

DETAILED BUDGET EXECUTION

	Index	
A	Staff	
B	Travel	
C	Equipment	
D	Consumables	
E	Other direct costs	
F	Indirect costs (max 7%)	
G	Contribution in kind/non eligible	
I	Other contribution from third parties and/or generated by the activities	
K	Financial contribution from the beneficiary/-ies	
J	Pre-financing paid	
H	Recovery of interest on pre-financing	

Subtotal of selected entries **19 814,93**

Budget heading	Name of Beneficiary	Workstream	Accounting referenc(es)	Date/period or duration when the cost was incurred	Description of item Answer to the questions: Who and/or What ? [e.g Functions/tasks in the project (Heading A); Estimated destination (Heading B); estimated depreciation (Heading C), etc]	Amount in currency	Currency	Exchange Rate	Total EURO	Additional information	
212	A	HCLU	Workstream 0	HCLU_BL46 A1	2013 February	Chef de Projet	133 266,00	HUF	296,0800	450,10	
213	A	HCLU	Workstream 0	HCLU_BL46 A1	2013/April	Chef de Projet	273 978,00	HUF	304,4200	900,00	
214	A	HCLU	Workstream 0	HCLU_BL46 A1	2013/May	Chef de Projet	268 335,00	HUF	298,1500	900,00	
215	A	HCLU	Workstream 0	HCLU_BL47 A3	2013/February	Comptabilité/gestion	248 707,00	HUF	296,0800	840,00	
216	B	HCLU	Workstream 0	HCLU_BL48 - B1	2013/January	Déplacement Budapest/Paris	149 200,00	HUF	290,7900	513,09	
217	B	HCLU	Workstream 0	HCLU_BL49 - B2	2013/February	Hotel Paris (2 personnes)	53 299,00	HUF	296,0800	180,02	
218	A	HCLU	Workstream 1	HCLU_BL86 A1	2013/July	Chef de Projet	353 976,00	HUF	294,9800	1 200,00	
219	A	HCLU	Workstream 1	HCLU_BL86 A1	2013/August	Chef de Projet	358 920,00	HUF	299,1000	1 200,00	
220	A	HCLU	Workstream 1	HCLU_BL86 A1	2013/September	Chef de Projet	360 552,00	HUF	300,4600	1 200,00	
221	A	HCLU	Workstream 1	HCLU_BL86 A1	2013/October	Chef de Projet	269 667,00	HUF	299,6300	900,00	
222	A	HCLU	Workstream 1	HCLU_BL87 A2	2013/August	Chargé de mission juridique	179 460,00	HUF	299,1000	600,00	
223	A	HCLU	Workstream 1	HCLU_BL87 A2	2013/September	Chargé de mission juridique	180 276,00	HUF	300,4600	600,00	
224	A	HCLU	Workstream 1	HCLU_BL87 A2	2013/October	Chargé de mission juridique	359 556,00	HUF	299,6300	1 200,00	
225	B	HCLU	Workstream 1	HCLU_BL88 - B3	2013/September	Déplacement Berlin/Budapest	108 800,00	HUF	300,4600	362,11	
226	B	HCLU	Workstream 1	HCLU_BL89 - B4	2013/September	Hotel Berlin	374,50	€	1,0000	374,50	
227	B	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL150 - B5	2013/December	Deplacement Luxemburg/Budapest ALOS	623,00	USD	1,3592	458,36	
228	B	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL151 - B6	2013/December	Déplacement Budapest/strasbourg MEDEL	72 300,00	HUF	299,4600	241,43	
229	B	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL152 - B7	2013/December	Hotel Budapest (4personnes, 2 jours) MEDEL, ALOS	255,00	€	1,0000	255,00	
230	E	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL164 E1	2013/December	Organisation seminaire: Cabine du traduction	220,00	€	1,0000	220,00	
231	E	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL164 E2	2013/December	Organisation seminaire: interprétation EN/FR	482 600,00	HUF	299,4600	1 611,57	
232	B	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL164 - B8	2013/December	Organisation seminaire: 3 répas (2 midi, 1 soir) 16 personnes	454,50	€	1,0000	454,50	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
	Budget heading	Name of Beneficiary	Workstream	Accounting referenc(es)	Date/period or duration when the cost was incurred	Description of item Answer to the questions: Who and/or What ? [e.g Functions/tasks in the project (Heading A); Estimated destination (Heading B); estimated depreciation (Heading C), etc]	Amount in currency	Currency	Exchange Rate	Total EURO	Additional Information
18											
233	B	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL166 - B1	2013/December	Organisation seminaire: 3 repas (2 midi, 1 soir) 16 personnes	99 000,00	HUF	299,4600	330,60	
234	B	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL161 - B1	2014/April	Hotel Bruxelles (1 personne, 2 jours)	392,00	€	1,0000	392,00	
235	B	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL160 - B1	2014/February	Déplacement Budapest/Bruxelles	116 156,00	HUF	310,9700	373,53	
236	E	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL167 E3	2014/June	Organisation conference de presse nationale	342,80	€	1,0000	342,80	
237	E	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL172 E4	2014/June	Edition 3000 passeports	228 981,00	HUF	303,5800	754,27	
238	E	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL96 E5	2014/June	Publication HIT parade	123 444,00	HUF	303,5800	406,63	
239	A	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL158 A1	2014/January	Chef de Projet	148 400,00	HUF	296,8000	500,00	
240	A	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL158 A1	2014/February	Chef de Projet	155 485,00	HUF	310,9700	500,00	
241	A	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL158 A1	2014/March	Chef de Projet	155 450,00	HUF	310,9000	500,00	
242	A	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL158 A1	2014/April	Chef de Projet	154 445,00	HUF	308,8900	500,00	
243	A	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL158 A1	2014/May	Chef de Projet	154 590,00	HUF	309,1800	500,00	
244	A	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL158 A1	2014/June	Chef de Projet	150 790,00	HUF	303,5800	496,71	
245	A	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL159 A4	2014/April	Charge du mission communication	370 668,00	HUF	308,8900	1 200,00	
246	A	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL159 A4	2014/May	Charge du mission communication	371 016,00	HUF	309,1800	1 200,00	
247	A	HCLU	Workstream 2	HCLU_BL159 A4	2014/June	Charge du mission communication	364 296,00	HUF	303,5800	1 200,00	
248	F	HCLU	Workstream 0			frais indirects	264,82	€	1,0000	264,82	
249	F	HCLU	Workstream 1			frais indirects	534,56	€	1,0000	534,56	
250	F	HCLU	Workstream 2			frais indirects	870,62	€	1,0000	870,62	
254	A	HCLU	Workstream 0	correction contrôle		Correctionn salaires après contrôle	-4 903,44	€	1,0000	-4 903,44	
255	B	HCLU	Workstream 0	Correction contrôle		Correction frais de dep après contrôle	-3,00	€	1,0000	-3,00	
256	F	HCLU	Workstream 0	Correction contrôle		correction frais indirects contrôle 4,56%	-805,85	€	1,0000	-805,85	

JUST/2011-2012/ACTION GRANTS

Final Narrative Report

The information provided in this report must correspond to the financial information that is declared in the final financial statement.

This form must be completed in English.

The European Commission will reject any incomplete reports.

The hard copies of the documents and all the deliverables must be sent to:

European Commission
Directorate-General Justice
Directorate A
Unit A4: Programme Management
MO59 04/021
B-1049 Brussels

Reference Number of the Project	JUST/2011/FRAC/AG/2854
Project Title	Fichage, informer les citoyens : passeport pour la protection des données personnelles
Name of the Beneficiary/Coordinator	Ligue des droits de l'Homme

Contact details	Name: Ligue des droits de l'Homme/ Viviane de Lafond Address: 138 rue Marcadet Postal code: 75 018 City: Paris Country: France E-mail: administration@ldh-france.org Phone: 33 1 56 55 51 00
------------------------	---

Co-beneficiaries and Associate Partners (Name + Country)	<p><i>Co-beneficiaries</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Association européenne pour la défense des droits de l'Homme AEDH – European net work Belgium 2. Tarsasag a Szabadsagjogokert – HCLU - Hungary 3. Humanistische Union e.V – HU - Germany 4. <p><i>Etc.</i></p> <p><i>Associate Partners</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LDH ALOS - Luxemburg 2. MEDEL – European net work Germany 3. 4. <p><i>Etc.</i></p>
---	---

Dates of project implementation	<p>Start date: 01/01/2013</p> <p>End date: 30/06/2014</p>
--	---

Project website(s) (if applicable)	
--	--

Estimated expenditure (Article I.4 ¹ of the Grant Agreement)	<p>Amount of total eligible costs: 306 458, 00</p> <p>Percentage of EU grant: 80,00%</p> <p>Amount of EU grant: 245 158,00</p>
Expenditure incurred (column <i>Declared expenditure</i> of the sheet <i>Budget & Execution Summary</i> of the financial statement)	<p>Amount of total eligible costs: 270 955,15</p> <p>Percentage of EU grant: 80%</p> <p>Amount of EU grant: 207 670,67</p>

¹ Article I.3 in single beneficiary Grant Agreements.

Executive Summary of the project (max. 4000 characters)

Summary presenting:

- the main objectives of the project;

The aim of this project was to raise European citizens' awareness about their rights regarding the dangers of institutional filing and explain how to protect them, using various innovative tools. Another aim was to sensitize policy makers so that in legislation and its application, the principles of founding texts of human rights are applied.

- a short description of the project activities;

The 1st seminar in **Paris (Feb. 2013)** allowed all partners to agree on:

- infringements of rights and freedoms,
- a method of work and the different stages
- the targets
- the scope of our study: 4 institutions (Justice, Police, Health, Education), and the targeted countries (the partners' one + nearby countries or close contacts) + the European legal framework
- the tools to achieve

Afterwards a very detailed questionnaire on legislation and its application was adopted (after email exchanges between partners - adapted for the EU) and has been used by partners to make the state of play of selected files. Answers obtained through the work of desk-research, workshops and experts' meetings, allowed partners to develop a monograph for each studied country.

At the seminar in **Berlin (Sept. 2013)** an assessment of this work has been done by all partners and despite the delays, exchanges occurred between partners about dangers, issues, priorities and messages to be included in future tools.

The various tools (to make in partner languages + others if possible) have been defined:

- The passport, printing 20-page, small format, aimed at the general public with simple messages alerting them on the dangers and providing advices to protect themselves and to act as responsible citizens;
- The quiz, to be published on partners' websites, to catch the public attention and to cause people to learn a minimum by accessing (thru a link) to the passport content;
- The hit parade (a 4-page A4 format) outlining the institutional filing in 14 European countries, their connection with European systems, graphic design and contact details of the DPA;
- The monographs of the studied countries and the comparative analysis of 14 countries.

The seminar in **Budapest (Dec. 2013)** resulted in refinement of the selected messages and specify the types of tools in the presence of the communication agency retained during exchanges in Berlin.

The **Brussels seminar (Apr. 2014)** allowed completion of the tools and exchanges on launch events and campaign dissemination programmed. The public launching meeting the next day helped carry our messages to decision-makers as the EDPS (Hustinx, Buttarelli), the head of Polish DPA (Wiewiorowski), one rapporteur of the draft amendment of Directive 95 (Droutsas) officials from EESC (Dassis) and some MEPs.

Distribution of our tools: the quiz was published on all sites and social networks of partners.

Events launch of the campaign on institutional filing were organized as well as training sessions during which the tools were distributed.

- the key results of the project;

This project allowed us to measure and to inform on how institutional filing can jeopardize the rights and freedoms in the countries studied, particularly by police files (the convictions of France by the ECHR for the fingerprint file have confirmed what we have denounced in our analyzes). However surveillance issues related to the Internet tend to hide those dangers which make communication to the press on our project difficult. The project allowed also to set up tools for information and rising awareness about this situation : passport; hit parade; quizz available also on the aptner's websites.

- the impact on the target groups or other groups affected by the project.

Passports and other tools were deemed relevant clear and precise, they are widely used by the partners and their network and will be performed by trained individuals.

Nevertheless, policy makers have little reaction to the tools we have provided to them. It was difficult to get interviews with officials (DPAs, elected, officials responsible for files, ministers...).

For better protection of citizens' personal data, we will continue to use these tools and in particular with MEPs who should lead the reform of the Directive 95 and improve the European framework in a more protective way.

PART 1 – RESULTS AND IMPACT OF THE PROJECT

1.1. Present in one sentence the main achievement of your project

We succeed to carry out the monographies on the state of art in the studied countries, to draw a comparative analysis and set up the foreseen tools ie the passport, the hit-parade and the quiz which were adapted and edited in 4 languages and then made broadly available for the intended audience also on websites.

1.2. Results of the project (max. 1 page)

Have you achieved the results described in Annex I to the Grant Agreement? List the results achieved by the project.

Describe how these results contributed to the achievement of the objectives described in Annex I to the Agreement and how they promote the objectives of the Programme that funded your project.

Highlight the innovative aspects of the project, if any.

*In this part you should not list activities/outputs/deliverables of your project (see Part 2), but you should focus on the results of your project. **Results** are immediate changes that arise for the target groups after the **completion of the project (e.g. improved knowledge, increased awareness).***

The results achieved by the project are :

- The establishment of a state of play on national and european legislation and the practices in state files procedures, and comparative analysis of 14 countries “fichage insitutionnel : quels risques pour le citoyen?”
- The setting up of transversal communication tools, which can be used in all UE : “hit –parade, 4 pages “le fichage insitutionnel dans 14 pays européens”, quiz, passport “fichage institutionnel, Quels risques pour les citoyens?”, all those tools printed and being also available on websites.
- And thus the seminar in Bruxelles gathered around this issue NGO’s network and decision makers (47 particiapnts) and allowed to begin awareness rising among NGO’s and decision makers.
- Partner’s organization networks (local groups, members, structures of human right’s defense in all Europe) got all a number of tools (mainly passports and “Hit parades”) and through the internal communication and trainings organized by each structure, began themseves to be aware of the issue of institutionnal filing. They also, through the training sessions and meetng, and through the downloading of the more specialized tools (comparative analisis, monographs), increased their knowledge on the subject
- Thus they can began themselves to contribute to rise aweness among local people.
- The project allows also to get in touch with the press (mostly specialized) and decision makers

How they promote the objectives of the programme

They promote the objectives of the program insofar citizen but also NGO’s networks are more aware of the dangers for freedoms and fundamental rights (included personal data protection) of those institutionnal files. The edited tools give them also some information for thinking about and to react in their everyday life (how to act when problems arise with justice or police files, how to deal with health files or education files).

Innovative aspects

First the transversal analysis of the files in 14 countries allowed to gather information which was formerly dispersed and also unavailable (also because of language barrier), and the compartive analisis provide an overview of the institutional filing and its dangers : such information was not

available, and also allows a beginning of work on the subject in all countries in Europe.

Indeed the subject is until now not considered as a priority for many NGOs which are working on data protection but focused on internet, videosurveillance, or private commercial files.

So the project gave the opportunity to put forth the subject and to give for many organisations, networks, also decision makers, materials and date to start work, thinking, reactions.

1.3. Long-term impact and/or the multiplier effect of the project (max. 1/2 page)

What change(s) will the project bring in the long-term? Take into account the long-term impact on the target groups and the society, as well as on legislation and/or policy-making. Make reference to national and/or transnational impact, as appropriate.

*In this part you should not list activities/outputs/deliverables of your project (see Part 2), but you should focus on the expected long-term impact of your project. The **long-term impact** refers to long-term socio-economic consequences that can be observed after a certain period following the completion of the project and may affect either the target groups of the project or other groups falling outside the boundary of the project, who may be winners or losers.*

1 – More focus particularly in the partner's country on the issue of institutional filing and also in the countries where the AEDH and the MEDEL have members.

2 – More meeting, awareness raising events for general public on the subject organized by the partners and the AEDH and MEDEL members : it must be underlined that, in many countries we studied, the subject was not a subject in itself. If some NGO's were working on personal data protection regarding internet, or commercial files, they were not involved in work about state files.

3 – More educated representatives on those questions, thanks to the mailings of the tools to those representatives

4 – And finally an impact on the appreciation of those representative when law are discussed, at the national level, but also at the european level. We believe that CSOs and officials will be more aware of the risks when creating new files or when changing the law. For example, to answer the many health files' access claims by insurers or laboratory, those responsible will be informed of the consequences for privacy, the CSOs will be able to conduct advocacy (same in other areas and particularly at European level for the reform of the Directive 95.

5 – It created for all the partners the possibility to broaden the scope of their activities.

1.4. Sustainability of the results (max. 1/2 page)

What is foreseen as follow-up of the project after the financial support of the European Union has ended?

How will the results of the project be sustained? Give examples (e.g. your organisation is able to financially sustain the project outputs/deliverables and/or results; or has other sources of funding to continue with the project activities or build on the project results; or another organisation has taken up the project outputs/deliverables and results; or the behaviour of the target group has changed already in a sustainable way).

All partners consider actually the project as still underway. If they do not get enough financial resources to reedit the tools or to organize big events specifically around the project, the work to rise awareness among population and representative will go on, as a part of their daily activity. They will took every opportunity to deliver the messages and the tools, this all the more, than the tools are available on website and downloadable.

An overview of the planned activities in the next few months :

LDH

The skills learned during this project will allow volunteers and activists LDH to continue training and the dissemination to the sections and the public:

25 sept. All the tools were presented to an MP particularly involved in issues of filing during a meeting.

12 nov. Epinal: training for students at law school (afternoon) Public meeting in the evening

19 nov. Caen : Public meeting in the « Forum Alternatif pour la liberté et la solidarité » meeting

13 feb. 2015 Dax: public meeting

Meetings were requested to CNIL (DPA) members to whom we sent the tools of the project during the summer. We will send reminders because we have not got any answer.

We also asked for an appointment with the Minister of Justice to advance our views especially on the sentences of France by the ECHR for the fingerprints files and for the STIC file.

We have sent the tools and asked for meetings with:

- The Police's union (proposition of training sessions...)

- The Magistrates' union and Justice auxiliaries (proposition of training sessions to the School of magistrates)

- Patients' associations

- Doctors' unions

- Parents' associations

- Teachers' unions

We sent monographs of the 3 other States (Italy, Spain, and Portugal) to the authorities of data protection and to the other interlocutors contacted during the project.

Also as coordinator of the project LDH will organize a transnational skype meeting with all the partners in december in order to get an overview of the work done since end of june, in order to follow the further developments of the project, and may be, plan to give a follow to the project (a proposal for another transnational project for instance, or how to take the opportunity of other transnational events, ...).

HU

The regional sections members welcome the new opportunity to reach out a broader public with attractive level materials, while in depth materials give useful information for experts : the awareness rising program goes on at the regional level.

Hu will continue the analysis of data protection regulations. IN november for instance the magazine "Vorgange" will examine differnet and data protection aspects (based on the program) and a search will be launch for a standard for data protection evaluations.

HCLU

The program gives HCLU the opportunity to broaden in the next months their activities and include data protection in the field of education. The project made HCLU aware that the centralisation process in files for schools has bcome a crucial space of possible human rights risks and violations. A new project emerge : a survey to detect problems, and it is palnned to write a template data prcessing guideline for elementary and high scholls withe special regards to data on religious appartenance.

Work is also going on health care records : a major legislative piece is introduced by the parliament allowing electronic health care system to be set up, and the compara-ison with other countries is unvaluable to analyse this legislative project.

AEDH

The dissemination work will continue. Indeed the tools have been sent to all the members of AEDH ((28 structures in 22 UE countries). But as the members were not involved nor financed by the project, they will use them at their own pace. However, the working group " data protection" will send out reminders, invite them to help organize public meetings and participate if they find financing. Messages with our arguments will also be sent to them so that they contact their MEPs to remind them of our arguments about the reform of the Directive 95.

The working group data protection will use the tools to connect with new elected or nominated persons in the European Commission (DG Justice), European parliament: LIBE Committee and "shadow rapporteurs" of the Regulation project which will replace the Directive 95/46/EC.

1.5. European dimension and added value of the project results (max. 1/2 page)

Describe the European dimension and the added value of the project results. How are the project and/or its results transferable to other Member States of the European Union?

The European dimension of the project has resulted in the number of countries studied (14) well representative of the diversity of laws and practices. The results of these studies published in monographs and especially in the comparative analysis. The fact that these documents are published in English in particular (language included in all European countries) can help all decision makers to be informed about the dangers of filing to examine their own national practices and take into account for their legislation. It is the same for public tools that should enable European citizens to wonder about the dangers of institutional filing in their country, to know their rights and how to assert them. Our documents are available to all organizations wishing to translate in their own language and disseminate in their country.

We also believe that the study on the European legislative framework should influence MEPs either for reform of the Directive 95, or for systems set up to file foreign (Eurodac, SIS, VIS).

1.6. Dissemination (max. 1/2 page)

How did you implement your dissemination strategy?

Demonstrate how the target groups were reached by your dissemination activities and give concrete examples (e.g. project outputs that were disseminated to other organisations in your field, researchers, politicians, published articles in newspapers, or specialised magazines; number of hits on a website; participation of the target group in awareness-raising events, such as conferences).

Describe the response of the target groups you reached out to and how successful you were in influencing their behaviour (e.g. project outputs that have been used by other organisations in your field, by researchers, by politicians, or that were quoted in newspapers; survey results comparing the level of knowledge/expertise before and after a training).

Our strategy of communication and dissemination was first to create tools, suited to a large dissemination : quizz and passport mainly, the "hit parade" being a little more adressed to activists, experts, or decion makers. They are indeed available in 4 languages, our poles and greece partners did not had time to do the translation.

The dissemination plan was globally implemented as foreseen in our program, but the time consacrated to diisemination was shorter than expected due to the delays of the achievement of the first part. So only 4 month, even lesser (if we consider the time once all the materials were published in all languages) were dedicated to communication and dissemination during the time of the project.

However the main steps of the dissemination plan were implemented :

- Transnational conference : each team communicated about this event in its country (toward NGO,s and european deputies), the AEDH as broadly as possible specifically toward europan NGO's, european deputies, for this event which gather as speakers recognised personalities in this field. Although the attendance was not so high as expected : mobilize on this subject is nos so easy as for other themes, many do not consider the theme as a priority. But we succeed to gather a little less than 50 person (ONG, institutions mainly). And documents (report of the meeting and were send afterwards to all those we get in touch for the event.
- Launch event in each partner's country : such events were organized by HU, HCLU and the LDH trying to gather both journalists and experts through direct contacts (not only e mailing lists). Those events also did not gather a large audience but were the opportunity to discuss the results of the studies among involved people. Nonetheless HCLU succeeded to mobilize governmental administration to debate. One of the most fruitfull impact of those events were that some journalists were interested and stayed in touch and report on data protection matters (HCLU : the press the covered wery well issues run by the HCLU regarding an unlawful database used for political campaigns by the ruling party).
- Training sessions were organised (1 to 5 sessions were foreseen per partner). Each partner organised at least one session during the lifetime of the project (LDH 7, HU 2, AEDH, 2) but plan to go on with this activity, focusing first on the members of the structure : indeed the first

step to rise awareness is to mobilize activists from various network, and first of the network of the partners. This objective is still in the way, with not only training session but also e mailings, information on websites, short presentations taking the opportunity of meetings or interventions (HCLU invited to the faculty of law to talk about state surveillance; AEDH during its General Assembly intervened on the subject and distributed materials – 15 organisations; HU announced to regional sections (54) about web site and printed communication tools; LDH send “infocom” on the subject on line, and presented the tools during the monthly meeting of regional representatives, ...)

- Thus about half of the printed material was distributed : but we have yet to go on with dissemination toward general public : this step is still in the way.
- We have also to go on with the contact with politicians : each structure get the opportunity to deliver our tools by mailings, but also tried to have discussion and to personally deliver documents : 1/07/2014 in France, presentation of the tools to the vice chairman of the national assembly, presentation in a closed professional workshop (HCLU), concept for a panel discussion among politicians planned but not yet implemented (HU), direct contacts for the conference in Brussels (AEDH).

1.7. Ethical issues (max. 1/2 page)

Were you faced with any ethical issues during the implementation of the project? How did you solve them?

No specific ethical issue.

1.8. Evaluation (max. 1/2 page)

Was the project evaluated (internally and/or externally)? If yes, summarise the results of this evaluation.

The project was evaluated internally and externally. We dedicated a time during each meeting to assess the work already done, also with the external evaluator, herself expert in matters of filing and issue of personal data protection.

The external evaluator assesses the implementation of the project and its results compared to the program and also gave an expert view on the work implemented, particularly during the WS and thus contributed to the steering of the project.

The evaluation underlines that :

- The work foreseen has globally been done
- The partnership set up outputs and deliverables of quality :
 - for the step of desk research and comparative analysis first, with good results on subjects which were not easy to inquire on. Thus the comparative analysis with its recommendations is a real progress to compare situations in Europe, with an assessment of the level of risk for personal data protection of the studied files.
 - For the setting up of communication tools : passport and quiz are also documents of good quality, and fitted to their purpose : rise awareness.
- But there was since the first step delays which had effects on the progress and exchanges during the meetings, induce also delays in the setting up of the communication tools, and thus shortened the step of communication and dissemination during the project itself. The issue of delays does not allow to get a hit parade of the same quality of the other tools.
- Fortunately, all the partners are really involved in the issue, and have included in their goals this step of awareness rising. So this step of the project goes on actively, since most of the activities can be included in the general activity of each structure, needing not a big amount of financial resources.

1.9. Conclusions and recommendations for the European Commission in terms of legislation/policy-making (if applicable)

All project partners would be extremely satisfied if the European authorities took into account the dangers put in perspective by our work and would apply our recommendations in the european legal framework (cf comparative overview)

PART 2 – WORKSTREAMS AND ACTIVITIES

2.1. Implementation of the Workstreams

How to report on the implementation of Workstreams

You must be consistent with the structure and logic of your project as presented in the Workstreams in Annex I to your Grant Agreement.

Workstream 0 - Management and Coordination of the Project

Workstream 0 is intended for all activities related to the general management and coordination of the project (kick-off meetings, coordination, project monitoring and evaluation, financial management) and all the activities which are cross cutting and therefore difficult to assign just to one specific workstream.

Workstreams 1 – 5

In Workstreams 1 to 4 you must follow the structure and logic of Annex I to your Grant Agreement and present the activities that you implemented in order to achieve the objectives and results described in Part 1, as well as the achieved outputs and deliverables of these activities.

Each activity/output/deliverable should be listed only once under the relevant Workstream.

I. Activities

Review the planned activities for the Workstream as presented in Annex I to your Grant Agreement and indicate in this report:

- which of the planned activities were implemented (including a description of these activities);
- which of the planned activities were not implemented (and explain why);
- if there were any unforeseen activities implemented (including a description of these activities).

Be concrete and specific in your descriptions and explanations.

II. Output(s) and deliverable(s)

Outputs and deliverables are respectively **intangible and tangible** outcomes/results of your activities.

Review the outputs and deliverables for the workstream as presented in Annex I to your Grant Agreement and list in this report all produced outputs and deliverables for the Workstream.

II.a. Output(s)

List the produced outputs: e.g. conferences, seminars, trainings, training modules, events, knowledge, professionals trained.

Indicate: title, date of implementation, place of implementation and number of participants.

Example: *Final conference, 9-10/3/2016, Brussels, 219 participants.*

II.b. Deliverable(s)

List the produced deliverables: e.g. manuals, leaflets, websites, articles, training material packages, books.

Indicate: precise title, type, format (e.g. printed and/or electronic), languages and number of copies produced.

Examples:

1. *Good Practice Guide on XXX, publication, printed and electronic, EN (100 copies), FR (only electronic), DE (100 copies), IT (only electronic), ES (100 copies), PL (only electronic)*

2. *<http://www.myproject.eu/>, website, electronic, all EU official languages*

► Workstream 0 – Management and Coordination of the Project

I. Activities

Indicate which of the planned activities were implemented, which of the planned activities were not implemented (and why) and if any unforeseen activities were implemented.

Implemented activities

1. Setting up of a Kit of management documents related to the project (All necessarily documents included grand agreement, handbook, guide for communication and publication, supporting forms, ...) - LDH
2. Organization of a kick off meeting (1 day dedicated to WS 0) – LDH – And mobilisation of an external evaluator (Marie Georges)
3. Management and internal organisation: Setting up of a mailing list “fichage”, of a FTP server (used for all the documents of all the partners of the project), regular use of this mailing list at all steps of the project, joint organisation of the transnational meetings, of the Skype meetings, of the seminar in Brussels, reminders of deadlines, work to be done, Writing down of the minutes of the meetings. – LDH
All partners attended all the meetings, as well as the evaluator.
4. Technical assistance: mainly during the seminars with a time dedicated to steering and evaluation committee, (meeting during each seminar with all the partners and associate partners) - LDH
5. Administrative and financial reporting : writing down by each partner of a contribution about the implemented work and its analysis, (according to the frame of the final report), national financial report with supporting documents realized by each partner, synthesis written down by the LDH
6. Final external evaluation written down by the external evaluator, global assessment of the project carried out according to the frame of the final report (contribution of each partner).

Not implemented activities

- 1.
- 2.

Unforeseen activities

- 1.
- 2.

II. Output(s) and deliverable(s)

List the produced outputs and deliverables of this workstream.

For the Outputs indicate: title, date of implementation, place of implementation and number of participants.

For the Deliverables indicate: precise title, type, format (e.g. printed and/or electronic), languages and number of copies produced.

II.a. Outputs

1. Kick off seminar, Paris, 15-16 /02/2013, 20 participants
2. Steering and evaluation committees during each transnational seminar
 - Seminar Berlin (see program of the meeting), 28-29 /09/2013, 14 participants
 - Seminar Budapest (see program of the meeting), 14-15/12/2013, 14 participants
 - Seminar Brussels (see program of the meeting), 8-9/04/2014, 17 participants le 8,36 participants le 9/04
3. Skype meetings
 - 08/07/2013
 - 05/06/2013
 - 05/09/2013
 - 15/01/2014
 - 25/02/2014
 - 25/06/2014

II.b. Deliverables -

611. Management kit – delivered printed during the first meeting included in the documents given to the participants – EN – Included: grant agreement, management guide, partner's agreement, survival kit, the use of the UE emblem.

512. Report seminar 1 Paris– EN with agenda and signed attendance list –

612. Presentation powerpoints seminar 1

513. Report seminar 2 Berlin –EN with agenda and signed attendance list –

613. Presentations powerpoints seminar 2

514. Report seminar 3 Budapest– EN with agenda and signed attendance list –

614. Presentations powerpoints seminar 3

515. Report seminar 4 Brussels – EN with agenda and signed attendance list –

615. Presentations powerpoints seminar 4

616. Skype reports :

- 08/07/2013

- 05/06/2013

- 05/09/2013

- 15/01/2014

- 25/02/2014

- 25/06/2014

8. External evaluation report

➤ **Workstream 1: Title: Fichage des citoyens et protection des DP : hit parade des législations et des pratiques**

I. Activities

Indicate which of the planned activities were implemented, which of the planned activities were not implemented (and why) and if any unforeseen activities were implemented.

Implemented activities

1. Methodology: proposition and discussion during the first meeting. Setting up of a grid and of a way of work (cf Report seminar 1 -) : on line research, contacting DPA,s and other NGO's.

2. Desk research and transnational inquiries

For all partners the desk research included :

- online research on relevant legislation, the role and powers of the Data Protection Authorities (DPA), published decisions, opinions and annual reports of DPAs, seeking information on news or scandals with regard to relevant data protection issues in the relevant countries, looking for EU provisions in the related matters,

-contacting DPAs for information (sometime to help to fill the questionnaire or at least provide a summary or insights, asking for translations of legislative pieces, aiming to understand the context and background of the regulations and decisions, etc.),

-contacting local NGOs for information (filling the questionnaire or at least provide a summary or insights, asking for translations of legislative pieces, aiming to understand the context and background of the regulations and decisions, what do they see differently from the governments' standpoint or the original purpose of the relevant file, etc.)

LDH :

Inquiries were broadly lead by our legal department for a high number of french files, in each relevant theme. A part of the work was also realized thanks to trainees which were thus involved during the seminars (H Tanghe and L Mouret) : so we could investigate more that

what we had foreseen and also investigate deeper for each subject. We also take the opportunity of language skills of the trainees (for Spanish contacts in particular).

Enquiries were thus made through contacts in Italy, Spain and Portugal. We had great difficulties to identify structures or people who were interested or involved in the subject : the subject was eventually not at all addressed! Even phone calls to the DPA's gave few useful information. So the LDH could not organize skype meeting after the first step of investigation. More the LDH could gather only very few useful information for Portugal (also language barrier – no answer of the DPA also nor NGO's)..

Creation of the grids for 17 files in France, 11 files in Spain; 4 files in Italy; 3 files in Portugal
Monographs written.

HU :

Desk research and consultation of experts in the legal and technical fields. Creation of grids for 9 files in Germany, for 3 files in Austria, for 2 files in UK.

The language barrier was not a problem for HU, but difficulties were encountered to get answers from experts in due time.

Monographs written for each country

HCLU :

Regarding Hungary, the necessary information was at the disposal of HCLU and more HCLU is in strong connection with other NGOs dealing with data protection. Such communication is so common that it happens informally over the phone or via email : so the workshop were not necessarily. HCLU submitted freedom of information and statistical data requests to obtain data on Hungarian criminal records.

During the desk research phase HCLU mainly used its already existing connections with local NGOs in the covered countries in emails and skype when it was more efficient. Our main goal was to get information to fill the grid. For this activity written communication was more suitable than skype meetings. HCLU contacted volunteers of the HCLU who speak the relevant foreign language, but the task (looking for the relevant legislation in that language, translate or summarize it) was generally too difficult and time consuming and also needed legal background. HCLU contacted also students of the Central European University (Budapest) who speak the relevant foreign language for the same reason

Creation of grids for 2 files in Hungary, only some data for Czech republic, for 1 file (and other data) in Poland, for some data in Slovenia

Monographs written

AEDH

The choice of the European files to be studied was made in Paris : SISII, VIS, EURODAC and ECRIS.

And to complete the investigations led by the national partners, AEDH choose to work on Finland, Bulgaria and Greece, where the AEDH has members which were interested in the program. If the analysis in Greece benefited from inside knowledge (thus no problem of language), it was finally difficult to gather information in Finland. The inside situation in Bulgaria led the contact partner to finally not get involved in the project.

Thus AEDH created 3 files for European level , set up grids for 4 files in Greece, 4 for 4 files in Finland

Monographs written for European level and each country.

ALOS LDH

ALOS LDH made investigation in Luxemburg and created 6 grids

A monograph was written.

All the filled-in grids are in annexe A (electronic only).

3. 2 National workshops were foreseen in France, Germany and Hungary.

LDH: 4 national workshop were organized in France: 19/09/2013, 24/10/2013, 03/12/2013, et

le 09/01/2014. The LDH succeed to gather some experts from the LDH and other networks (particularly the SM -syndicat de la magistrature- and the SAF -syndicat des avocats de France-) to discuss the files and monograph. No meeting reports were written down: the discussions were the directly used to fill in the grid and complete the French monograph.

Workshops organized by LDH

19/09/2013: Review and verification of the information listed in the grids on French police files and health care files. Discussion and validation of dangers to freedoms listed in these documents.

24/10/2013: Review and verification of the information listed in the grids on French justice files and education files. Discussion and validation of dangers to freedoms listed in these documents.

03/12/2013: Work on the French monograph.

09/01/2014: Thinking about the dangers to be denounced and key messages to be provided in the passport on rights enforcement.

4. Transnational workshops in France, Germany and Hungary via skype : not implemented

No team succeed to gather enough information or contacts to set up such workshop, due to the lack of interest of the contacts.

5. State of art on each studied country: this task was carried out.

The monographs were written, for almost all countries studied based on the files realized according to the grid: the monographs helped to carried out the synthesis. Nonetheless all data includes in grids were taken into account for comparative analysis. The filing systems studied by field are detailed in the comparative analysis.

LDH : France, Italy Spain, Portugal (grids)

HU : Germany, Austria, UK

HCLU : Hungary, Poland (some data), Czech Republic (some data) , Slovenia (some data)

AEDH : Greece, Finland

ALOS LDH : Luxemburg

Those documents were for most written down in English, not published but were the basis of the comparative analysis (14 countries). When monograph were not written the fill in grids were the basis of the comparative analysis work.

6. Monograph: Evaluative analysis at the European level. This task was implemented by the AEDH

7. Seminar “hit parade” in Berlin, realisation of a comparative analysis starting from the national monographs.

The seminar was co organized in Berlin by HU and LDH, and discussions took place about the assessment of the filing, with establishment of criteria of analysis and assessment.

Then the comparative analysis was carried out by the LDH, once each team gave complementary data for the grids and wrote the monographs after the seminar in Berlin.

Each team contributed by its remarks, comments, additions, ...

The “hit parade” was then discussed during many e mail exchanges before and after the seminar in Budapest.

8. Translation and publication: each partner translated and edited the documents (hit parade and comparative analysis) on its website and in print.

Not implemented activities

1. National workshops were not organized by HU and HCLU : those partners did not succeed to gather the experts – and did not consider it as useful for implementing their tasks –well

known contacts- but worked individually with them by phone or skype.
2. Transnational Skype meeting: for all partners gather information from other country has been hard work, included the difficulties of languages. The information was very often unavailable. So every team did his best via phone or email contact, or skype exchanges and did not succeed to organise the Skype meetings which were foreseen. A lot of time was spent on the research of data from other countries, not always successfully.

Unforeseen activities

- 1.
- 2.

II. Output(s) and deliverable(s)

List the produced outputs and deliverables of this Workstream.
For the Outputs indicate: title, date of implementation, place of implementation and number of participants.
For the Deliverables indicate: precise title, type, format (e.g. printed and/or electronic), languages and number of copies produced.

II.a. Outputs

1. Kick off meeting : a day dedicated to methodology (cf program, Paris, 15-16 /02/2013, 20 participants – See the program of the meeting and the report) – Deliverable 512/612

2. National workshops (cf : signed list of attendance 521)

LDH, Paris, at the headquarters of the LDH

19/09/2013, 11 participants

24/110/2013, 9 participants

03/12/2013, 7 participants

09/01/2014, 9 participants

4. Transnational meeting in Berlin, 28-29 /09/2013,14 participants (see the program of the meeting and the report) - Deliverable 513/613

II.b. Deliverables

Realisation of “state of art”, realisation and publication of “comparative analysis” and of the “hit parade” by each partner (print and electronic)

LDH (FR)

411 Monograph France 50 copies

412 Monograph Europe 50 copies + on the LDH website

413 Monograph Spain

414 Comparative analysis 400 copies + on the LDH website

415 Institutional filing in 14 European countries 5000 copies + on the LDH website

HU (G)

421 Monograph Germany 50 copies

422

423 Monographs Austria and UK

424 Comparative analysis 50 copies + on the HU website

425 Institutional filing in 14 European countries 5000 copies + on the HU website

HCLU (HUN)

431 Monograph Hungarish

432

433 Monographs CZ, PL, Slovenia

434 Comparative analysis 50 copies + on the HCLU website

435 Institutional filing in 14 European countries 3 000 copies + on the HCLU website

AEDH (EN)	
441	Monograph Europe 500 copies + on the AEDH website
442	Monographs Finland, Greece
443	Comparative analysis 500 copies + on the AEDH website
444	Institutional filing in 14 European countries 5 000 copies + on the AEDH website
ALOS LDH	
451	Monograph Luxembourg

➤ **Workstream 2: Title: Campagne de communication : sensibilisation, information, formation**

I. Activities

Indicate which of the planned activities were implemented, which of the planned activities were not implemented (and why) and if any unforeseen activities were implemented.

Implemented activities

1. Meeting in Budapest with all the partners and the communication agency : the communication tools, debate and propositions. Local organisation by HCLU. 14-15/12/2013. Mobilisation of the communication agency by LDH and AEDH with a collective chose of an agency, starting from 3 proposals of different agency, during the seminar in Berlin.

2. Work on messages and framework for the quiz and the passport : go between with the communication agency and between the teams after the meeting and almost until the seminar in Brussels, exchanges also on the presentation of those documents, and also for the presentation of the “hit parade”). Each team took in charge a chapter (Education, health, police; justice) to propose the messages to the others.

3. Final version of the quiz and of the passport set up by the agency

Proof reading, modifications, realized mainly by LDH and AEDH.

4. Transnational conference in Brussels 09/04/2014 co organized by LDH and AEDH during the first trimester of the year, with a first proposition of planning in January. The date was chosen, taken into account the progresses of the program, the presence in Brussels of European deputies. To give more visibility to the event, the conference was organized in a meeting room of the CESE. The AEDH with the help of all the other teams and thanks to former relationships succeeded to gather panellists of high quality (see program). But the attendance was relatively low, despite a large communication (internet, mailings). During the meeting between the partners, the last steps of the project were discussed (mainly achievement of all publications) and each team presented its communication plan for the next months and eventually after.

5. Translation and publication were carried out by each team. So the documents are available in **4 languages** (print and electronic for the passport, electronic for the quizz)

6. Launch event in each country

LDH

Paris (25.06.2014) – Panel discussion/press conference on “Which risks for the citizen?” Data protection experts on national level (5 panelists); journalists (4 attended the panel discussion)

HU

Berlin (18.06.2014) – Panel discussion on the General Data Protection Regulation with data protection experts on national, and EU level.

HCLU

Budapest (10.06.2014)

– First part : Closed professional workshop and discussion including NGOs (Eötvös Károly Intézet), one professor from Central European University, the data protection authority, relevant departments of Ministries (2 representatives) and private company stakeholders. It was truly fruitful and unique because in recent times it does not happen very often that professionals from the executive branch and NGO members are engaged in discussion. The representative of the DPA did not come to the event in the end but they issued a formal written opinion which is considered as a positive outcome of the project.

- Second part: event for the press based on invitation. Unfortunately, it happened in the period when the result of the national election was in the centre of attention. The HCLU has a close connection with plenty of editorials, news sites, etc. but due to the political turmoil our event did not create as much attention as expected. HCLU contacted 20 journalists from every major online and offline media outlet and some other smaller editorials directly and gave special exclusive contents to attract them. Although the level of participation did not meet our expectations but the conversations with the present journalist turned out to be successful and we have been in touch ever since and they report on data protection matters. Program about: Are people at risks? Government data collection project and data retention

7. Dissemination and Training, awareness sessions in each country

LDH

The trainings and awareness sessions

Those sessions were mainly organized with our local sessions.

Besides, during our regular monthly meeting with all our regional delegates, we dedicated a time on the presentation of the program and of the tools.

- Bordeaux, 9th May 2014 – LDH Regional Committee

Training session with 25 persons of Aquitaine region

- Aix en Provence, 20th May 2014 - Technologos association

Presentation and distribution of the tools during a public conference about: “*Privacy is it not soon more than an old story?*” (50 persons)

- Paris 15th, 4th June 2014 – LDH section

Training sessions, 12 persons

- Brive, 7th June 2014 – LDH section

Training session, 15 persons

- Paris 13th June 2014 – LDH

Training session, 15 delegates of the Convention

- Paris 14th June 2014 – LDH

Training session, 12 delegates of the Convention

- Paris 19th June 2014 – LDH

Presentation of the project to the members of the Liberties and digital technology

Observatory.

Dissemination of the tools

- Ivry 25th June 2014 – LDH section

Training session, 12 persons

- Carcassonne 26th June 2014 – LDH section

Training session, 10 persons

- 1st July 2014 – Economic, Social and Environmental Council

Dissemination of the tools to the *Education, Cultural and Communication Section* (20 persons)

- 1st July 2014 – National Assembly Presentation of the tools to the vice-chairman of the National Assembly, commissioner at the CNIL

Dissemination

About half of the documents are distributed :

- First during the launch event and training sessions (about 1500 copies of passport and 300 “hit parade”)
- Second during the monthly meeting gathering our regional delegates: they were in charge to distribute copies in their regional sections. About 5 000 copies of the passport were disseminated via the sections and 2000 “hit parade”.
- Next some local sections requested more copies of the passport particularly, so a mailing was organized toward about 50 local sections. Distribution of 1000 copies (for instance : Mont de Marsan – Aix en Provence – Strasbourg - Verneuil/seine – Coutances – Dax – Rennes – Castelnaudary - St Briec – Noirmoutier – Limoges – Carcassonne - L’Hay les roses – Le Kremlin Bicêtre – Brest – Brive – Marseille-Centre – Ivry-Vitry, ...).

HU

Training and awareness sessions

- Hannover (08.-09.02.2014) – Knowledge transfer session with expert members of the HU, based on the national grids and monographs. Discussion of the implications (10 participants)
- Humbolt Universitat – Berlin (25 mai 2014)- Discussion panel among EU politicians – Was cancelled due to the lack of availability of politicians during the election campaigns
- Berlin, expert panel discussion 18/06/2014 (25 attendants) announcement on the website <http://berlin.humanistische-union.de/nc/veranstaltungen/veranstaltungsdetail/back/veranstaltungen-6/article/wie-weiter-mit-dem-datenschutz-in-der-eu-und-in-deutschland/>
- Rastatt (21.-22.06.2014) – Training session during the biannual national HU meeting, presentation of the national monographs and comparative analysis to members of regional sections, presentation of the communication tools, instructions on their use. 1455 invitations, 47 participants

Dissemination

- distribution of 16x (350+ 150 hit parade) to regional sections
- distribution of (3 passport+ 1 hoit parade) to prospective members with “data protection” in their interest profile

- Distribution of 500 passports at our stall during the largest national privacy demonstration (“Freiheit statt Angst” = “Freedom not Fear”) in Berlin, 30.08.2014
Dissemination in the way : passport are added to any publication orders in our onlineshop. Regional section and interested members can order further copies of all communication tools.

HCLU

Dissemination

The dissemination is ensured in three different paths. First of all, HCLU find it important to have a constant connection with journalist and inform them not only on the project itself but data protection risks and infringements in general. This is the most efficient way to have an impact on people as in general audience.

The second is based on our online presence including our website and social media surfaces.

And third, the printed materials are disseminated in conferences and meetings that we organise or participate in

We do not consider the dissemination phase closed as it only started in the beginning of summer. It shall be noted, that from September the chance to make an impact in the field of education is opening again and the HCLU will use the outcome of the projects in doing so.

We trust that as it is described in the report that returning of the new school year will create an opportunity to disseminate the outcomes of the project especially regarding education. The establishment of the electronic health care database is also under scrutiny and we will use the materials and research results of the project when a development occurs.

The press conference was successful in terms of awareness raising and sensitivity towards privacy and data protection issues. The press excessively covered issues run by the HCLU regarding an unlawful database used for political campaigns by the ruling party and infringements in connection with personal data and nomination ballots

AEDH

Training sessions

Brussels, 13 of June 2014: attendance, 19 persons,

Brussels, 16 of June 2014 : attendance, 21 persons

Diversified public, members of the AEDH, coming from France, Bulgaria, Greece, Spain, Belgium, European networks, such as PICUM, Caritas Europe, EDRI, Datapanik and also experts.

Audience interested in the subject and ready to be involved on such subjects which will contribute to the dissemination of the tools in their own networks.

Dissemination

On the web site and on the page facebook

E mails to all participants of the various events and also to those which were invited : presentation of the tools : it includes the European parliament, the EESC, and some DPA;s.

Mailing : all the structures members of the AEDH (28 structures in 22 UE countries) and European networks (EDRI, Solidar, generation 112).

Half of the documents are distributed.

8. On line information

LDH

The LDH ensured communication about the project and the tools via the website (see below)

and also via facebook, and mailing lists (“infocom”).

<http://www.ldh-france.org/>

<http://www.ldh-france.org/projet/fichage-institutionnel/>

<http://www.ldh-france.org/projet/quiz-fichage/>

HU

HU ensured communication about the project and the tools via the website (see below). The work is available in german and in english.

<http://www.humanistische-union.de/index.php?id=2947>

http://www.humanistische-union.de/fileadmin/hu_upload/Fichage-Quiz/DE/index.html

http://www.humanistische-union.de/fileadmin/hu_upload/Fichage-Quiz/German_Monograph.pdf

http://www.humanistische-union.de/fileadmin/hu_upload/Fichage-Quiz/2014_07_28_Hitparade_DEweb.pdf

HCLU

The link of the page dedicated to the project can be found under this link: <http://tasz.hu/adatvedelem/veszelyben-vagyunk>

It is accessible under the page of data protection program : <http://tasz.hu/adatvedelem>

AEDH

The LDH ensured communication about the project and the tools via the website (see below) and also via facebook, and mailing lists

<http://www.aedh.eu/>

<http://www.aedh.eu/Quiz-Fichage-informer-les-citoyens.html>

<http://www.aedh.eu/-L-AEDH-et-la-protection-des-.html>

9. Distribution of the passports: mailings: see trainings sessions and dissemination. Still underway

10. Final meeting via skype – 25/06/2014

The final skype took place at the end of june with all the partner. See Skype meeting reports. The main points were: an overview of dissemination, a reminder of the task to be done for the final report with deadlines (end of july).

Not implemented activities

1. The translations were not made in Poland and in greece.
- 2.

Unforeseen activities

- 1.
- 2.

II Output(s) and deliverables

II.a. Outputs

1. Transnational seminar Budapest (see program of the meeting), 14-15/12/2013, 14 participants – Deliverable 414

2. Transnational conference in Brussels (see program of the meeting), 8-9/04/2014, 17 participants le 8, 36 participants le 9/04 – Deliverable 415

3 Organisation of national events for launching dissemination

- LDH : press conference
- HU
- HCLU

4. Organization of training or awareness rising sessions

LDH

- Bordeaux, 9th May 2014 – LDH Regional Committee 25 persons of Aquitaine region
- Aix en Provence, 20th May 2014 - Technologos association (50 persons)
- Paris 15th, 4th June 2014 – LDH section 12 persons
- Brive, 7th June 2014 – LDH section 15 persons
- Paris 13th June 2014 – LDH 15 delegates of the Convention
- Paris 14th June 2014 – LDH 12 delegates of the Convention
- Paris 19th June 2014 – LDH Observatory of the liberties and of the digital technology
- Ivry 25th June 2014 – LDH section 12 persons
- Carcassonne 26th June 2014 – LDH section 10 persons
- 1st July 2014 – Economic, Social and Environmental Council (20 persons)
- 1st July 2014 – National Assembly vice-chairman of the National Assembly, commissioner at the CNIL

HU

* Hannover (08.-09.02.2014) – (10 participants)

- Berlin, expert panel discussion 18/06/2014 (25 attendants)
- Rastatt (21.-22.06.2014) – Training session 1455 invitations, 47 participants

HCLU

AEDH

Brussels, 13 of june 2014 :attendance, 19 persons,

Brussels, 16 of june 2014 : attendance, 21 persons

5. Mailings

LDH : half of the documents are distributed :

- During launch event and training sessions distribution about 1500 copies of passport and 300 “hit parade”
- About 5 000 copies of the passport were disseminated via the sections and 2000 “hit

parade”.

- a mailing was organized toward about 50 local sections. Distribution of 1000 copies (for instance : Mont de Marsan – Aix en Provence – Strasbourg - Verneuil/seine – Coutances – Dax – Rennes – Castelnaudary - St Briec – Noirmoutier – Limoges – Carcassonne - L’Hay les roses – Le Kremlin Bicêtre – Brest – Brive – Marseille-Centre – Ivry-Vitry, ...).

HU

- distribution of 16x (350+ 150 hit parade) to regional sections
- distribution of (3 passport+ 1 hoit parade) to prospective members with “data protection” in their interest profile
- Distribution of 500 passports at our stall during the largest national privacy demonstration

HCLU

- Dissemination during meeting and conferences
- And foreseen toward schools in September
-

AEDH

Mailing: all the structures members of the AEDH (28 structures in 22 UE countries) and European networks (EDRI, Solidar, generation 112). 300 passport + 100 hit parade for each

6 Reunion skype organisée le 25/06/2014

II.b. Deliverables

Passports

LDH	461	15 000 passports
HU	462	15 000 passports
HCLU	463	15 000 passports
AEDH	464	15 000 passport

Quizz (on line)

LDH	471
HU	472
HCLU	473
AEDH	474

On line information

LDH	481
HU	482
HCLU	483
AEDH	484

Report of national events for launching dissemination

LDH	531
HU	532
HCLU	
AEDH	(cf conference in Brussels - 515)

Report of training sessions

LDH	541
-----	-----

HU	542
HCLU	
AEDH	544

2.2. Staff members

List the names of all the staff members per organisation (mentioned in the final financial statement under Heading A - Staff) and describe their role in the project.

Indicate: Name of the staff member, employer organisation, role in the project, total number of days worked for this project.

LDH

Viviane de Lafond, coordinator 58 days

Isabelle Denise, in charge of desk research 28 days

Virginie Peron (1 days) , then Christelle Poglio (6 days) , then Leny Nicollet (18 days) and after Virgine Peron (20 days) : in charge of communication tools, communication, dissemination (V Peron was on maternity leave and replaced by C Poglio and then by L Nicollet)

Christine Jacomet : in charge of accounts 14 days

Trainees : Hélène Tanghe; Louise Mouret : contributions to desk research

Volunteers, members of the board : Maryse Artiguelong, Dominique Guibert, contribution to the coordination, to the meetings, to the desk research and communication tools, interventions during training sessions. : total 42 days

HU

Michael Kuhn : 65 days

Axel Bussner : 25 days

Anja Heinrich : 40 days

All in charge of desk research, contribution to meetings, contribution to tools, to communication and dissemination, also administrative tasks

HCLU

Fanny Hidvégi : in charge of the project – coordinator for HU 63 days

Andréa Polgar : administrative and financial tasks 7 days

Stafania Kapronczay : legal department, desk research 20 days

Anna Kertecz : in charge of communication 20 days

AEDH

Amanda Rasolofotsara : in charge of the all project 95 days

Member of the board : Philippos Mitleton, Pierre Barge : contribution to meetings to desk research, to communication tools, about 15 days

2.3. Intellectual property rights (max. 1/2 page)

In addition to the provisions of the Grant Agreement, what intellectual property rights have you agreed within the partnership?

No specific intellectual property : our wish is that all the materials could be as largely and broadly spread among organizations, network; decision makers. So any organization can use the documents and results : the pdf of our work is downloadable without any restriction.

What other intellectual property rights issues have you identified? None

Did any third parties have any pre-existing intellectual property rights in relation with the project? No

2.4. Commercialisation of outputs/deliverables

Have you commercialised or do you intend to commercialise any of the outputs/deliverables? If so, please give details.

No commercialisation foreseen by any member of the partnership.

2.5. Visibility of EU funding (max. 1/2 page)

How was the visibility of the European Union's financial support ensured throughout the project?

All program events and all publications, included the website pages dedicated to the project and the quizz on line mentioned the EU financial support, with the EU logo and the non reponsability for contents of the UE (see deliverables and reports).

More, during the public evens, (meeting in Brussels, launch event in each partner country, training and awareness sessions, the presentations made all included a reminder of the program and by whom it was funded. The source of financial support was explained to the participants.

All the partners underlined that the realisation and the publication of the tools were allowed by european support.

2.6. Main problems/difficulties in the implementation (max. 1/2 page)

Were you faced with any problems/difficulties during the implementation of the project? How did you solve them?

The coordination between the countries and languages involved was sometimes a challenge. We had finally to work mostly in english although the language chosen for the project was initialy french.

The difficulties of languages were also permanent for most of the partners for the research work in the other countries : AEDH solved partially the problem with a member of it's board involved in the project who is Greek, difficulties remained for finland, LDH worked with trainees who spoke spanish and italian, For the Hungarish team, except for the basic legislation which is english, it was impossible to find by themselves more information. Anyway the contacts with other NGO's or DPAs finally remained deceitful : either they were not aware of the problem (and our work induced a beginning of awareness) even if they worked on data protection on internet, either they did not want to give time to translate in english the needed information. The level of assistance provided by the DPAs for filling our grids in was lower than expected, even with the mediation of our evaluator, who knows some of them. And assessing other countries files from data protection perspective and lack of inside knowledge was thus really difficult for some countries.

This difficulties of gathering the information needed induced delays in the WS1 which finally was achieved later as expected. So WS2 was implemented in the last months of the project (starting from april). So the dissemination step was still in the way for all the partners at the end of the project. During the last skype meeting each team stated that they were going on and will disseminate the tools, and work on awareness rising at least until december 2014 : indeed the subject is one each partner is eager to deal with in it's own country.

2.7. Cooperation within the partnership (max. 1/2 page)

How did the Co-beneficiaries and Associate Partners participate in the project and what was their role?

LDH coordinated the project, thus was in permanent contact with all the partners, a little less with the associate partners which were not so involved in the project (especially the MEDEL). This pemanent contact was esttablished through the e mail list (reminder of the work to be done, dead line, programmation of skypes, ...), but also with individual contacts via mail, according to the progress of the project and the work done by each partner.

There was at least two collective e mail per month, and generally, much more as the transnational meetings were approaching. And since the beginning of the project the LDH foresaw to set up skype

meeting : the transnational meeting were too few to allow a good coordination of the partnership during all the project. 6 skype meetings were set up and animated by the LDH, with the participation of all the partnership.

LDH, HU, HCLU and AEDH organised each a transnational meeting. The program was established, according to the need of each step of the project between LDH and the other teams. All the teams participated actively to each meeting, included ALOS PME (associate partner) which works on the project for Luxemburg as much as the other teams on the files in its country, thanks to the involvement of a board member and of a trainee. This active participation was allowed also thanks to translation which was organised for each meeting.

LDH, HU, HCLU and AEDH (and also ALOS LDH, associate partner) were equally involved in the desk research, filling in the grid, writing down monographs, each with more or less files studied, according to the difficulties encountered, the involvement of also members of the board and trainees.

The MEDEL was not so much involved : their participation was to give contacts, inside informations, participate to the transnational meeting (3 of them) and to the skype eventually. Their involvement was not so fruitful as expected (cf difficulties to gather information).

The comparative analysis was carried out by the LDH, as coordinator. The LDH also ensure all the partners participate to the assessment which lead to the "hit parade" collective definition of criteria (all the partners and ALOS LDH), participate also to the choice of the agency (3 different propositions were made), to the definition of the messages for the passport and the lay out of the documents, once the contents collectively approved. If in the first step, gathering information was the main difficulty, in the second step, obtain agreement between the partnership was hard work considering the different cultures and opinions. But the synthesis was made to the satisfaction of all (included associate partners): so each partner was satisfied with the final products and worked to publish and edit the documents, and then to promote and disseminate them.

2.8. Lessons learned and other comments on the implementation of the project (positive and/or negative experiences) (if applicable).

We were optimistic about the idea of mobilizing other NGO's of DPA's of other countries : if there is no work time and thus money allowed, it is difficult for a NGO to give "free" work, because they have not time, and are generally overworked.

LDH dedicated a great amount of time first for coordination (more than expected and more than reported!) because there were difficulties to get agreement between the partnership about the tools, the messages : only the great involvement of board members allowed to succeed because it took a large amount of time.

The skype meetings were indeed very appreciated : with almost no supplementary budget and also with no time lost, they allowed effective partner's meeting and globally really saved time! Nevertheless transnational meetings are essential for an understanding between the teams and to create a true synergy.

If there are delays in the project, the partner involved (all NGO's) are eager to go on the work of awareness rising and dissemination : the time of the project is for them not really the time of the program.

2.9. Conclusions and recommendations for the European Commission in terms of programme management (if applicable).

More time management for the coordonnateur to be foreseen

It must be taken into account that the dissemination and communication time is going on after the end of the program : some questions as "impact" are difficult to evaluate, when this step is still in the way for the partners.

SIGNATURES

DECLARATION

In addition to the provisions of Articles I.11.4² and II.3, the Beneficiaries warrant that the European Union has the rights to use or publish the information included in this report and its Annexes.

We, the undersigned, confirm that we are duly authorised to sign this declaration on behalf of the Beneficiaries. We certify that the information given in this report is correct, and confirm that the Annexes are complete, accurate, and adopted/approved by the Beneficiaries.

Name of the person responsible for the project: Viviane de Lafond

Signature:

Place: Paris Date: 29/09/2014

Name of the legal representative of the Beneficiary/Coordinator: P Tartakowsky

Signature:

Place: Paris Date: 29/09/2014

² Article I.10.3 in single beneficiary Grant Agreements.

COMPULSORY ANNEXES

The Final Narrative Report must be submitted within 3 months of the end date of the action in one paper copy and in electronic version (either on a USB key or CD-ROM or by e-mail to the functional mailbox of the programme).

The following documents must be annexed to this Final Narrative Report:

1. The signed cost claim (original copy)
2. The final financial statement (paper and electronic copies)
3. Quantitative reporting on policy-related outputs and deliverables (Indicators)
4. One sample of each finalised deliverable produced by the project: e.g. reports, surveys, publications, flyers, posters, promotional material, such as T-shirt, mugs, caps, training material (hard copies, where applicable)
5. Agendas/programmes and signed attendance lists of meetings, conferences etc. (preferably in electronic format)
6. Minutes of meetings, presentations and proceedings of conferences, etc. (preferably in electronic format)
7. Results of the evaluations/feedback given by participants and facilitators/trainers at the end of a seminar/training/conferences (preferably in electronic format)
8. Evaluation reports (if applicable) (at least electronic copies)
9. Audit report (if applicable) (original hard copy)

List of annexes

1. The signed cost claim (original copy)
2. The final financial statement (paper and electronic copies)
3. Quantitative reporting on policy-related outputs and deliverables (Indicators)
- 411 . Monograph France
- 412 . Monograph Europe FR
- 413 . Monograph Spain
- 413 . Monograph Italy
- 414 . Analyse comparative FR
- 415 . Institutionnal filing in 14 countries. FR
- 421 . Monograph Germany
- 423 . Monograph Austria
- 423 . Monograph UK
- 424 . Comparative analysis Germany
- 425 . Institutionnal filing in 14 countries German
- 431 . Monograph Hungary
- 433 . Monograph Poland
- 433 . Monograph Czech
- 433 . Monograph Slovenia
- 434 . Institutionnal filing in 14 countries Hungarian

441 . Monograph Europe EN
442 . Monograph Finland
442 . Monograph Greece
443 . Comparative analysis EN
444 . Institutionnal filing in 14 countries Hungarish
451 . Monograph Luxembourg
461 . Passport French
462 . Passport German
463 . Passport Hungarish
464 . Passport English
471 . Quizz FR
472 . Quizz DE
473 . Quizz HU
474 . Quizz EN

512 . Report sem 1 agenda attendance list
513 . Report sem 2 agenda attendance list
514 . Report sem 3 agenda attendance list
515 . Report sem 4 agenda attendance list
515 . Report conference sem 4 agenda attendance list
516 . CR Skype meetings
521 – National workshops attendance lists FR
531 – Launch event LDH
532 – Lauch event HU
541 – Training session LDH (2)
541 – Training sessions LDH
542 – Awareness rising sessions HU
544 – Training sessions AEDH (2)
544 – Training session AEDH

611 – Management kit – Survival kit
612 – Powerpoint presentation seminar 1
613 – Powerpoint presentation seminar 2
614 – Powerpoint presentation seminar 3
615 – Powerpoint presentation seminar 4

8 – External Evaluation report

Grids for each country studied.