

### The Rights of the child including the protection of children

**Legal basis:** Council Regulation (EC) No 168/2007 / Council Decision of 28 February 2008 implementing Regulation 168/2007

**Budget line:** B0-3331

#### Project 2.4.2: GUARDIANSHIP PROVISIONS FOR CHILD VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING

Objectives: See AWP2012 project fiche

Budget: € 222,958.00

Objectives: See AWP2012 project fiche

Budget: € 222,958.00

Description of the action: Research and data collection

Type of contracts:

Number of contracts:

Indicative timeframe for procurement:

Indicative budget for procurement: € 222,958.00

### Cross-cutting projects or activities covering all MAF areas

**Legal basis:** Council Regulation (EC) No 168/2007 / Council Decision of 28 February 2008 implementing Regulation 168/2007

**Budget line:** B0-3701

#### Project 2.6.8: ONLINE COMMUNICATION AND DOCUMENTATION

Objectives: See AWP2012 project fiche

Budget: € 298,000.00

Objectives: See AWP2012 project fiche

Budget: € 70,000.00

Description of the action: Research and data collection

Type of contracts: Framework contract (FRANET)

Number of contracts:

Indicative timeframe for procurement:

Indicative budget for procurement: € 70,000.00

## 1. External evaluation of the FRA

### 1.1 The purpose

The Agency, in compliance with its Founding Regulation 168/2007 (art. 30) commissioned in 2011 an independent external evaluation to undertake a review of progress and achievements during the first five years of operations of the Agency.

According to the mentioned article, the external evaluation shall:

- (a) Take into account the tasks of the Agency, the working practices and impact of the Agency on the protection and promotion of FR;
- (b) Assess the possible need to modify the Agency's tasks, scope, areas of activity or structure;
- (c) Include an analysis of the synergy effects and the financial implications of any modification of the tasks;
- (d) Take into account the views of the stakeholders at both Community and national levels."

Within the procurement procedures for selecting the external evaluators, the terms of reference were issued in-house (inspired by good practises of other Agencies by the Management Board in agreement with the EC. The final terms of reference were adopted in July 2011 and the related call for tender launched.

As stated in the Terms of Reference, the overall objective of the study is to evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency, added value, utility, coordination and coherence of the contribution made by the Fundamental Rights Agency while the main specific objectives are as follows:

- To identify instruments for evaluating the FRA effectiveness, efficiency and its added value;
- To assess the FRA usefulness in assisting EU institutions and Member States to ensure fundamental rights are respected;
- To assess the overall ability of the FRA to sustain its activities and meet future challenges;
- To define the barriers and obstacles to optimal performance;
- To identify relevant actions to improve the performance and added value;
- To identify actions needed to eliminate or reduce possible inefficiencies;
- To identify challenges as regards the FRA governance (including managerial issues, planning and priority setting and working practices);
- To benchmark the overall efficiency, balance of resources, budget distribution and resource allocation with other organisations carrying out similar tasks.

The contract was awarded to Ramboll Management Consulting, leader in the field of Evaluation and M&E Systems (it was charged by the Commission to carry out an extensive evaluation of the 26 EU decentralized Agencies).

### 1.2 The criteria

Ramboll Management started its activities in January 2012, when the inception meeting was held. The inception report outlined the work plan from the early stages till the preparation and finalization of the External Evaluation Report, planned for November 2012.

The external evaluator, in order to perform its tasks, referred to the following criteria:

- Effectiveness, to assess the extent to which objectives are achieved, including the quality and timeline of its achievements;
- Efficiency, to assess the extent to which it has conducted its activities and achieved its objectives at a reasonable cost
- Added value, to assess the extent to which it has been successful in addressing needs for the full respect of FR in the framework of Union law
- Utility, to assess the extent to which it has been more effective and efficient in achieving its results and impacts
- Coordination and coherence, to assess the extent to which it coordinates with relevant bodies and agencies in the field of FR carrying out similar tasks

### 1.3 The operations and coordination

Ramboll Management Consulting started its activities in January 2012, when an inception meeting was held. The inception report outlined the work plan from the early stages until the preparation and finalization of the External Evaluation Report, planned for November 2012.

Since the beginning of operations the FRA set up a Steering Group composed by the heads of department and the planning team.

The purpose of the Steering Group was to act as the external evaluator's counterpart, performing the following functions:

- supervising all operations and tasks carried out both in technical and administrative terms;
- ensuring a coordinated and timely delivery of all information and data the contractor might have required
- Ensuring that all aspects related to the functioning of the FRA were well represented in the evaluation documents.

In particular, the planning team of the FRA supported the external evaluator by acting as contact person in order to ensure the necessary daily link between the evaluator and the FRA.

### 1.4 The methodology

According to the proposed and adopted methodology, the evaluation was performed using a combination of tools and data collection activities which fit the Agency's profile best.

More specifically:

- Systematic review of secondary data
- An online survey directed towards the key stakeholders of the FRA, as defined in the Founding Regulation
- A second survey was directed towards the FRA's staff, members of the Management Board and members of the Scientific Committee
- Interviews carried out both with key stakeholders and FRA staff.
- Benchmarking with other organisations
- Case studies, i.e. in-depth investigations used to examine the identified assumptions and mechanisms in the FRA intervention logic and to explore causation between different levels of results.

The mentioned in – depth investigations carried out during the external evaluation exercise, played a relevant role for two reasons: the first is that the external evaluator used for the reconstruction of FRA intervention logic the performance measurement framework, an Agency's internal document drafted as an essential step towards the designing of its internal and monitoring and evaluation system; the second is that they referred to the contribution analysis.

The approach of contribution analysis is to verify and to validate assumptions behind the program where causality between results' levels (outputs – outcomes) is inferred from the following evidence:

- The programme is based on a reasoned theory of change: the assumptions behind why the programme is expected to work are sound, plausible and agreed upon by at least some of the key players;
- The activities have been already implemented;
- The theory of change is verified by evidence and the chain of expected results occurred;
- Other factors influencing the programme were assessed and were either shown not to have made a significant contribution or, the relative contribution was recognised.

### 1.5 The conclusion of operations

The FRA external evaluation report has been finalized on 15th November 2012, in compliance with the contract and the work plan.

The presentation of the main findings and recommendations will be made during the Management Board meeting scheduled on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2012.

## 2. Monitoring and Evaluation of the FRA performance

### 2.1 The Purpose

The adoption of a monitoring and evaluation system and implementation of related activities usually cover an important role for assessing how work programmes are carried out.

According to the Article 15, co. 4 f) of the FRA's founding regulation (168/2007) effective monitoring and evaluation procedures shall be implemented relating to the performance of the FRA against its objectives according to professionally recognised standards. The Director shall report annually to the Management Board on the results of the monitoring system.

The Monitoring and Evaluation activities will serve three purposes:

- Provide reliable performance information to assist management to deliver against targeted results, to address problems promptly and to take planning and budget decisions;
- Improve learning through regular review of strategies, projects and other activities improving internal functioning and providing staff and stakeholders with opportunities to learn more about the effectiveness and performance of the Agency;
- Strengthen accountability and transparency providing empirical evidence on the outcomes of the FRA activities and thus providing reliable information on results to EU institutions, Member states, and relevant stakeholders and to the public

The FRA, both in compliance with provisions of the founding regulations and in coherence with the content of the above mentioned requests contained in the joint statements of the Inter - Institutional Working Group in 2011 launched its road map to set up its internal monitoring and evaluation system.

The main idea is that monitoring and evaluation activities are made against the performance measurement framework based on the mandate, main objectives and core tasks of the FRA (as defined in the FRA founding Regulation) and defining long-term, intermediate and immediate outcomes to be achieved. Key performance indicators will serve to determine the extent to which FRA has delivered the expected results (see Annex FRA Performance Measurement Framework).

### 2.2 The overall planned activities

In order to set up Monitoring and Evaluation, the following activities have been planned:

- Review of the Performance Measurement Framework, refining the list of indicators to measure different activities, outputs, and outcomes in the Logic Model;
- Establishment of the FRA baseline situation for measuring change over time and to establish the basis for a 'before and after' assessment, assessing the achievement of the outcomes and outputs as expressed in the Performance Measurement Framework;
- Design and implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation activities based on the Monitoring and Evaluation Action Plan drafted by the FRA, which includes the methodology to be adopted, data collection methods and data sources to be used;
- Gathering any useful information and data to implement the Monitoring and Evaluation activities at the level of outputs, outcomes and processes of the FRA against the key performance indicators defined in the Performance Measurement Framework.
- Drafting the Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report (interim and final), based on clear and concrete key performance expectations and evaluation of achievements focused on outcomes and outputs attributed in whole or in part to the activities undertaken;
- Advising the FRA on monitoring mechanisms and appropriate tools for data management (for example databases or software).

Within the procurement procedures for selecting contractors for the M&E Activity, the Framework Contract method was used due to the long time-frame (2012-2016) of the activity, the framework contract terms of reference were issued in-house (inspired by good practises of other Agencies by the Management Board in agreement with the EC). The final terms of reference were adopted in XX 2011 and the related call for tender launched.

### 2.3 The activities implemented in 2012

The FRA is already carrying out the first set of the overall envisaged activities, according to the agreed work plan. This first phase started in August 2012 and ends in March 2013, with the contract signature with the contractor which will support the FRA planning team for all operations. At present, the system is being designed and a pilot phase, with the selection of a number of projects from different thematic areas and the Communication and Awareness Raising cross cutting activity, is being implemented both for assessing the functioning of the designed methods and tools and for the elaboration of first FRA performance report.

According to the adopted methodology for the first FRA Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report, the monitoring and evaluation to be performed uses a combination of tools and data collection activities. More specifically:

- Review of background documents, selected projects results and outputs, external evaluation results
- Interviews of relevant external parties and experts in the scientific field of the FRA selected projects
- Interviews and data collection with FRA project managers, thematic coordinators and management team
- Project case studies, i.e. in-depth investigations, desk research and each project's available documentation used to examine the identified assumptions and mechanisms in the FRA RIL/PMF matrix developed by the contractor

Under this pilot phase the reconstructed intervention logic and the performance measurement framework of FRA have been aligned and combined in a matrix form as an essential step towards finalisation of the monitoring and evaluation system and to facilitate the allocation of baseline and targets of the performance measures (indicators) relevant to the matrix which will be carried out in Specific Contract 2.

The revised PMF / RIL Matrix will form the basis for data collection and monitoring of indicators set in PMF.

The overall organizational and Thematic Area level evaluation will be carried out using SWOT Analysis while the selected projects will be evaluated using contribution analysis. Both these methods are qualitative evaluation methods that can operate in the lack of a baseline and targets as is the case for 2012.

The FRA performance report will be structured as follows:

- I. Executive Summary: with an overview of the evaluation methodology, cases selected, results, conclusions and recommendations
- II. Overview: outlining the framework and purpose of the internal evaluation as well as its relationship with Annual Activity Report
- III. Introduction: presenting the aims of the report, purpose of the evaluation, a brief description of FRA evaluation efforts and its context.
- IV. The FRA: background and mandate of FRA, FRA organization and management, Objectives and activities
- V. Methodology: with the planned survey of project related external stakeholders and experts, interviews, desk research, description of methodology used, including tools, case studies, relevance of data collection methods to PMF, results and reporting on outputs, results and reporting on immediate outcomes, results and reporting on intermediate outcomes, Results and reporting on long term impact.
- VI. Evaluation of FRA Thematic Areas: in terms of contribution made by the FRA in the covered domain
- VII. Case studies: including projects 1) EU MIDIS, 2) Fundamental rights of persons with intellectual disabilities and persons with mental health problems, 3) Handbook on European Union non-discrimination law, 4) Holocaust and human rights education / Lessons from the holocaust (2008-2012), 5) Greece flash report, 6) Indicators for the rights of the child, 7) Cross cutting activities (Communication and Awareness Raising activities and Networking).
- VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations: This section will discuss the findings from the previous sections, recommendations for further developing and exploiting the Performance Monitoring Framework and for FRA to achieve its PMF goals.
- IX. Monitoring Framework: Description of Monitoring Framework

### 3. Communication and use of evaluation results

Results of the external evaluation will be firstly submitted to the attention of the FRA Management Board. The report will be then transmitted to the European Commission, the European Parliament and Council of the EU and published on the FRA web site to inform the general public.

As for the use of the external evaluation results, according to the adopted methodology, several recommendations for actions have been made. They are based on findings and conclusions of the external evaluation and have been grouped in three categories:

- The usefulness of the FRA
- The organisation of the FRA
- The working procedure of the FRA

As for results coming from the monitoring and evaluation activities, the FRA Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report represents an internal document, aimed at assisting management in delivering against identified results, addressing problems promptly, planning according to lessons learnt from the past and providing empirical evidence of the outcomes of the FRA activities. Even though the internal monitoring and evaluation activities are mainly designed as an internal managerial tool, their results will be communicated to the general public, too.

From 2012 onwards, Annual Work Programmes of the FRA will be enriched with an annex which will give evidence on the annual performance.

### 4. Resources and budget

The FRA, for carrying out the External Evaluation, allocated 245,700.00 EUR, only for 2012.

As for the Monitoring and Evaluation activities, the total amount allocated in four Annual Work Programmes, for the period between 2012 and 2016, is 820,000.00 EUR.

The existing Performance Measurement Framework has been used as the basis of the work developed in the framework of the Agency's external evaluation. The drafted framework has been revised in 2012 according to the reconstruction of intervention logic of the FRA realized by the external valutors and will be annually implemented (and reported on) in the framework of the monitoring and evaluation activities of the FRA



## Performance Measurement Framework

In order to best cater to its stakeholders' needs FRA must be capable of applying the lessons learned and best practices. FRA must strive for continuous improvement to strengthen the effectiveness and impact of its functions. This learning process rests on FRA's ability to carry out its Monitoring and Evaluation activities. The Agency has already introduced project -level indicators describing the planned output of each project (number of reports, number of participants in each event etc.) in order to follow the progress of the implementation of the Annual Work Programme. Monitoring the performance of FRA will be carried out in accordance with a Performance Measurement System which includes a logic model (composed by outputs, immediate, intermediate and ultimate outcomes) and the list of the performance measures (indicators)

The developed indicators, at both project and corporate level, constitute an integral part of the FRA Performance Measurement Framework, which is a pyramid structure with five levels of indicators has been defined: 1) output, 2) immediate outcomes, 3) intermediate outcomes, 4) ultimate outcome and 5) organisational impact- starting from the project level and finishing with indicators at the corporate level. The framework follows a logical chain where the ultimate outcome determines what intermediate and then immediate outcomes we will seek to reach during the Agency's lifecycle. The Framework thus also gives a set of performance indicators that we will use to assess whether FRA has reached its targets and supplied its products. Each outcome and output has a set of performance indicators (quantitative and qualitative) that will be used to measure FRA's achievement in this area.

Inputs	Resources	Outputs	Immediate Outcomes	Intermediate Outcomes	Long term impact
human, intellectual physical and economic capital	Data collection	Development of research analysis and surveys, identification of good practices	Relevant, timely, accessible and reliable data, evidence based advice and opinions are provided to decision makers and stakeholders.	Evidence increasingly influences policy development	Relevant institutions, bodies and agencies increasingly respect Fundamental Rights
		Formulation of opinions to EU Institutions and Member States		Decision makers in government at all levels make use of evidence in the decision making process	Evidence is used in the implementation of policies in practice
		Publication of thematic reports and handbooks		Relevant non-governmental stakeholders make use of evidence to influence decisions	Effective policies are designed and implemented to guarantee rights to everyone
		Development of relevant scientific methodologies and standards			
	Targeted communication Strategy, promotion of dialogue with civil society	Awareness Raising for stakeholders	Pertinent emerging fundamental rights issues are brought upwards on the agenda of stakeholders	Frontline professionals acknowledge their responsibilities as Fundamental Rights agents	Human Rights institutions keep safeguarding and enhancing FR protection
			Increased awareness of fundamental rights among select professional organisations and stakeholders		
		Development of networking activities with key institutional and non-institutional stakeholders	Members of networks (in particular civil society) improve their capacity on fundamental rights	Professional organisations communicate evidence on fundamental rights to membership	Rights holders increasingly know and claim their rights
	Carrying out, encouraging and cooperating with relevant stakeholders and networks		Networks established at EU level and among national stakeholders	Networks are effectively promoting Fundamental Rights	

Outputs	Output Indicators	Sources of information
<b>Development of research analysis and surveys, identification of good practices</b>	Number of countries covered by data collection on average (per Thematic Area)	<i>Desk Research</i>
	Number of good practices identified (per Thematic Area)	<i>Desk Research</i>
	Usefulness of information and the analyses provided to stakeholders	<i>Survey</i>
	Percentage (and number) of responses to ad hoc requests	<i>Desk Research &amp; Interviews (FRA Staff)</i>
<b>Formulation of opinions to EU Institutions and Member States</b>	Number of hearings/presentations to EP, Council, Committee of Regions and other institutional stakeholders (EU+national level) per year	<i>Survey, Interviews</i>
	Number of requests to the FRA from EU institutions, broken down by initiator	<i>Desk Research, interviews.</i>
	Proportion of requests followed up / completed (not rejected)	<i>Desk Research, interviews</i>
	Average response time and delivery for opinion requests (formal)	<i>Desk Research, interviews</i>
	Degree of satisfaction among main stakeholders to ad-hoc requests /opinions In regards to: relevance, timeliness, quality per thematic area	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
	Average response time and delivery for assistance requests (informal)	<i>Document review of Management information</i>
<b>Publication of thematic reports and handbooks</b>	Number of publications produced per thematic area per year	<i>desk research, interviews</i>
	Degree of satisfaction of stakeholders with thematic reports and handbooks	<i>Survey</i>
	Number of stakeholders who receive copy of the reports	<i>Survey, Desk Research</i>
	Number of publications downloaded (per thematic area)	<i>Web traffic Data (FRA IT) – interviews</i>
<b>Development of relevant methods and standards</b>	Number of methods and standards (incl. sets of indicators produced)	<i>Desk Research</i>
	Usefulness of methods and standards for the FRA's research needs	<i>Interviews (FRA Staff)</i>
	Proportion of methods and standards judged adequate by scientific committee	<i>Interviews</i>
<b>Awareness Raising for stakeholders</b>	Number of events organized per year	<i>interviews, desk research</i>
	Number of training events organized per year	<i>Desk research, interviews</i>
	Attendance of FRC, Symposium and other events organised by FRA, broken down by event.	<i>Desk Research, Interviews</i>
	Number of FRA speeches/presentations to events and conferences.	<i>Desk Research, Interviews</i>
	Number of information instruments (postcards, flyers etc.) distributed	<i>Desk Research, Interviews</i>
	Number of people reached by awareness raising activities (cumulative)	<i>Desk Research, Interviews, survey</i>
	Proportion of answered emails and individual complaints to overall received emails and individual complaints	<i>Desk Research</i>
	Number of Newsletters distributed per year	<i>Desk Research</i>
	Number of recipients of Newsletters per year	
	Number of social media fans/likes	<i>desk research focus group</i>
	Number of page views and unique visitors, (website)	<i>Desk Research, Interviews (CAR and IT)</i>
Average time of visitors in website	<i>Desk Research, Interviews</i>	



<b>Development of networking activities with key institutional and non-institutional stakeholders</b>	Number of stakeholders contacted to participate in networking activities	<i>Desk Research</i>
	Number of successful applications for FRP	<i>Desk research</i>
	Number of participants in FRA networks	<i>Desk Research</i>
	Increase in number of participants in FRA networks (in one year)	<i>Desk Research</i>
	Number of FRA consultations with Stakeholders p.a. and average number of participants in consultation processes p.a.	<i>Desk Research</i>

<b>Immediate Outcomes</b>	<b>Immediate Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>Source of Information</b>
<b>Relevant, timely, accessible and reliable data, evidence based advice and opinions are provided to decision makers and stakeholders.</b>	Extent to which publications and evidence is considered timely by stakeholders (per thematic area)	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
	Extent to which publications and evidence are considered relevant for stakeholders (per thematic area)	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
	Extent to which publications and evidence is considered reliable and of high quality by stakeholders (per thematic area)	<i>Survey, Interviews</i>
	Extent to which the communication on FRA work ensures accessibility of the work to stakeholders (per thematic area)	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
<b>Pertinent emerging fundamental rights issues are brought upwards on the agenda of stakeholders</b>	References to FRA in legislative/strategic/political instruments	<i>Desk research</i>
	Extent to which FRA contributes to a greater shared understanding of emerging FR issues among stakeholders in the EU and Member States	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
<b>Increased awareness of fundamental rights among select professional organisations and stakeholders</b>	Extent to which FRA contributes to a greater shared understanding of FR issues among policy/decision-makers and stakeholders in the EU and Member States	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
	Number of professionals trained through partners (police officers, teachers etc.)	<i>Desk research ,survey</i>
<b>Members of networks (in particular civil society) improve their capacity on fundamental rights</b>	Increased capacity, knowledge, skills, attitudes and learning of key stakeholders in relation to FRA activities (incl. training) and its ongoing work	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
	References to FRA by non-governmental actors	<i>Desk research</i>
<b>Networks established at EU level and among national stakeholders</b>	Increased capacity, knowledge, skills, attitudes and learning of key stakeholders in relation to FRA activities and its ongoing work	<i>Survey, interviews,</i>
	Extent to which FRA contributes to effective data and information-sharing across the EU and Member States on key FR issues	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
	Extent to which network members judge FRA networking activities satisfactory	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
	Number of network members	<i>Desk research</i>

<b>Intermediate Outcomes</b>	<b>Intermediate Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>Source of information</b>
	Extent to which FRA opinions and advice taken on board	<i>Desk research, survey, interviews</i>
	Extent to which EU policies and legislation in relation to FR issues display a common	<i>Desk Research,</i>

	underlying logic of intervention on Fundamental Rights issues	<i>Interviews</i>
<b>Evidence increasingly influences policy development</b>	Extent to which FRA opinions and policy advice contribute to the development and implementation of EU legislation and policies that have an impact on FR issues	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
	Extent to which the general awareness of FRA work and ongoing FR issues has been raised among policy- and decision makers in the EU 27 Member states	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
<b>Decision makers in government at all levels make use of evidence in the decision making process</b>	Extent to which FRA supports the drafting and / or implementation of laws, policies and practices in FR issues in EU 27 Member States	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
<b>Relevant non-governmental stakeholders make use of evidence to influence decisions</b>	Extent to which FRA non-governmental stakeholders are able to make use of FRA evidence to influence local institutions and broader political forces to promote and develop policies and objectives relating to FR	<i>survey, interviews</i>
<b>Frontline professionals acknowledge their responsibilities as Fundamental Rights agents</b>	Feedback from professionals being trained in FRA training events	<i>Survey</i>
	Extent to which the general awareness of FRA work and ongoing FR issues has been raised among the general public and specific/vulnerable groups	<i>survey, interviews</i>
<b>Professional organisations communicate evidence on fundamental rights to membership</b>	Number of events organized by Professional Associations based on FRA evidence / tools	<i>Survey, interviews (FRA)</i>
	Number of participants in Professional Associations events	<i>Survey</i>
	Number of tools / studies / communications based on FRA evidence / tools disseminated by Professional Associations to members	<i>Survey</i>
<b>Networks are effectively promoting Fundamental Rights</b>	Extent to which individuals/organizations joining together on FRA initiative have developed and maintained positive and productive working relationships	<i>Interviews, Survey</i>

<b>Long term impact</b>	<b>Long term impact indicators</b>	<b>Source of Information</b>
<b>Relevant institutions, bodies and agencies increasingly respect Fundamental Rights</b>	Degree to which stakeholders consider FRA intervention to modify institutions/bodies/agencies approach towards FR	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
<b>Evidence is used in the implementation of policies in practice</b>	Extent to which stakeholders consider FRA evidence to have played an active role in FR policies and practice already implemented	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
<b>Effective policies are designed and implemented to guarantee rights to everyone</b>	Degree to which stakeholders consider existing FR policies to be effective in guaranteeing FR to rights holders	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
<b>Human Rights institutions keep safeguarding and enhancing FR protection</b>	Degree to which stakeholders consider FRA intervention to modify institutions/bodies/agencies approach towards FR	<i>Survey, interviews</i>
<b>Rights holders increasingly know and claim their rights</b>	Positive trends in Fundamental rights awareness	<i>Survey, interviews</i>