act establishes a new foundation for strengthening systematic public health work in the development of policies and planning for societal development based on regional and local challenges and needs. The Act provides a broad basis for the coordination of public health work horizontally across various sectors and actors and vertically between authorities at local, regional and national level. Only by integrating health and its social determinants as an aspect of all social and welfare development through intersectoral action, can good and equitable public health be achieved. One of the main features of the Act is that it places responsibility for public health work as a whole-of-government and a whole-of-municipality responsibility rather than a responsibility for the health sector alone. In public health work the municipalities must involve all sectors for the promotion of public health, not just the health sector. Each municipality shall implement the measures that are necessary for meeting the municipality's public health challenges. This may, for example, encompass measures relating to childhood environments and living conditions, such as housing, education, employment and income, physical and social environments, physical activity, nutrition, injuries and accidents, tobacco use, alcohol use and use of other psychoactive substances. The counties (19 altogether) have the responsibility to support public health work in the municipalities. The county governor shall supervise the legality of the municipality`s and county authority`s fulfilment of the duties imposed in or pursuant to the Act. The Norwegian Directorate of Health will monitor implementation of the Act. Evaluations have showed that the municipalities do not consider the health sector to be the most important sector in the health promotion work. This corresponds with the basic idea of HiAP (Health in all policies) and the importance of SDH (social determinants of health) and the policy behind the Public Health Act. The municipalities regard the Public Health Act as a helpful tool for systematic, inter-sectoral health promotion work in the municipality.

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

Study Visit	Norwegian Public Health Act
Date	June 13 – 14, 2016
Inviting partner	Ministry of Health and Care Services The Norwegian Directorate of Health
Visiting partners	Bilateral visit of Directorate of Health – DOHI (Iceland)
Elements of the original intervention to keep after transfer / scaling-up	- Local and regional levels are key stakeholders but the national level has clear responsibility to support the implementation. - The responsibility has been moved from the health service sector to municipalities as a whole.
Essential elements of project management of original intervention	- The national level provides various support for monitoring and capacity building (platform for networking and evidence based guidance for implementation of measures) - Evaluation of stated goals, strategies and other public health efforts - All counties and most municipalities have public health coordinators
Indispensable conditions for success of the original context	- Systematic public health work with the new Public Health Act in 2011 - Long term instead of short term focus - Inclusion of key stakeholders
Necessary (and feasible) elements of a knowledge transfer process	- Engagement of a HiAP approach to political decision making - Application of scientifically sound, holistic methods - Use of evidence based methodologies - Application of key health indicators
What could be done better in a transferred project?	- A national policy and act like the Public health Act needs to be adjusted to setting. - The Act can give ideas to implement in other settings.
Good to know	Norwegian institute of public health provides statistics for the municipalities on public health issues in the local community: https://www.fhi.no/en/hn/health-in-the-municipalities/hent-folkehelseprofil-for-kommune-fylke-eller-bydel/
Further information on the project	Annex of the Report on Good Practice examples in Health Promotion & Primary Prevention in Chronic Disease Prevention, page 259ff [http://chrodis.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Annex-Report-CHRODIS-WP5-Task-3_Version-1.3-.pdf]

Final Draft

Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union