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EVALUATION QUESTIONS

• EFFECTIVENESS: To what extent has the FRA been successful in achieving its objectives and carried out the tasks established by the Founding Regulation?

• EFFICIENCY: To what extent has the FRA conducted its activities and achieved its objectives at a reasonable cost in terms of financial and human resources and administrative arrangements?

• UTILITY: The extent to which the FRA has been successful in addressing needs for the full respect of fundamental rights in the framework of Union law by the European Union, Member states and other stakeholders?

• ADDED VALUE: To what extent has FRA been more effective and efficient in achieving its results and impacts compared to other existing or possible national-level and EU-level arrangements?

• COORDINATION AND COHERENCE: To what extent has the FRA ensured appropriate coordination and or cooperation with the stakeholders identified in the Founding Regulation (articles 6 – 10)
THE EVALUATION

• Evaluation was supported by a Steering Group, consisting of Heads of Departments, Director and the Planning Manager.

• Data collection consisted of:
  
  • Survey to all key stakeholders (Founding Regulation articles 6 – 10)
  
  • Survey to all staff, Scientific Committee and Management Board
  
  • Focus groups with staff of the FRA, interviews with Management Team
  
  • Interviews with sample of key stakeholders (Founding Regulation articles 6 – 10)
  
  • Thematic case studies (Roma, Annual Report, Irregular Migrants, VAW Survey, Homophobia)
  
  • Validation interviews with the FRA, MB, NLOs, EP and the EC
  
  • In total app. 100 interviews were conducted
## Staff Development of the FRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual staff numbers end of year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD staff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST staff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Agents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seconded National Experts (SNE)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interims</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PUBLICATIONS SINCE 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Factsheet</th>
<th>Opinion Papers</th>
<th>Working Papers</th>
<th>Magazines</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 2012</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEETINGS AND EVENTS SINCE 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Conferences</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 2012</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>158</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFECTIVENESS: TO WHAT EXTENT HAS THE FRA BEEN SUCCESSFUL IN ACHIEVING ITS OBJECTIVES AND CARRIED OUT THE TASKS ESTABLISHED BY THE FOUNDING REGULATION?

- The FRA fulfils to a high extent its mandate to collect, record and analyse relevant, objective, reliable and comparable information and data relating to fundamental rights issues.

- A clearly favourable assessment in terms of the timeliness and adequacy of the FRA's assistance and expertise relating to fundamental rights, in particular among the EU level institutions.

- At the level of Member States the picture is more mixed, and the FRA has gradually begun to explore and develop new modes of cooperation with key national actors at the Member State level.

- The quality of the FRA's publications is generally considered to be very good by stakeholders. In particular the socio-legal approach is highly appreciated, in taking the citizen as a starting point for the research on fundamental rights issues.
The FRA publications deliver timely data and information on pertinent fundamental rights issues in the EU N=304

How would you assess the scientific quality of the FRA's research? N=308

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree or disagree</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/cannot assess</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of a very high quality</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of a high quality</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of a sufficient quality</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of a limited quality</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of a low quality</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/cannot assess</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFICIENCY: TO WHAT EXTENT HAS THE FRA CONDUCTED ITS ACTIVITIES AND ACHIEVED ITS OBJECTIVES AT A REASONABLE COST IN TERMS OF FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES AND ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS?

• The evaluation findings show an overall positive evolution in terms of the FRA's internal organisation, operations and working practices towards efficiency.

• The evaluation findings point towards a favourable assessment of the working methods and composition of the Executive and Management Board.

• The majority of the staff considers the Agency’s structure and organisation to be appropriate in relation to the FRA's mandate, but there are some concerns regarding the workload.

• Based on the findings, it can be concluded that administrative systems overall function well. However, it is clear that there is a need for increasing the use of MATRIX as a management system.

• There seems to be a reasonable balance between administrative procedures and the need for checks and controls.
UTILITY: THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FRA HAS BEEN SUCCESSFUL IN ADDRESSING NEEDS FOR THE FULL RESPECT OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF UNION LAW BY THE EUROPEAN UNION, MEMBER STATES AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS?

• The general satisfaction with the Agency's work is high, and the organisation is seen as accessible and responsive to stakeholders needs.

• A clearly favourable assessment in terms of the FRA's ability to effectively help institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the Union to ensure full respect of fundamental rights, in particular at the EU level.

• There is a clearly favourable assessment in terms of the suitability of the FRA's outputs to the needs of its stakeholders.

• The changed format of the outputs, in particular in terms of providing information in a more condensed and targeted format, is highly appreciated.

• A favourable assessment in terms of the FRA's ability to contribute to a greater shared understanding of fundamental rights issues.
The FRA's work and actions have effectively helped institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the European Union to ensure increased respect of fundamental rights in the framework of EU law N=307
The FRA's work and actions have effectively helped Member States to ensure increased respect of fundamental rights in the framework of EU law N=307

- Strongly agree: 1.6%, 2.7%
- Agree: 24.8%, 30.1%
- Neither agree or disagree: 39.1%, 45.2%
- Disagree: 12.1%, 9.6%
- Strongly disagree: 2.9%, 1.4%
- Do not know/cannot assess: 11.0%, 19.5%

All respondents n=307
National authorities n=73
The FRA's publications inform and assist decision-making at EU level N=302

- Strongly agree: 11.6% (All respondents), 13.1% (EU institutions)
- Agree: 46.4% (All respondents), 59.0% (EU institutions)
- Neither agree or disagree: 22.5% (All respondents), 13.1% (EU institutions)
- Disagree: 4.0% (All respondents), 4.9% (EU institutions)
- Strongly disagree: 0.3% (All respondents), 1.6% (EU institutions)
- Do not know/cannot assess: 15.2% (All respondents), 8.2% (EU institutions)
ADDED VALUE: TO WHAT EXTENT HAS FRA BEEN MORE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT IN ACHIEVING ITS RESULTS AND IMPACTS COMPARED TO OTHER EXISTING OR POSSIBLE NATIONAL-LEVEL AND EU-LEVEL ARRANGEMENTS?

• The FRA is considered to be in a unique role as a provider of comparative, EU-wide studies.

• The Agency is acknowledged for concentrating on topics that are not covered by other similar actors, and their position as an independent EU Agency gives their work additional backing.

• Findings point towards a favourable assessment in terms of the FRA having been more effective in achieving its results and impacts compared to other existing or possible national-level and EU-level arrangements.

• The evaluation does not provide sufficient evidence to conclude that the effects in the field of fundamental rights have been achieved at lower cost because of the Agency's intervention.
COORDINATION AND COHERENCE: TO WHAT EXTENT HAS THE FRA ENSURED APPROPRIATE COORDINATION AND OR COOPERATION WITH THE STAKEHOLDERS IDENTIFIED IN THE FOUNDING REGULATION (ARTICLES 6 – 10)

• A clearly favourable assessment in terms of the FRA's coordination and cooperation with the stakeholders in the Founding Regulation.

• Strong formal procedures exist between the FRA and the Council of Europe and the European Commission. These formal procedures are strengthened by informal channels.

• The relevant EU Agencies, the European Commission and the European Parliament all expressed positive views with regard to the collaboration with the FRA.

• The FRA works in close cooperation with the Council of Europe, no duplication of work has been cited and the two organisations create strong possibilities for complementarity of work.
How valuable are the networking/collaborating activities organised by the FRA to your institution/organisation? N=64

- **European Parliament n=10**: 50% to a very high degree, 10% to a high degree, 20% to some degree, 10% to a limited degree, 0% not at all, 10% do not know/cannot assess.

- **European Commission n=30**: 6.7% to a very high degree, 50% to a high degree, 30% to some degree, 10% to a limited degree, 0% not at all.

- **EU Agencies n=20**: 20% to a very high degree, 40% to a high degree, 15% to some degree, 20% to a limited degree, 0% not at all.

- **Council of EU n=4**: 25% to a very high degree, 50% to a high degree, 25% to some degree, 0% to a limited degree, 0% not at all.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- The work of the Agency contributes to policy development, in particular at the EU level.

- The European Commission and the European Parliament see a clear added value of the FRA to the policy implementation at the EU level. At the Member State level the value is less clear and more mixed.

- What is considered highly useful for EU institutions, such as EU wide data collection, is not always considered equally relevant for and by the Member States.

Recommendations

The evaluators recommend the FRA to undertake, with the Management Board and possibly other stakeholders, a thorough review of priorities.

The objective should be to ensure that the available resources are used in the most effective and efficient way, which may mean a smaller number of projects, stakeholder focus or scope of activities.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

• The expertise of the Agency seems to be increasingly in demand (ad-hoc requests), but this may also become a challenge in terms of workload and planning.

• When requests arrive, they in general need to be prioritised at the expense of running research projects.

• Hence, the more requests arrive, the more difficult it may be for the Agency to free necessary resources to provide high quality responses.

Recommendations

The evaluators recommend that a strategy for meeting increasing demand for ad hoc-requests be developed.

It should ensure that the most pertinent needs for responses on fundamental rights issues are met within the available resources, while also ensuring that responses do not impede on ongoing planned research projects.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- The evaluation findings show that stakeholders perceive that, as consequence of the mandate and the MAF, the Agency’s full potential towards providing advice in the field of fundamental rights is not being utilised.

- It is considered that the FRA could have a clearer position in the legislative process, for example through contributions to impact assessments and providing opinions on legislative proposals.

Recommendations

The evaluators recommend that limits of the mandate of the FRA be examined and discussed

In particular it should be clarified to what extent the FRA should be mandated to issue on its own initiative opinions in the legislative process and have a wider mandate to address particular pertinent issues occurring in Member States.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Since its establishment, the Agency has developed into a well-functioning organisation, which is largely appreciated by stakeholders for its openness and responsiveness.

- The FRA is now at a point of development where the focus should be on consolidation and implementation of procedures and systems, such as the Management Information System MATRIX, the Performance Measurement Framework and Quality Management System.

Recommendations

The evaluators recommend a focus on continued consolidation and implementation of the different management tools developed. Efforts should be made to ensure that the systems are properly implemented and also used.

Ensure that staff workload continues to be regularly monitored, to ensure that there is a reasonable workload.
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