



## D2.9

# Training manual for the Living labs

Deliverable type  
Report

Work Package  
2

Dissemination level  
Public

Month and date of  
Month 18 | 30, May 2023

Leader  
BayHfoD

Authors  
Max Hausner

programme ISFP | GA number 101038752 | duration 24 months | start Dec 1, 2021 | end November 30, 2023



This product is funded by the European Union's Internal Security Fund - Police. The content of this product represents the views of the author(s) only and is his/her/their sole responsibility. The European Commission does not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.



[www.eradicate-thb.eu](http://www.eradicate-thb.eu)

## Peer Reviews

NAME

**Caroline Sander**

**Stefan Ralchev**

ORGANISATION

**GGMH**

**CSD**

## Revision History

VERSION	DATE	REVIEWER	MODIFICATIONS
<b>0.1</b>	<b>27/03/2023</b>	<b>Max Hausner</b>	<b>Table of Contents</b>
<b>0.2</b>	<b>11/04/2023</b>	<b>Max Hausner</b>	<b>First Draft</b>
<b>0.3</b>	<b>16/04/2023</b>	<b>Max Hausner</b>	<b>Final Touch for Peer review</b>
<b>0.4</b>	<b>26/04/2023</b>	<b>Heike Menzel-Kötz</b>	<b>Annex II - IV</b>
<b>0.5</b>	<b>27/04/2023</b>	<b>Heike Menzel-Kötz</b>	<b>Post Processing</b>
<b>0.6</b>	<b>28/04/2023</b>	<b>Stefan Ralchev</b>	<b>Review</b>
<b>0.7</b>	<b>28/04/2023</b>	<b>Caroline Sander</b>	<b>Review</b>
<b>0.8</b>	<b>04/05/2023</b>	<b>Amelie Veicht</b>	<b>Revision</b>
<b>0.9</b>	<b>10/05/2023</b>	<b>KEMEA</b>	<b>Review</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>25/05/2023</b>	<b>Max Hausner</b>	<b>Final Version</b>

## Table of Abbreviations and Acronyms

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
<b>CSE</b>	Child Sexual Exploitation
<b>D [x.x]</b>	Deliverable
<b>GA</b>	Grant Agreement
<b>FPM</b>	Footprint Material
<b>LEA</b>	Law Enforcement Agency
<b>NGO</b>	Non-governmental Organisation
<b>T [x.x]</b>	Task
<b>THB</b>	Trafficking in human beings
<b>Q [x]</b>	Question
<b>WP [x]</b>	Work Package

## Index of Contents

1	Introduction	6
1.1	Background	6
1.2	Relation to other project activities	6
1.3	Objectives	7
2	Living Lab Approach	8
2.1	Definition and framework in general	8
2.2	Aim in ERADICATING	8
3	Methodology	9
3.1	Overview of relevant materials and documents	9
3.2	Guidelines and recommendations for planning	10
3.2.1	Target Group	10
3.2.2	Roles and Group Size	11
3.2.3	Logistics	12
3.2.4	Step-by-Step model preparation plan	12
3.2.5	Exemplary Agenda	13
3.3	Guidelines and recommendations for implementation	14
3.3.1	Introduction	14
3.3.2	Presentation of the underlying Use Case Scenario	14
3.3.3	Validation and Evaluation of the ERADICATING Footprint Material	14
3.3.4	Discussion: Problems and Solutions Detection	16
3.3.5	Conclusion / End of the Event	17
4	Post-Processing	18
	References	20
	Annex I: Specific Use Case Scenario for LLs	21
	Annex II: Material evaluation questionnaire	23
	Annex III: Template for the Analysis of Survey Results Regarding the Evaluation and Validation of the Footprint Material	25
	Annex IV: Template for the “Problems Detection and Solutions Suggestion”	28



## Index of Tables

Table 1 - Exemplary Agenda for Living Labs.....	13
Table 2 - Opening Question for Validation .....	15
Table 3 - Additional suggested Questions for Validation .....	15

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

This manual forms part of the implementation of Work Package 2 of the ERADICATING Project. Pursuant to the ERADICATING Grant Agreement, this deliverable corresponds to D2.9, developed within the framework of T2.3 “Development of training material for the ERADICATING Footprint”. This manual seeks to provide the necessary information, i.e., the methodology for the preparation and implementation of ERADICATING’s “Living Labs”. The Living Labs (LLs), accordingly this document, will be customised for end user requirements for combatting cases of THB and CSE and each one will take place in Bulgaria, Greece, and Germany.

In a nutshell, the LLs, for which this D2.9 serves as a basis, will serve the purpose on the one hand piloting, testing, and validating the ERADICATING Footprint material. On the other hand, these LLs will enable the discussion, derivation and identification of problems and solutions in THB and CSE cases.

## 1.2 Relation to other project activities

This manual is closely interwoven with other activities within the framework of the ERADICATING project. First and foremost, several activities flow directly into this manual, and accordingly into the three LLs: As mentioned already in chapter 1.1, the LLs and accordingly D2.9 are customised for the end user requirements for combatting cases of THB and CSE. These end user requirements were collected, examined, and reported on in D2.2, "Report on End User Requirements," which was part of T2.2. Using a specifically designed questionnaire, 26 semi-structured interviews with experts from a variety of groups involved in handling THB cases were conducted in Bulgaria, Greece, and Germany. These groups included law enforcement agencies, prosecutorial offices, labour inspectorates, NGOs, social service providers, and other relevant organisations. To identify gaps, challenges, and end user requirements, the use case scenarios presented in D2.1 "Report on Use Case Scenarios" were also examined in the framework of T2.2. A set of suggestions for the design, structure, and content of the ERADICATING Footprint were produced as a consequence of these findings. The design and content of the manual for the Living Labs was heavily influenced by these recommendations. The D2.4 "Practical Guide," the D2.5 "Intro Videos for the Training Simulation," as well as the D2.6 "Digital child manual in the form of a fairy tale" are all directly related to this manual. As part of the ERADICATING Footprint, all of these deliverables constitute both the basis and subject for piloting, testing, validation, and discussion in these LLs. The D2.7 "Spots for the living labs and transferability workshops," which includes brief videos supporting

the training events stated in the deliverable's title, is also closely related to D2.9. Accordingly, the LLs can also benefit from using this material.

Secondly, in relation to the activities and documents into which D2.9 and the corresponding LLs will feed: T3.4 "ERADICATING Footprint Evaluation and validation" and corresponding Deliverables, namely D3.4 "Report on the Solution mapping and evaluations (from the LLs)", the D3.5 "Factsheets per country (in total 3)" and the D3.6 "Manual on examination of conformity: Promising practices and guidance". T3.4 and the corresponding D3.4 will consist of a reporting on the three LLs, it will include the evaluation of the tools' performance, sustainability and transferability to diverse situations and end users' daily operations in relation to prevention and combating THB and CSE and the culture of impunity. The D3.5 and the corresponding factsheets per country will also be a direct outcome of the LLs, as these factsheets will be a cooperative co-creation regarding "Problems detection and Solutions suggestion" in the course of the LLs. Last but not least, the content of D3.5 will feed directly into the D3.6, which contains and analysis and comparison of the factsheets and other outputs of the LLs, which will lead to extraction of "Promising Practices". In this case, "promising practices" are defined as practices which may foster and improve the prevention, management and prosecution of cases of THB and CSE.

### 1.3 Objectives

The purpose of this document is first and foremost to provide a methodology for developing the three LLs. Therefore, this manual has four main objectives:

- Outline of the approach "Living Lab" in general as well as an overview of the LLs' aim in ERADICATING.
- Detailed instructions on how to prepare the LLs.
- Comprehensive guidance for the implementation of the Living Lab, including suggestions on how to facilitate validation, evaluation and the detection of problems and solutions.
- Information on the necessary documentation and post-processing of the LLs and, i.e., their results.

## 2 Living Lab Approach

### 2.1 Definition and framework in general

Living Labs can provide invaluable insights into the practical needs, challenges, experiences and lessons identified by first-line practitioners. The group dynamic offered by the Living Lab setting also enables interaction, discussion, and joint analysis, reflection and evaluation, as well as the development of recommendations. Living Labs provide an opportunity to define the general tendencies in people's thinking in a qualitative way. This is an essential element for the in-depth analysis. The method implies a structured group discussion among relevant experts and practitioners in the field of interest, here: the field of managing cases of THB and CSE. As some sources state, group interaction and non-verbal communication are part of the data to be taken into account during the Living Lab (Almirall et al., 2012). Group interactions/discussions are structured by 1-2 moderators, whose role should be clear to the participants of the Living Labs from the beginning. A skilled moderator can encourage the group interactions to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of what is being studied. A sound and reliable methodology is essential to ensure the quality of implementation and recording of results and findings.

Living Lab activities aim to bring together multidisciplinary participants to integrate through the co-creation, exploration, experimentation and evaluation of innovative ideas, here, the ERADICATING Footprint Material. Living Labs are mainly intended to share ideas and find innovative solutions. To meet this expectation they attempt to:

- (1) Create participatory environments, facilitating the exchange of views and proactive interaction among experts in the different areas.
- (2) Promote the exchange of views for the peer-to-peer learning approach.
- (3) Share experiences, through the study and analysis of real cases, to address potential solutions. (Bergvall-Kåreborn et al., 2009; Følstad, 2008).

### 2.2 Aim in ERADICATING

ERADICATING's Living Labs aim to create such a participatory environment, involving experts and practitioners from various professional background, to serve a two-fold objective: First, the Living Labs will be utilised to pilot, validate and evaluate the Footprint Material in ERADICATING, utilising the exchange of views of the multidisciplinary participants. With the same approach, second, the LLs aim to serve as a platform for



identification of problems and solutions, through sharing of experiences, open discussion on the basis of a specific use case and junction of different perspectives and views.

## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Overview of relevant materials and documents

The basis as well as the subject of the activities in the ERADICATING Living Labs are the tools of the Footprint Material as well as additional relevant documents. The table below presents all these materials and documents:

*Table 1 - Overview of relevant materials and documents.*

No	Title	Description/Comment	Purpose
1	Specific Use Case Scenario	See Annex I	Basis for Validation
2	Practical Guide (D2.4)	Provides an overview of essential procedures for protecting victims of trafficking, along with useful communication tips that are sensitive to gender and child-related issues, and to outline relief and support structures for such victims. The guide is specifically focused on Greece, Germany, and Bulgaria, and has been published on the ERADICATING Website ( <a href="https://www.eradicate-thb.eu">https://www.eradicate-thb.eu</a> ) in four languages: English, Greek, German, and Bulgarian.	Subject to Validation and Evaluation
2	Fairy Tale (D2.6)	Titled "Footprints of Hope". The main objective of the Digital Child Manual is to increase awareness among students about the issue of trafficking in human beings (THB), with a focus on the various forms of exploitation experienced by minors. The Fairy Tale is accessible on the Website of the ERADICATING Project ( <a href="https://www.eradicate-thb.eu">https://www.eradicate-thb.eu</a> ).	

3	Spots for the living labs and transferability workshops (D2.7)	The set of spots created in the framework of D2.7 will support the implementation of the LLs by presenting suggested techniques and methods on how to deliver trainings involving the ERADICATING Footprint Material.	Supporting the Implementation
3	Evaluation Questionnaire	See Annex II	Instrument for Evaluation
4	Consent Forms	To be created individually and signed by all participants prior to each LL.	Other

## 3.2 Guidelines and recommendations for planning

### 3.2.1 Target Group

The target group for the ERADICATING Living Labs encompasses a diverse range of stakeholders who are involved in combatting human trafficking and supporting victims, in order to enable a multi-agency, multi-disciplinary approach, allowing for a more holistic understanding, validation and evaluation and the comprehensive, multiperspectival detection of problems and solutions. The target group, thus the potential participants of the Living Labs, may include persons from the following organisations and authorities:

- **Law Enforcement Agencies**, including local, national, or international agencies responsible for detecting, investigating and prosecuting THB and/or CSE cases.
- **Non-Governmental Organisations** that focus on THB and/or CSE or victim support organisations.
- **Social Service Providers**, including, e.g., social workers, counsellors, and psychologists.
- **Labour inspectorates** or similar agencies responsible for monitoring and enforcing labour laws and regulations playing a critical role in detecting and addressing labour trafficking.
- **Border Guards**, including, e.g., immigration officers and customs officers playing oftentimes a decisive role in the detection of cases of THB.
- **Prosecutorial Offices**, responsible for prosecuting suspected perpetrators and seeking justice for victims.
- **Others**: Depending on the context, other stakeholders such as policymakers, researchers, academics, representatives from international organisations, survivor advocates, and other relevant actors may also be included in the Living Lab. Their diverse perspectives and expertise can enrich the discussions,

validation and evaluation and contribute to the development pertinent strategies for improvement.

### 3.2.2 Roles and Group Size

At the Living Labs, three different roles are represented: One person as facilitator/moderator (1), one or more persons who support the implementation of the LLs especially by taking accurate notes (2) and last but not least and the participants per se (3):

- (1) In a Living Lab, the work of the **moderator/facilitator** is critical for ensuring that the collaborative creativity process runs smoothly and effectively. The moderator/facilitator acts as an impartial and professional guide, directing Living Lab participants through all stages of the innovation process. The moderator/facilitator creates a safe and welcoming environment in which participants can freely share their thoughts, ideas, and insights. To build a collaborative culture, they encourage open communication and active listening among participants. Furthermore, the moderator/facilitator is in charge of regulating group dynamics and resolving any conflicts or disagreements that may develop during the Living Lab process. To create a good and productive environment, they use dispute resolution tactics, stimulate dialogues, and encourage constructive criticism. It is recommended that a person with a sound knowledge of THB and CSE, who is a member of the ERADICATING consortium or a person close to the project, acts as moderator/facilitator.
- (2) One or several persons will be **taking notes** on the Living Lab's content and document insights and outcomes generated during the innovation process. They record discussions, ideas, and statements from participants, and create written documentation of the Living Lab session. These notes serve as a valuable basis for analysing and synthesizing information and the utilisation of findings. It is recommended that members of the ERADICATING consortium will take over this role.
- (3) Ensuring the attendance of **participants** from a diverse range of professional backgrounds is crucial when organising a Living Lab on THB and CSE in order to ensure a comprehensive and multi-dimensional approach to addressing this complex issue. It is recommended to invite experienced practitioners involved in the management of cases of THB and CSE as participants, especially from the

groups mentioned in chapter 3.2.1. About 15 to 20 participants are envisaged per Living Lab.

### 3.2.3 Logistics

To ensure high quality and professionalism overall, all partners responsible for the planning and execution of a Living Lab are requested to pay close attention to logistics and proper preparation, management, and implementation of the LLs, including engagement with participants and stakeholder institutions. All partners are asked to develop a well-structured plan to avoid incidents that might postpone the event or affect the overall quality of it.

### 3.2.4 Step-by-Step model preparation plan

- ✓ Identify relevant potential participants (see chapter 3.2.1).
- ✓ Create a contact list.
- ✓ Identify and reserve a venue.
- ✓ Determine which tools of the footprint material need/should be validated: It is at the discretion of the respective consortium partner responsible for planning and implementing the Living Lab which tools of the Footprint are offered for validation. While the Simulation Exercise has been thoroughly and sufficiently validated and evaluated in the framework of the Simulation Exercise that took place in February 2023 in Athens, it can be assumed that the practical guide has not yet been discussed, validated and evaluated so far. The fairy tale “Footprints of Hope”, on the other hand, has already been discussed in three national roundtable discussions and feedback has been collected. It is left to the discretion of the respective national consortium partners, if further validation as part of the Living Lab is necessary. If national consortium partners wish to further validate and evaluate the fairy tale, they may choose to do this either as part of the LL, or individually, e.g. by approaching one or more educator(s)/ teacher(s).
- ✓ Adapt the agenda to your needs.
- ✓ Adapt the evaluation questionnaire to your needs, i.e., to the tools chosen as subjects for the validation and evaluation.
- ✓ Send an invitation (incl. agenda) to the target participants with the proposed day/time. If deemed necessary, use a means of registration.
- ✓ Choose a facilitator/moderator and (at least) one more person who will take notes.

- ✓ Translate the material (see chapter 3.1) to your local language (if needed).
- ✓ Adapt the evaluation questionnaire to your needs, translate it.
- ✓ Prepare and print the information sheets and consent forms to be signed by the participants (beforehand or at the venue/day of the event?).
- ✓ Verify participants attendance.
- ✓ Send out the Footprint material to the participants along with the request to go through this material prior to the LL (see Annex XYZ for relevant letter/mail).
- ✓ Finalise room arrangements.
- ✓ Reminder notice / call to participants.

### 3.2.5 Exemplary Agenda

The following table contains an exemplary agenda for the Living Labs. As already mentioned in chapter 3.2.4, the consortium partners responsible for the planning and implementation of the Living Labs are free to adapt it according to their own needs and/or the expected needs of the participants.

*Table 2 - Exemplary Agenda for Living Labs.*

<b>Step/ Session</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1	09:00 – 09:30	Welcome and Introduction	As described in chapter 3.3.1
2	09:30 – 10:00	Presentation of the specific Use Case Scenario	As described in chapter 3.3.2
3	10:00 – 12:00	Validation of the ERADICATING Footprint Material Carrying out the survey (Annex II)	As described in chapter 3.3.3
4	12:00 – 13:00	<i>Lunch Break</i>	
6	13:00 – 15:00	Discussion: Detection of Problems and Solutions	As described in chapter 3.3.4
7	15:30 – 16:00	Conclusion / End of the Event	As described in chapter 3.3.5

### 3.3 Guidelines and recommendations for implementation

#### 3.3.1 Introduction

The Living Labs will be initiated by the moderator/facilitator, a representative of the responsible ERADICATING consortium partner. After welcoming remarks, all participants will introduce themselves, the ERADICATING project per se will be briefly outlined, thus its duration, funding scheme, consortium partners, overall objectives and achievements so far. Following, the purpose, focus and objectives of the Living Lab will be briefly explained and a short overview of the agenda will be given. In addition, the participants will be informed about data protection regulations and the strategy for evaluation and validation is explained.

#### 3.3.2 Presentation of the underlying Use Case Scenario

The introduction is directly followed by the presentation of the underlying use case scenario, which represents the foundation and subject for the validation and evaluation activities within the framework of these Living Labs. ERADICATING's D2.1 contains a compilation of various specific use cases, of which a shortened and adapted version has been derived for the purpose of the Living Labs. This Use Case Scenario, specifically designed for these LLs, can be found in Annex I.

It is recommended to proceed as follows:

- (1) The text of the use case scenario should be translated if deemed necessary.
- (2) The text of the use case scenario is printed and handed out to the participants.
- (3) The text of the use case scenario is read aloud together  
and/or
- (4) Will be presented in a specifically prepared Power-Point presentation (or similar).

After reading and/or presenting the use case scenario, participants are given the opportunity to ask questions, which the facilitator answers to the best of his/her ability.

#### 3.3.3 Validation and Evaluation of the ERADICATING Footprint Material

The validation and evaluation follows a holistic mixed-methods approach; accordingly, both qualitative and quantitative survey instruments are used here. Please note: It is of particular importance to take detailed notes during this session.

The validation of the Footprint material will take place as freely, flexibly and in joint discussion of all participants as possible. While the participants were able to review the Footprint material before the start of the Living Lab and now, as described in chapter 3.3.2, also the Use Case Scenario was described, initiated by the moderator/facilitator, the participants will go through the Use Case Scenario together and “tackle” this case utilising the Footprint Material.

Thereupon, without a dedicated and stringent moderation of the discussion for the purpose of validation and evaluation, it is recommended that only the following question will be raised by the moderator/facilitator:

*Table 3 - Opening Question for Validation.*

<b>Question No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
Q1	Reflecting on this use case scenario, to what extent is the application of the ERADICATING Footprint material suitable to improve the management of this case?

Following Q1, participants will be allowed open and free exchange of opinions and engage in discussion. The moderator/facilitator follows these conversations closely while detailed notes are taken. In this first, free session, it is recommended that the moderator/facilitator again raises Q1 specifically for any elements of the Footprint material that may not have been addressed by the participants.

In order to further drive and/or intensify the process of validation beyond the activities of the free session as a result of Q1, the moderator/facilitator can also use the questions provided in the following table. It should be noted, however, that these are also only recommendations, while the questions asked can be determined flexibly and depending on the individual case by the respective moderator/facilitator:

*Table 4 - Additional suggested Questions for Validation.*

<b>Question No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
Q2	To what extent is the application of the ERADICATING Footprint material suitable to improve the identification of potential victims?
Q3	To what extent is the application of the ERADICATING Footprint material suitable to improve protection of victims and provision of support for victims?
Q4	To what extent is the application of the ERADICATING Footprint material suitable to improve interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral cooperation (e.g., between LEAs and NGOs), thus the management of the case?

Q5	To what extent is the application of the ERADICATING Footprint material suitable to improve the investigational process?
Q6	To what extent is the application of the ERADICATING Footprint material suitable to improve international police cooperation (if needed)?
Q7	To what extent is the application of the ERADICATING Footprint material suitable to improve prosecution and court proceedings?

During the second part of this evaluation, in order to provide a further opportunity for participants' evaluation and additional assessment, participants will be given the possibility to complete an evaluation questionnaire towards the end of this session and also, if necessary, at the end of the Living Lab, which will enquire both qualitative and quantitative input. Intentionally, neither names nor the respective organisation/authority are requested here in order to ensure total anonymity and thus prevent the effect of social desirability. Accordingly, this two-fold approach ensures that the maximum potential for information gain is achieved within the framework of this Living Lab. In addition to general demographic information, this evaluation questionnaire will directly enquire to what extent the trainees consider the tools contained in the ERADICATING Footprint material relevant, useful and appropriate to serve their respective purpose, i.e., to improve the management of cases of THB and CSE in various regards. The evaluation will also focus on the difficulties and suggestions for improvement that the participants identified.

A draft of this evaluation questionnaire can be found in Annex II. As mentioned in chapter 3.2.4, this questionnaire may need to be adapted by national partners prior to the LL depending on and according to the individual selection of tools to be validated and evaluated in the national context. Also, national partners may choose to translate the questionnaire in Annex II into their local language (Bulgarian, German, Greek). The national partners will then make their survey available to participants in their national context either in digital form (via the online surveying tool "EUSurvey": <https://ex.europa.eu/eusurvey/home/welcome>), in printed form (see Annex II), or as a Word or PDF file via email (see Annex II)<sup>1</sup>.

### 3.3.4 Discussion: Problems and Solutions Detection

Beyond the validation and evaluation of the Footprint material, the underlying specific use case scenarios and discussions will be used to identify problems and solutions. The moderator/facilitator will ask the participants what problems they have identified during the discussion of the use case. The facilitator will also ask the participants what other/additional problems they encountered in the management of other THB and CSE cases that did not arise in the use case and the associated discussion. All identified problems

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to Chapter 4 for details.





are recorded in writing. In a next step, the participants are encouraged to propose and discuss possible solutions to the problems mentioned. These are also noted in detail in written form.

### 3.3.5 Conclusion / End of the Event

To conclude the LL, the moderator/facilitator will reiterate the main findings, especially with regard to suggestions for improvement and the detected problems and solutions. The participants are also given the opportunity to comment on the findings and, if necessary, to make further, concluding suggestions. Furthermore, the participants are urged to fill in the evaluation questionnaire (see Annex II). Last but not least, the participants are informed about further planned steps in ERADICATING, encouraged to keep track of the progress in the project on social media and the website and to participate in further activities within the project.

## 4 Post-Processing

As described in chapter 1.2, the results of the Living Labs are incorporated into several other activities and deliverables of the project. Accordingly, a targeted and detailed post-processing of the LLs is necessary.

Deliverable 3.4 “Report on the Solution mapping and evaluations” will include the results of the evaluation and the solutions mapping, both as a result of the Living Labs. Consortium partner responsible for D3.4, GGMH, instructs in detail in the following section what information is to be provided and in what form: However, prior to the detailed information, the following is recommended:

- In principle, work steps in the implementation of the Living Labs must be precisely documented.
- Time, location, number of participants and background of the participants must be recorded.
- The signed consent forms must be stored locally.
- Precise documentation of statements, opinions discussions around validation/evaluation and detection of problems and solutions must be ensured.

**Consortium partners must adhere to the following THREE detailed steps:**

### **EVALUATION AND VALIDATION**

#### **(1) Conduct survey among Living Lab participants: Material evaluation questionnaire (Annex II)**

The consortium partners are responsible for providing the Living Lab participants with the survey prepared by GGMH. It is important that partners actively encourage their participants to complete the survey in order to achieve the highest possible response rate. Consortium partners can use a variety of strategies to do this, however, GGMH strongly suggests advertising the survey and reserving specific time slots for it, during the Living Lab itself. This is to ensure that the survey results are meaningful and representative.

It is at the discretion of the consortium partners what form the survey takes. The survey can be conducted in digital form via an online link (provided by GGMH), as a print version (see Annex II), or as a Word or PDF document via email (see Annex II).

**(2) Filling in the “Template for the analysis of survey results regarding the evaluation and validation of the Footprint material” (Annex III)**

After completion of the survey, the results must be transferred to the "Template for the analysis of survey results regarding the evaluation and validation of the Footprint material". The filled-out template is to be submitted to GGMH in English within a maximum of three weeks after the Living Lab has been conducted. It is important to keep this timeframe to ensure that the results can be analysed in a timely manner. GGMH will then be responsible for coding and analysing the data provided by all national partners.

Based on the results, GGMH will develop Deliverable D3.4 "Report on the Solution mapping and evaluations from the LLs".

## **SOLUTION MAPPING**

**(3) Completing the "Problem Identification and Proposed Solutions" template form (Annex IV)**

Consortium partners are encouraged to use the template created by GGMH (Appendix IV) to document (in English) the problems and solution mappings developed in the Living Lab. By using the standardized format, the results can be better compared and analysed and common solution approaches can be better identified.

The template is composed of Part I and Part II.

In Part I, the identified problems as well as possible solution approaches are to be presented in a short and concise form in a tabular overview. This overview will form the basis for the creation of the "factsheets per country" (D3.5), which will be publicly accessible and available in English, German, Bulgarian and Greek.

In Part II of the template, partners are asked to provide a more detailed description of the contributions provided by the participants of the LLs. This detailed documentation should contain further valuable information relevant to the "Report on Solution Mapping from the LLs" (first part of D3.4, confidential).

## References

Almirall, E., Lee, M., & Wareham, J. 2012. Mapping Living Labs in the Landscape of Innovation Methodologies. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 2(9): 12-18. Retrieved from: <http://doi.org/10.22215/timreview/603>.

Bergvall-Kåreborn, B. / Eriksson, C. / Ståhlbröst, A. / Svensson, J. (2009). *A Milieu for Innovation – Defining Living Labs*. Retrieved from: <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1004774/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.

Følstad, A. (2008). Living Labs for Innovation and Development of Information and Communication Technology: A Literature Review. *The Electronic Journal for Virtual Organizations and Networks*, 10: 99-131. Retrieved from: [https://sintef.brage.unit.no/sintef-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2440026/eJOV10\\_Folstad\\_ICTLiving%2bLabs%2breview.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y](https://sintef.brage.unit.no/sintef-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2440026/eJOV10_Folstad_ICTLiving%2bLabs%2breview.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y).

## Annex I: Specific Use Case Scenario for LLs

The following use case scenario is based on real-life cases of human trafficking and sexual exploitation in Greece, however, is adapted to a certain extent in order to best serve the purpose of this Living Lab, the validation and evaluation of the ERADICATING Footprint material.

The victims are three young women from Bulgaria. At the time of the initial contact with the police, the age of only one of these women was known, she was 17 years old. In at least one of the other cases, it was suspected that the victim might be a child.

In Bulgaria, all of these three women faced various vulnerabilities such as low education, poor living conditions, and domestic issues. The recruitment process begins when recruiters, following orders from the head of an Organised Crime Group (OCG), approach and recruit the victims using false promises, including the "loverboy" method, and take advantage of their vulnerability. The victims see this as an opportunity to escape their misery, fall in love with the recruiters, and agree to travel to Greece.

Once in Greece, the victims are delivered to other members of the OCG, acting as the guardians, and are kept under their control through physical violence, psychological suppression, and exploitation of their vulnerability. The guardians, in close contact with the client's recruiter, advertise the victims' services by taking nude pictures and uploading them to specific websites. Clients then call operators to order services from the victims, and the operators, in coordination with the guardians and drivers, arrange for the victims to be delivered to the clients. The victims are paid by the clients, but forced to hand over all the money to the driver, who then delivers it to the head of the OCG. The sexual exploitation takes place at clients' places and brothels, and the lack of awareness among clients about human trafficking makes them accept services without suspicion. Moreover, as the investigation indicates later, at least one of the victims had to work shifts in hospitality, while labour regulations were not complied with, and the victim was not paid or at least under-paid. In addition, the investigation raised suspicions that at least one of the victims was forced to sell drugs to clients. The profits from this also had to be handed over in full to the members of the OCG.

The investigation in this case starts with one of the victims herself, who learns about dedicated police units dealing with human trafficking through a TV program and approaches a patrolling police car for help.

Based on the victim's statements, the Anti-trafficking Police Unit has reasonable grounds for initiating a detailed investigation. The investigation involves identifying and apprehending the various members of the OCG and further victims, collecting further evidence, and building a strong case for prosecution. Challenges include the international linkages of organised crime around human trafficking, lack of awareness



among victims and clients, and the need for specialized training for law enforcement officers to recognize indicators of human trafficking and effectively engage with victims. However, the investigational process turns out to be particularly complicated, as the victims are either not at all or only to a limited extent willing and/or able to testify, which has a significant negative impact on the further investigation and especially on the prosecution.

## Annex II: Material Evaluation Questionnaire

*The national partners will then make their survey available to participants in their national context either in digital form (via the online surveying tool "EUSurvey": <https://ex.europa.eu/eusurvey/home/welcome>), in printed form, or as a Word or PDF file via email.*

Dear participants, welcome to our survey!

With your help, we would like to evaluate and validate our material that was created within the framework of our EU project ERADICATING in order to better tailor it to the needs of relevant stakeholders involved in combatting trafficking in human beings. It is our aim to support the process of improving prevention and identification mechanisms as well as law enforcement on a national level.

We therefore kindly ask you to take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire and provide us with your assessment of the ERADICATING Footprint material we previously presented to you.

We look forward to receiving your responses and suggestions.

Your anonymous responses will be stored confidentially as part of the ERADICATING consortium's ERADICATING project documentation. Data processing will comply with the General Data Protection Regulation (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj>).

(1) **Country:** \_\_\_\_\_

(2) **Type of your professional group / organization / authority**

- Law Enforcement Agencies
- Prosecution Offices
- Border Guards
- Labour Inspectorates
- Non-Governmental Organisations
- Social Service Providers
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Please rate the following statements from your perspective:**

(3) **The material of the "Eradicating Footprint" is well-structured.**

Completely Agree / Mostly Agree / Slightly Agree / Slightly Disagree / Mostly Disagree / Completely Disagree

**In case of disagreement:**

- The following should be improved: \_\_\_\_\_



(4) **The material of the "Eradicating Footprint" is comprehensive and correct.**  
Completely Agree / Mostly Agree / Slightly Agree / Slightly Disagree / Mostly Disagree / Completely Disagree

**In case of disagreement:**

The following should be added/corrected: \_\_\_\_\_

(5) **The material of the "Eradicating Footprint" is useful/helpful.**  
Completely Agree / Mostly Agree / Slightly Agree / Slightly Disagree / Mostly Disagree / Completely Disagree

**In case of agreement, please specify for which target group you consider it useful/helpful:**

- Law Enforcement Agencies
- Prosecution Offices
- Border Guards
- Labour Inspectorates
- Non Governmental Organisations
- Social Service Providers
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

(6) **The material of the "Eradicating Footprint" could be used in my organization/agency in training and practice.**  
Completely Agree / Mostly Agree / Slightly Agree / Slightly Disagree / Mostly Disagree / Completely Disagree

**In case of agreement:**

We/I would be interested in using it for: \_\_\_\_\_

(7) **What are the strengths and weaknesses of the material? What should be considered for improvement?**

---

---



**We greatly appreciate your participation in our survey. Thank you very much!**

## Annex III: Template for the Analysis of Survey Results Regarding the Evaluation and Validation of the Footprint Material

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

### a) Evaluation of question 2

How many survey participants per professional group / organization / authority:

Law Enforcement Agencies: \_\_\_\_\_ persons  
 Prosecution Offices: \_\_\_\_\_ persons  
 Border Guards: \_\_\_\_\_ persons  
 Labour Inspectorates: \_\_\_\_\_ persons  
 Non-Governmental Organisations: \_\_\_\_\_ persons  
 Social Service Providers: \_\_\_\_\_ persons  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_ persons. **If applicable, please list:** \_\_\_\_\_

### b) Evaluation of question 3 - 6 (Likert scale)

Number consecutively	Please enter the professional group to which the participant has assigned	Please fill in the answers chosen by the participants in the survey: Completely Agree / Mostly Agree / Slightly Agree / Slightly Disagree / Mostly Disagree / Completely Disagree			
Consecutive number	Group affiliation of the respondent: Professional Group / Organization / Authority	Answer question 3 (Well Structured)	Answer question 4 (Comprehensive & Correct)	Answer question 5 (Useful & Helpful)	Answer question 6 (Useful at my place)
e.g. (1)	e.g. Public Prosecutor's Office	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Completely Disagree
e.g. (2)	e.g. Social service provider	Completely Agree	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Agree
1					

2					
3					
...					

**c) Evaluation of question 3 in case of existing answers**

(Well structured: The following should be improved)

Consecutive number	Group affiliation of the respondent: Professional Group / Organization / Authority	Answer (free text)
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
...		

**d) Evaluation of question 4 in case of existing answers**

(Comprehensive & Correct: The following should be added/corrected)

Consecutive number	Group affiliation of the respondent: Professional Group / Organization / Authority	Answer (free text)
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
...		

**e) Evaluation of question 5 in case of existing answers**

(Useful/Helpful for professional group / organization / authority)

Law Enforcement Agencies: \_\_\_\_\_ persons  
 Prosecution Offices: \_\_\_\_\_ persons  
 Border Guards: \_\_\_\_\_ persons  
 Labour Inspectorates: \_\_\_\_\_ persons

Non-Governmental Organisations: \_\_\_\_\_ persons  
 Social Service Providers: \_\_\_\_\_ persons  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_ persons. **If applicable,**  
**please list:** \_\_\_\_\_

**f) Evaluation of question 6 in case of existing answers**

(Useful at my place: Interested in using it for)

Consecutive number	Group affiliation of the respondent: Professional Group / Organization / Authority	Answer (free text)
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
...		

**g) Evaluation question 7 in case of existing answers**

Consecutive number	Group affiliation of the respondent: Professional Group / Organization / Authority	Answer (free text)
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
...		

## Annex IV: Template for the “Problems Detection and Solutions Suggestion”

**Country:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date and location of the Living Lab:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Number of participants:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Professional groups represented:**

- Law Enforcement Agencies, Number of persons: \_\_\_\_\_
- Prosecution Offices, Number of persons \_\_\_\_\_
- Border Guards, Number of persons \_\_\_\_\_
- Labour Inspectorates, Number of persons \_\_\_\_\_
- Non-Governmental Organisations, Number of persons \_\_\_\_\_
- Social Service Providers, Number of persons \_\_\_\_\_
- Other, Number of other persons \_\_\_\_\_ and what kind of:  
\_\_\_\_\_

**How this template is structured:**

Part I forms the basis for the creation of Deliverable 3.5 "Factsheets per country". These factsheets will be publicly available in English, German, Bulgarian and Greek.

Part II is intended to provide further valuable information for the "Report on the Solution Mapping from the LLs" part of the confidential Deliverable 3.4.

## Part I - Summary

To insert additional focal areas, copy the table as many times as necessary.

Please ensure that the numbering is correct and consecutive so that information from Part I and Part II can be merged!

A) Focal Areas: Identification, Investigational process, Prosecution and Court Proceeding			
No.	Problems detection (main challenges, specific gaps, specific needs for improvement).	Solutions suggestion	Ideas on how this could be initiated very specifically (who, what, when, how, where).
	<i>e.g. Lack of specialisation in the area of criminal prosecution</i>	<i>e.g. Training is certainly helpful and desirable here, but it is more important to create special responsibilities.</i>	
	<i>e.g. Witnesses often do not testify or do not testify truthfully. A reliable statement by a victim of forced prostitution in the courtroom in the presence of the accused is regularly not to be expected.</i>	<i>e.g. Victim compensation. Necessary to <b>make video interviews mandatory</b> for all victim witnesses of human trafficking and forced prostitution. So far, such an obligation only applies to sexual offences (cf. §§ 58a, 255a StPO).</i>	
A (1)			
A (2)			
...	<i>Extend by as many rows as desired</i>		

**B) Focal Areas: Protection (From initial contact to after the end of the court case) and Support (Legal, Psychological) for Victims**

No.	Problems detection (main challenges, specific gaps, specific needs for improvement).	Solutions suggestion	Ideas on how this could be initiated very specifically (who, what, when, how, where).
B (1)			
B (2)			
B (3)			
B (4)			
...	<i>Extend by as many rows as desired</i>		

Focal Areas: <b>Interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral Cooperation (national and international)</b>			
No.	Problems detection (main challenges, specific gaps, specific needs for improvement).	Solutions suggestion	Ideas on how this could be initiated very specifically (who, what, when, how, where).
C (1)			
C (2)			
C (3)			
C (4)			
...	<i>Extend by as many rows as desired</i>		

## Part II - More detailed notes

*! At this point, please explain in more detail the lines you inserted above (following the appropriate numbering)*

**It must be ensured that the numbering is identical to Part I**

No.	More detailed information e.g. who named this problem or how was the solution developed? Has it been confirmed by several people?
e.g. A (1)	
...	
...	
...	<i>Extend by as many rows as desired</i>