

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Strasbourg, 14 February 2014

GEC (2013) 10 rev1

**GENDER EQUALITY COMMISSION
(GEC)**

Analytical Study of the Results of the Fourth Round of Monitoring
the Implementation of Recommendation Rec(2002)5
on the Protection of Women against Violence in
Council of Europe member states

Prepared by Prof i.R.Dr Carol Hagemann-White

Contents

Introduction 4

National Policy: Overall indicators of progress 6

Punishment..... 14

Protection 21

Provision 23

Prevention 35

Data Collection 41

Conclusions 46

Appendix..... 50

INTRODUCTION

This is the fourth report on implementation of *Recommendation Rec(2002)5 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the protection of women against violence*, presenting the results for 2013, as well as a comparative analysis of developments since the setting up of a monitoring framework in 2005. The regular reporting aims to present a numerical overview of progress based on cross-nationally comparable measures in the areas of legislation and policies to prevent and combat violence against women, support services and protection for women who suffer violence, programmes for perpetrators, prevention efforts through public awareness and media, education and training, and in the area of data collection and research.¹

The Recommendation is now being superseded by the legally-binding *Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention)*, which was opened for signature in Istanbul in May 2011, and will enter into force following ten ratifications. The findings from the first three rounds of monitoring the implementation of Rec(2002)5 informed the drafting of the Istanbul Convention, which includes many of the measures the Recommendation had called for.

After its entry into force, the implementation of the Istanbul Convention by States Parties will be monitored by a group of independent experts (GREVIO). The fourth round of monitoring Rec(2002)5 aims to provide this new process with an initial overview of the situation in all Council of Europe member states. With this objective in mind, for the fourth round, the indicators initially chosen for monitoring the implementation of the Recommendation were revised to correspond better with the requirements of the Istanbul Convention. The questionnaire was brought in line with concepts and terminology used in the Convention, while carefully ensuring its comparability with the previous rounds of monitoring. The revision of the questionnaire also took into account earlier reports, as well as the experience and findings within campaigns, projects and seminars for exchange of good practice, which had shown that some questions needed to be more precise to capture the different ways in which violence against women can be addressed. Furthermore, some questions had proven difficult to answer because the categories offered did not always apply to all of the diverse legal and institutional structures across Europe.

The revised questionnaire was adopted by the Steering Committee on Gender Equality of the Council of Europe (CDEG) at its 47th meeting (30 November – 2 December 2011). For the previous three rounds, the monitoring framework comprised 20 questions in seven areas:

- I. General indicators,
- II. Legislation and judicial procedures,
- III. Specialist support and protection for victims,
- IV. Programmes for perpetrators,
- V. Public awareness and the media,
- VI. Education and training,
- VII. Data collection and research.

¹ The findings from the previous rounds of monitoring Recommendation Rec(2002)5 have been published in the following reports: *Analytical study of the results of the third round of monitoring the implementation of Recommendation Rec(2002)5*, Council of Europe, 2010; *Analytical study of the results of the second round of monitoring the implementation of Recommendation Rec(2002)5*, Council of Europe, 2008, and *Analytical study on the effective implementation of Recommendation Rec(2002)5 on the protection of women against violence in Council of Europe member states*, Council of Europe, 2007. A stocktaking study had been published in preparation for monitoring Recommendation Rec(2002)5: *Combating violence against women: Stocktaking study on the measures and actions taken in Council of Europe member states*, Council of Europe, 2006. All reports can be accessed on the dedicated site of the Council of Europe Istanbul Convention: www.coe.int/conventionviolence (last accessed February 2014).

For the fourth round, the questionnaire was structured in the same seven areas, but three new questions were added and a few additional possibilities for replies included. An online version of the questionnaire was made available to members of the Gender Equality Commission and National Focal Points to complete between April and June 2013.

In addition to the replies received from the member states, the analysis of the results was supplemented by three recent mapping exercises: the EU 2010 “Feasibility study to assess the possibilities, opportunities and needs to standardise national legislation on violence against women, violence against children and sexual orientation violence” (hereinafter EU 2012 Feasibility Study),² the review of the implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action delivered in 2012 by the European Institute for Gender Equality (hereinafter EIGE 2012)³, and the Women against Violence Europe Country Report 2012 (hereinafter WAVE Country Report 2012), which used the EIGE 2012 data, while extending coverage to most of the Council of Europe member states⁴. Additional published research, especially evaluation studies or comparative studies, also proved useful for interpreting the monitoring data.

Although signature and ratification of the Istanbul Convention is necessarily a long process, since many member states need to examine their existing legal and institutional frameworks and consider bringing them into line with the Convention requirements (indeed, this is mentioned in the comments several times), an overall sense of a common direction is reflected in the fact that this round of monitoring received the highest number of responses to date: 46 out of the 47 member states supplied the information requested in time for this analytical report⁵. Furthermore, the option of adding comments was frequently used, and over a third of the respondents appended original documents such as a National Action Plan (NAP) or policy document, relevant law, regulation or directive. The comments and additional material also indicate that the EEA/Norway Grants programmes⁶ are helping some states, especially in Southern, Central and Eastern Europe, to take significant steps toward a systematic response to violence against women despite financial pressures in a period of austerity.

The present report focusses on assessing overall progress since the monitoring began in 2005, and on constructing as far as possible a baseline from which future implementation of the Convention can be evaluated. Identifying innovations or examples of good practice is not a main focus, especially since much of that has been done in recent years in studies, reports, comparative projects and conferences.

² European Union, 2010: *Feasibility study to assess the possibilities, opportunities and needs to standardise national legislation on violence against women, violence against children and sexual orientation violence*: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/funding/daphne3/daphne_feasibility_study_2010_en.pdf (last accessed October 2013).

³ EIGE (European Institute for Gender Equality) 2012: *Review of the Implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action in the EU Member States: Violence against Women – Victim Support*: <http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/Violence-against-Women-Victim-Support-Report.pdf> (last accessed October 2013).

⁴ WAVE 2012: *Country report. Reality check on data collection and European services for women and children survivors of violence. A right for protection and support?* (Vienna, March 2013): http://www.wave-network.org/sites/default/files/02%20WAVE%20COUNTRY%20REPORT%202012_0.pdf (last accessed February 2014).

⁵ The Russian Federation did not provide information.

⁶ The EEA financial mechanism contributes to the reduction of economic and social disparities in the European Economic Area and to strengthening the bilateral relations between the EEA EFTA States – Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway – and the Beneficiary States.

NATIONAL POLICY: Overall indicators of progress

At the outset of the monitoring process, three general indicators of progress were agreed:

1. *Establishment and publication of a National Action Plan (NAP) addressing (all forms of) violence against women;*
2. *Existence of a governmental co-ordinating body for implementation and evaluation;*
3. *Allocation of specific funds for activities to combat and prevent violence against women.*⁷

Revision of the monitoring questionnaire took account of two strategic developments.

First, the Istanbul Convention addresses violence against women and domestic violence as separate but interrelated issues; thus, the questionnaire was adapted to include both concepts.

Second, diverse approaches to developing national policies on violence against women were being pursued that had not been fully captured by the general idea of a NAP. It was found that preference was sometimes given to the concept of a “National Strategy”, while the comprehensive national policy could be laid out in one or several action plans or strategies each with a specific focus. Member states also revealed patterns of policies that locate violence against women in a general framework such as gender equality, health, crime prevention, family policies or child protection.

For this round of monitoring, member states were no longer asked “*Have you established a National Action Plan*”, but whether they have “*established a comprehensive and co-ordinated policy addressing all forms of violence covered by the Istanbul Convention and offering a holistic response to violence against women*” (see Table 1 in the Appendix). While the “yes” answers to the earlier question had been growing steadily, reaching 34 in 2010, in 2013 only 23 member states confirmed having a **comprehensive and holistic policy** addressing all forms of violence covered by the Istanbul Convention. Out of these 23 member states, 21 said that the comprehensive policy had been laid out in one overarching NAP or national strategy, while the remaining two - Lithuania and Slovenia - said a comprehensive strategy was implemented in several interrelated action plans or strategies⁸. Iceland commented that a NAP has just ended and a new one that addresses the Istanbul Convention is almost ready. “The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” did not confirm a comprehensive policy, but did confirm that national policy has been laid out in several interrelated action plans, thus bringing the total number of member states with a comprehensive policy to a probable 25. An additional 21 states, not confirming a comprehensive and holistic policy, do report that they have NAP or strategies for some of the forms of violence covered by the Istanbul Convention, specifically citing one or more of the areas asked about in the questionnaire.

Thus, all 46 member states participating in this round of monitoring report having national strategies or action plans addressing all or some forms of violence covered by the Istanbul Convention, although these national policies may not (and some do not) recognise that the forms of violence they cover are related to gender inequality.

⁷ *Combating Violence Against Women Stocktaking study on the measures and actions taken in Council of Europe member States*. Council of Europe, 2006, pp. 28-29.

⁸ 12 member states reply yes to both: the comprehensive strategy is laid out in a NAP, and it is implemented by way of several interrelated action plans. This can mean that there is an NAP on domestic violence and another on gender equality which together deal with a wide range of forms of violence, or it can simply mean that there has been a series of NAPs.

From the additional information sent by member states, it appears that a national policy is sometimes articulated within the framework of a NAP on gender equality or of securing human rights. 14 member states cite a NAP on gender equality as part of their policy approach; the sections on violence against women in such NAP seem to vary greatly in the level of elaboration and extent of specific measures foreseen. From the replies to Question 1 and the comments and attachments, 12 member states could be identified whose current national policy explicitly addresses violence against women generally and elaborates an action plan or strategy. In the other 13 states that report having a comprehensive policy, it appears that there are different paths to implementation. For some the approach might be described as “family plus”, that is, there are action plans/strategies that cover domestic violence but also deal with some other issues, such as sexual harassment, genital mutilation, or rape. In others, the action plan on gender equality (or, in a few cases, general action plans on human rights or reducing violence) is the framework for measures on violence against women. This is sometimes complemented by a specific plan addressing domestic violence.

Since women are disproportionately affected by all the forms of violence named in Rec(2002)5 and in the Istanbul Convention, they profit to some extent from any policies and measures that provide redress or protection, but these may not adequately meet their needs. When national policies do not explicitly refer to violence against women, such general measures will not contribute to eliminating gender-based violence as a form of discrimination. Article 6 of the Istanbul Convention provides that Parties shall include a gender perspective in the implementation and evaluation of impact; in consequence, general policies, e.g. on domestic violence, require a gender impact assessment. Future monitoring will thus be justified in asking for evidence that gender-neutral legislation or policy is implemented with a gender perspective.

A different angle on national policy was provided by Question 2, “*Do national plans or strategies address both domestic violence (as defined in Article 3 (b) of the Istanbul Convention) and the forms of violence against women?*” 35 member states answered yes. An affirmative answer did not require policy measures on *all* forms of violence against women, as Question 1 did. Rather, Question 2 asks whether violence against women and domestic violence are each explicitly recognized as such in policy. A “no” may mean that policy measures centre on domestic or family violence only (this seems to be the case in five member states), but may also mean that national strategy focuses on violence against women, and not separately on domestic violence.

Question 2b then asks, for each of the nine forms of violence against women covered by Rec(2002)5, whether these are addressed in national policy. All member states except Austria (which does not yet have, but is developing a NAP) supplied information. All 45 states have a national policy on violence within the family or domestic unit, and for five states (Armenia, Bulgaria, Estonia, Luxembourg and Turkey) this is the only aspect of violence against women that they address. It is evidently quite possible to declare that there is a national strategy towards both violence against women and domestic violence, and then report that existing action plans only include measures against domestic violence. When a total of two of the nine forms are addressed in national policy, the second form is violence in institutional environments (Czech Republic) or sexual harassment (Iceland). With three forms of violence addressed (as in Cyprus and Poland) sexual assault and rape appear alongside sexual harassment as a topic of national policy concern.


The limited numbers of forms of violence addressed in many member states, despite a general confirmation that “both domestic violence and the forms of violence against women defined in Rec(2002)5” are included in national policy, suggest that the member state is aware of the issues in general and steps have been taken to address other forms of violence against women besides domestic violence (such as specific penalisation or supporting NGOs that work on sexual violence), but at present, practical efforts (documented in plans of action or strategy papers) focus on domestic or family violence as a priority concern. One reason for this might lie in the particular need for multi-agency and cross-sectoral co-operation in measures against domestic violence. More generally, “national policy” has multiple levels. It is one thing to declare a commitment to end all violence against women, and quite another to devise and pursue specific measures for each and every form of violence against women in Rec(2002)5. After all, there are issues of priorities and resources here, as well as issues of awareness level in the public and political sphere.

There are advantages and drawbacks to thematically restricted NAP. On the one hand, differentiating policy plans to target specific forms of violence can bring neglected or pressing issues into focus, and can promote the process of change. On the other hand, if these partial and specific plans are not tied in to an overarching policy that takes account of the interconnections among the various forms of violence, they can obscure the structural foundations of violence against women in gender power relations and its character as a form of discrimination, thus weakening the human rights basis for a holistic approach.

Thus, the key question is how gender-based violence against women is being understood and dealt with in the Council of Europe member states. A possible indicator for this is the degree to which national policies, strategies or action plans are comprehensive in the sense of dealing with, and recognising connections among the various forms that such violence takes. Figure 1 suggests that comprehensiveness of national policies – that is, the number of forms of violence that are now targeted by national policy in some way – has been increasing.

Policies that take only three or fewer forms of violence into their area of concern are becoming much less frequent. There has been a very strong increase in the number of policies that address four to six forms of violence, and the group of policies with seven to nine forms on violence in their purview has also nearly doubled in size (from six to 11). There are now four member states (Andorra, Denmark, Germany and Norway) that have given policy consideration and have planned to take action with regard to all nine forms of violence in the Recommendation.

Figure 1: Number of forms of violence against women addressed in national policy 2005-2013




Several changes from previous monitoring rounds are worth noting. There has been a steady increase in concern for sexual violence, but especially for sexual harassment: Where in 2010 only 21 of the 35 reported NAP took this on board, it can now be seen that 35 out of 45⁹ national policies do so, almost as many as the number concerned with rape and sexual assault. A second major change has been the concern about female genital mutilation or cutting. Where in the past only ten member states saw this as an issue for them to deal with (respondents often commented that this was not a custom in their country), there are now 17 member states that have a policy, and the comments indicate a growing sense that Europe as a whole needs to confront this problem.

The increase in concern about violence in institutional environments is perhaps not surprising, given the revelations of recent years about abuse in residential institutions, but the doubled number of member states with policies on failure to respect women's freedom of choice in regard to reproduction is interesting.

⁹ Without Austria, which is currently developing its first NAP

Figure 2. Forms of violence specifically addressed in national policy 2005-2013



While concern about killings in the name of honour has not spread to more member states – in many these seem still to be understood as a problem of specific immigrating groups – forced and early marriage has moved significantly into the foreground (from 11 in 2005 to 21 states in 2013 having a policy addressing this problem). Nonetheless, Figure 2 also shows that, despite increases, less than half of the reporting member states have a national policy regarding female genital mutilation, forced marriages, violence in conflict and post-conflict situations, killings in the name of honour or failure to respect choice with regard to reproduction. In the comments, six member states explain that the forms of violence missing in their policy are not considered relevant or a priority, or do not exist in that country, while a further four merely refer to existing general law, noting that forced marriage could be prosecuted, or that freedom of choice concerning reproduction is guaranteed by the Constitution.


This situation points to a more serious monitoring problem: the tendency, evidenced in some comments, to cite the existence of provisions in criminal law as evidence of a specific policy. While criminalisation can be one of the measures within a national policy, in itself it does very little to prevent the violent acts from occurring, and even less to protect the victims from harm. Many acts of violence fall under provisions of existing criminal law in most member states. They continue to affect women disproportionately because they have been tolerated or ignored in women's social environments as well as by professionals, and because those responsible for the law and social welfare have often failed to investigate or to intervene, in part because they are insufficiently educated about the problem. To change this state of affairs requires efforts far beyond a paragraph in criminal law or a reference to constitutional rights. The call for "*effective, comprehensive and co-ordinated policies*" recognises that *de*

jure sanctions against the violence rooted in domination and discrimination are inadequate unless measures are taken to make them effective *de facto*.

An important indicator for the political will to prevent and combat violence against women broadly is the establishment of a **governmental co-ordinating body** for implementation of policies and measures to prevent and combat all forms of violence against women. Although the shift from asking about a NAP to asking about national policy limits the comparability of the data, the fact that all but a few member states have established a governmental co-ordinating body for implementation suggests that there is a general trend towards coherent national policy. Therefore, we may conclude that despite the fragmented policy, there is evidence that more and more member states have a comprehensive approach to violence against women.

Based on the 2002 Recommendation, the monitoring framework in the past asked about such a body "for implementation and evaluation". In the Convention, Parties are asked to establish one or more bodies, allowing for the possibility that the monitoring and evaluation might be entrusted to a body that is independent of the one responsible for co-ordination and implementation. Asking about these separately revealed that the function of monitoring and evaluation is more likely to be missing: 39 member states have a co-ordinating body for implementation, but only 30 ensure that monitoring and evaluation will take place. Only two member states have a monitoring body, but neither to co-ordinate implementation; the reverse pattern – implementation but no evaluation – is more frequent (nine member states). Since we do not know what functions the co-ordinating bodies in the past took on, the comparative graph (Figure 3) coded the answer as "yes" when there is a governmental co-ordinating body that has either or both responsibilities; this is the case for 41 of the 46 states reporting. We can see that there has been a steady, although not dramatic increase; the higher number in 2013 as compared to 2010 is mainly due to the member states that had not responded in 2010, although there are several countries that are taking measures to set up a co-ordinating body specifically in order to meet the requirements of the Istanbul Convention (Article 10).

Figure 3: Existence of a governmental co-ordinating body 2005-2013



Further information was offered in comments and attached documents to explain how the implementation of national policy is co-ordinated. There is a great deal of variety in how the responsibilities for implementation, co-ordination, monitoring and evaluation are distributed, with many member states having several different bodies involved. In a number of member states, the primary responsibility lies with the gender equality mechanisms; these are often, but not always located within (or attached to) whatever ministry has these concerns in their portfolio. Their responsibility is likely to include violence against women generally, but as only one of numerous equality-related tasks to be addressed.

Either for gender equality overall, or specifically for co-ordinating policy on violence, there is frequently an inter-ministerial body (council, committee or working group) that also includes stakeholders from civil society (for example, in Armenia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany and Republic of Moldova); such a body may primarily co-ordinate, or may also monitor implementation. In Albania, Cyprus and Malta, the co-ordinating body was established by the law on domestic/family violence, lending it certain independence, although these are advisory bodies in Cyprus and Malta. Where there are specific co-ordinating bodies for a national strategy, their task tends to be defined as preventing and addressing domestic violence (although the NAP on partner violence in Belgium, for example, understands this to include forced marriage, crimes in the name of honour and genital mutilation, while the NAP on domestic violence in Malta also covers sexual violence, sexual harassment, freedom of choice regarding reproduction, and forced and early marriage).

Independent monitoring is not reported very often. In a few states there is a monitoring body independent of the ministry responsible for co-ordinating the national strategy, and Portugal has a general regulation that all NAPs must be externally evaluated; in addition, the Gender Equality Commission of Portugal must prepare and publish reports on implementation of all Plans. This is a promising practice that deserves consideration especially in view of the reporting obligation in Article 6 of the Istanbul Convention. Slovakia has a project supported by EEA/ Norway Grants to establish a "Co-ordinating Methodical Centre for prevention and elimination of violence against women and domestic violence". The project will not only set up the body (inter-ministerial responsibility with stakeholders to act as a board of supervisors), but also develop a co-ordinated system of action with professional management and regional intervention teams, as well as guidelines for provision of services.

Financial commitment to combating violence against women

One of the most difficult tasks of monitoring was to gather data on budget allotments for the fight against violence. There is a widespread expectation among activists, researchers and other observers that budget figures would serve as a major indicator of how states fulfil their obligations to limit and reduce violence against women. As the monitoring process shows, there are many obstacles in the way of using such an indicator. Since in the first round of monitoring, only 17 states were able to give a figure at all, the framework was made more specific, asking separately for the funds used on government activities and the amount of financial support for NGOs. In order to clarify why figures were missing or incomplete, as of 2008, the option was included "*Data not available because of decentralised budgeting*".

Violence against women presents a further challenge, however, in that it is also a cross-sectoral task. Thus, budgetary provisions tend to be documented only when they go to specialised actors or are invested in specialised projects, research and development activities, campaigns or educational material, but cannot be easily tracked when they are mainstreamed. Clarity can also be lacking when important action areas do not have separate budget titles. States often delegate tasks to ministries, agencies, departments or committees to be handled within their general budgets, and the respondents to these questions sometimes expressed their regret that they could not identify what funds were being made available for this work. Given widespread financial restrictions, it can happen that the general budget is not stretched over all tasks equally or adequately.

Although member states seemed overall better able to give information about funds for government activities on the national level – 39 states said that such funds were allocated – there were only eight member states that provided a figure for national funds in both 2010 and 2013. It is sometimes not clear whether the same categories within budgeting were being used each time.

Some states report only the funds dedicated to the work of NGOs, but specific figures are often lacking. Thus, while 39 states reported that funds were made available on the national regional and/or local levels for NGO activities on violence against women, no pattern of development can be followed, because only four member states provided figures in both 2010 and 2013. It is even more difficult to identify what resources are being invested, for example, to improve the intervention of statutory agencies such as the police, public health and social protection. Arriving at reliable figures often requires undertaking more extensive research. Where the distribution of financial responsibilities is more complicated, with different budget subtitles and agencies responsible for activities and varied rules for distributing public funds to NGOs, the most likely result is to receive no declared figure at all.

To conclude, these difficulties form part of the background for the fact that the monitoring data on funds for preventing and combating violence against women are highly variable, inconsistent, probably often not reliable and ultimately not very informative. If budget allocations are to be used in future monitoring, agreements will be needed on what categories of dedicated funds can realistically be applied in all member states.

PUNISHMENT: Legislation and procedures for penalisation, prosecution and sanctions

A central provision of Rec(2002)5 in Paragraph II calls on member states to: “*Recognise that states have an obligation to exercise due diligence to prevent, investigate and punish acts of violence, whether these acts are perpetrated by the state or private persons, and provide protection to victims*”. In the Istanbul Convention, Chapter V on substantive law spells out this duty, and in particular obligates Parties to take the necessary legislative or other measures to ensure that the intentional commitment of each of the forms of violence is criminalised.

Criminalisation, as called for in the Istanbul Convention, does not necessarily mean that the act in question appears as a specific named offence in the Criminal Code. Indeed, almost no member state has instituted a specific offence of “marital rape”, and the political demand over the past decades has been that rape should be considered rape regardless of whether it is committed by a spouse, an acquaintance or a stranger¹⁰. Against the background of what has been a European-wide struggle to reform rape law, the 2013 questionnaire explicitly asked if rape within marriage was criminalised on the same basis as rape outside marriage.

The majority of EU member states have a similar policy approach to domestic violence, as a survey in 2010 found that only ten defined domestic violence as a specific criminal offence.¹¹ Of these, only four defined the offence with reference to an intimate partner relationship, while the others referred to any person with whom there was a family or household relationship¹². The provision in Article 43 of the Convention – “*The offences established in accordance with this Convention shall apply irrespective of the nature of the relationship between victim and perpetrator*” – can be taken to mean that, as with rape, general criminal statutes and regulations for imposing sanctions should ensure that no exceptions will be made due to an intimate or family relationship. Conversely, this implies that specific named offences, for example psychological violence (Article 33: “*intentional conduct of seriously impairing a person’s psychological integrity through coercion and threats*”), if penalised within a relationship, will not meet the standard for criminalisation, unless they are criminal offences in general as well. While all member states have provisions against physical violence, such as assault or causing bodily harm, this may not be the case with threats, and psychological violence has been newly criminalised in some states in connection with laws on domestic or family violence.

Notably, all 46 reporting member states declare that all forms of intentional physical violence irrespective of the nature of the relationship are penalised, as is rape within marriage on the same basis as rape outside marriage. In 44 member states - all but Estonia and Ukraine - all forms of sexual assault against regular or occasional partners are criminalised. The same number of countries (44 member states) report all sexual acts against non-consenting persons are a criminal offence (the exceptions here being Latvia and Ukraine). Psychological violence is now criminalised irrespective of the nature of the relationship in 40 member states (this was the case in 32 states in 2010), and 35 now penalise stalking, with other states having such legislation in preparation. A number of member states report in their comments that they are currently reviewing their criminal codes in the light of the Convention; thus the proportion of specific offences will probably rise.


¹⁰ See for example: Regan, L. & Kelly, L.: *Rape: Still a forgotten issue*. London 2003, where one measure of progress in legislation is whether states have “removed the rape in marriage exemption”, p.13.

¹¹ European Union, 2010, *Feasibility study*, p.62.

¹² EIGE 2012, p.23.

Psychological violence and stalking are now defined clearly in the Istanbul Convention, which asks States Parties to criminalise these forms of violence¹³. Specific criminal provisions may, however, be subject to very restrictive interpretations in the courts. This also applies in no small extent to criminalisation of sexual harassment, for which the EU Directive 2002/73/EC has provided a definition since 2002. Legal systems differ in how they can deal with “course of conduct” offences in which it is typically the series of acts, each of which may in itself not be penalised (such as making a phone call), that causes harm. They also differ in the ways in which the aspects of intent, motive or causality can be included in the definition of the offence. Thus, a variety of legal framings is to be expected, and indeed probably needed, if the relevant laws are to be effective in each member state. With the “yes” answers to the question concerning penalisation it remains to be seen, in future country-based monitoring, what falls under a criminal penalty, and whether these provisions are accepted, understood and implemented by prosecutors and courts.

Figure 4: Forms of violence penalised 2013



¹³ These definitions are narrow and may be regarded as a minimum; the Spanish law on gender violence, for example, has a much broader definition of psychological violence, and United Kingdom law on stalking also has a wider scope than that in the Convention.

In the past, the member states were asked whether every act of violence against women was penalised, followed by asking whether each particular form of violence was penalised. The modified questionnaire took notice of Article 40 of the Istanbul Convention, which requires that sexual harassment (in any context, not only at work) should be subject to criminal or other legal sanction; harassment has very often been prohibited in labour law (shifting, since 2006, more and more to anti-discrimination law)¹⁴ and thus may incur other types of sanctions.

There have been debates on how best to address forms of violence in which a single act does lasting and perhaps irrevocable harm, such as genital mutilation, forced sterilisation or forced marriage, and whether preventive measures might be more effective than criminal sanctions. With this in mind, in order to capture the state of the present legal strategies as a baseline for future monitoring, the member states were asked whether sexual harassment (at work, and in any other environment), female genital mutilation, forced marriage, and performing an abortion or sterilisation without prior and informed consent were specific criminal offences, and/or whether other sanctions are provided for by the law.

For all of these forms of violence except forced sterilisation/abortion, the number of member states citing other remedies or sanctions was higher than the number that defined them as a specific criminal offence. The difference is especially noticeable with respect to sexual harassment, either at work or elsewhere. This may mean, as the comments from the Netherlands show, that genital mutilation and forced marriage fall under general provisions of the criminal code, so that other **criminal** sanctions are possible, while for sexual harassment, the “other remedies” are usually not located in criminal justice. However, the higher total is also partly due to the fact that many states where these forms of violence are criminalised report that other remedies or sanctions are provided for by law as well. Croatia and Spain confirm both criminal and other sanctions for all five forms of violence where this was asked. While other remedies (often in labour law) are to be expected in view of EU law with regard to sexual harassment at work (confirmed by 34 member states), 30% of the member states indicate that both criminal sanctions and other sanctions apply to non-consensual abortion or sterilisation. This dual response is less frequent for sexual harassment outside of work, female genital mutilation, and forced marriage (for each of these, seven member states confirm that both types of sanctions apply); here the dominant approach seems to be either criminal sanctions or other sanctions.). No legal sanctions at all are reported by four member states for sexual harassment (either at work or in any other environment¹⁵), by ten states for genital mutilation, by nine member states for forced marriage and for four member states for non-consensual abortion/sterilisation (however, in Luxembourg this applies only to abortion, and in the United Kingdom medical reasons may permit either).

With very few exceptions, there is no general pattern of missing sanctions to be seen. Only one state (Armenia) has no legal sanctions for any of these forms of violence, while Azerbaijan and Georgia have sanctions only for forced marriage. But for the most part, the states that have not established penalties for one of these forms of violence are not the same ones in which another form of violence does not (yet) encounter sanctions. The picture is rather one of general progress towards sanctions, but different priorities in the process.

Either as an alternative to specific criminalisation, or as a flanking measure, the Istanbul Convention obligates Parties to ensure that certain **aggravating circumstances** may be taken into consideration in sentencing. The questionnaire selected four of these circumstances as important indicators. The responses show that the great majority of member states (between 36 and 40) provide that repeated violence, violence against a vulnerable person and offences committed against or in the presence of a child can be

¹⁴ European Union, 2010, *Feasibility study*, p. 58-59.

¹⁵ Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Luxembourg report no penalties or remedies for sexual harassment in both cases, while all other member states report either criminal sanctions or other remedies for both kinds of sexual harassment, at work and elsewhere (for example, on the street or via telecommunication and media).

considered aggravating circumstances in sentencing. Only two thirds of the member states, however, have a legal provision allowing a higher sentence when the acts were committed against a former or current spouse or partner. This is possibly the most controversial of the proposed aggravating circumstances, since it could position victims of the same offence by someone not a partner (perhaps a rejected would-be partner) as suffering less serious harm. Eight member states recognize the other three aggravating circumstances, but not the intimate relationship.

Because of the diversity of legal systems, it is very difficult to form an accurate picture of how aggravating circumstances are regulated. There can be a blanket provision stating that certain offences, if committed against an (ex-) partner or spouse, should always be considered aggravated (France), but this does not cover the range of circumstances in the Istanbul Convention. The aggravated case can be a distinct named offence, as is child abuse in many states, or abuse of a position of trust in German law, or maltreatment of a family member in Italian law. It can be included in the description of a general offence as a circumstance calling for a higher penalty, as is not infrequently the case in rape law, for example when two or more perpetrators commit rape together. There are also provisions in the criminal code, in criminal procedural law, or sentencing guidelines in legal systems that permit these, where the general conditions for a higher sentence, such as acting with a particularly high degree of recklessness or brutality, may be defined as aggravating circumstances for any offence. Quite possibly the provisions to “ensure” that the various circumstances in Article 46 of the Convention “*may be taken into consideration as aggravating circumstances*” will be anchored in different parts of the legal framework dealing with crimes against the person. The main effect of implementing this Article might be to ensure that evidence of the circumstances in question must be taken when investigating and prosecuting a case. The results from this first attempt to survey existing provisions can thus only offer a first orientation.

All 46 member states gave a “yes” response to at least one aspect of aggravating circumstances. In the questionnaire, member states were also given the option of saying that there is no general provision, but that the circumstances in question are usually constitutive elements of the relevant offences. Three member states (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Switzerland) replied “no” to each one of the specific circumstances named, but “yes” to this option. Five other countries (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Malta, Norway and Portugal) had at least one “no” answer to specified aggravating aspects, but used this option to indicate that the aggravating circumstances did find recognition in the Criminal Code as gradations of severity. In four member states, one or two of the specific aggravated circumstances were confirmed without using this additional option.

A total of 26 member states confirmed that each of the circumstances named in the questionnaire are legally regarded as aggravating. Of these, eight also confirmed that these are usually constitutive elements of the relevant offences. Twelve states confirm that three of the four circumstances define aggravated cases. Without examining the criminal and procedural law of each country, it is not possible to decide whether these response patterns actually describe differences or reflect different decisions about how best to give a “yes” or “no” answer.

Prosecution

Penalisation in law may not mean sanctions in practice. Most gender-based violence against women is committed by men who are known to them as partners, family members, co-workers, neighbours or acquaintances. This makes it both risky and emotionally difficult for the victims to pursue sanctions. Thus, the reality of sanctions and their possible dissuasive effect very much depends on whether the responsible statutory agencies have both the power and the will to **initiate prosecution** when there is evidence of a crime.

The most recent systematic review of legislation and its implementation in the EU (the “feasibility study” in 2010¹⁶) identified five states that require a victim complaint or even private prosecution for violence within the family, and only 19 states in which prosecution of rape is an obligation of the public prosecutor *ex officio*. A further barrier is to be found in legal systems that give the police responsibility for assessing whether a charge should be made, as is the tradition in British common law, and is also the case, for example, in Ukraine. Where this applies, the prosecutor may not even see cases if the police have concluded that no crime was committed, and the above study identified nine EU states in which the police have the power to “no crime” a report.¹⁷ However, the number of member states in which the prosecutor cannot proceed without a request from the injured party seems to be sinking.

In Rec(2002)5, the focus was on whether the public prosecutor has the power to proceed. The Convention is more precise in Article 55, providing that prosecution “shall not be wholly dependent on a report or complaint filed by a victim”. In the present round of monitoring, only Ukraine (for both violence in the family and sexual violence), and Latvia (for sexual violence) report that the prosecutor is generally unable to initiate proceedings *ex officio*. However, the fact that the power to initiate proceedings exists only in more serious cases in eight member states (for violence in the family), and in five states for sexual violence, does suggest that prosecution in many cases may indeed be wholly dependent on a victim’s request.¹⁸ On the other hand, several member states comment that legal changes are underway to ensure, for example, that the public interest in prosecution applies to all cases of sexual violence.


Equally important would be ensuring that the offences covered by the Convention may not be referred to private prosecution, and establishing the principle that there is a public interest in “effective investigation and prosecution” of such offences. Asking whether the public prosecutor “*can initiate criminal proceedings*” fails to uncover the existence of legal provisions permitting or encouraging a decision not to prosecute. The data analysed here do not reveal the current situation in this respect.

¹⁶ European Union, 2010, *Feasibility study*.

¹⁷ European Union, 2010, *Feasibility study*, p. 54.

¹⁸ Bosnia and Herzegovina checked both “in all cases” and “in the more serious cases”; this may depend on the nature of the offence. In the analysis the answer with the wider reach was used.

Figure 5: Prosecutor can initiate proceedings 2007-2013



Overall, it seems that the Council of Europe's process of elaborating and specifying the due diligence obligation to punish perpetrators of violence against women, from the 2006-2008 campaign to the Istanbul Convention, adopted in 2011 and currently being ratified by member states, has lent momentum to legislation and policies that criminalise and prosecute such acts. Nonetheless, the diversity of legal systems and traditions in Europe continues to result in different ways of framing and applying criminal law, including varying decisions on whether to make each form of violence a named criminal offence, and if so, whether the legal definition should refer to gender. Different views prevail on whether criminal prosecution should be pursued in all cases of violence within the family. No information could be gathered on how decisions to prosecute cases are made and when the wishes of the victim enter into the decision; in most of Europe, even where the strict legality principle applies, the public prosecutor is not subject to policy instructions, and prosecution is, in any case, highly dependent on the judgment of police and the quality of their investigation. Thus, these indicators provide only a rough outline of developments. Improved statistics and research will be needed to assess the reality of law enforcement and criminal justice responses.


Mediation

The revised monitoring framework added a question on prohibiting mandatory alternative dispute resolution (ADR) procedures, including mediation and conciliation in all cases of violence against women. Not all member states have institutionalised ADR procedures, or they may exist only as a resource when both Parties to a dispute agree. Thus, the absence of a legal prohibition does not mean that such procedures are or can be mandatory; they may not be foreseen at all.

From the comments it appears that at least some member states replied only with a view to criminal proceedings. A criminal prosecution is not, however, a dispute; the prototypical use of ADR is as an alternative to a civil lawsuit. Nonetheless, victim-offender mediation has become established for criminal cases as well, initially in juvenile justice, but now more widely as a form of restorative justice, primarily in cases of property crimes and minor assaults. The Council of Europe Recommendation R(99)19 supporting **mediation in penal matters** “as a flexible, comprehensive, problem-solving, participatory option complementary or alternative to traditional criminal proceedings” doubtless contributed to a focus on criminal cases; that Recommendation also underlines as its first principle that mediation in penal matters should only take place if the Parties freely consent. The prohibition foreseen in Article 48 of the Istanbul Convention goes further. Since violence against women is a manifestation of unequal power relations, that inequality limits the freedom of consent.

Mandatory mediation or mandatory attempts towards reconciliation play a greater part in proceedings concerning divorce or in civil suits for compensation, and indeed, the Explanatory Report to the Convention refers particularly to **family law**. When there is any history of violence, negotiation on an equal basis is undermined, intimidation is possible and there may be a significant risk of the violence recurring or escalating. Thus, in monitoring the extent to which member states have prohibited mandatory mediation, it will be crucial to include civil cases and family matters. The replies to this question suggest that the process of understanding and applying the principles behind Article 48 is only beginning.

Figure 6: Prohibition of mandatory alternative dispute resolution procedures 2013



PROTECTION: Measures to protect women at risk of further violence

The revised questionnaire specified the measures for protection more clearly than in the past, and following the Convention gave specific consideration to emergency measures in situations of immediate danger (Question 9) and to judicial measures that can be issued *ex parte* (without a hearing, Question 10a) and irrespective of other legal proceedings (Question 10b).

Emergency measures

Where the earlier monitoring framework only asked “*if different types of judicial protection orders were available*”, the present data give a picture of how rapidly protection can be given and (to some extent) what kinds of protection are included. This reflects the developments that have been a focus of discussion in the exchange of good practice. On the one hand, immediate protection has been increasingly recognised as being indispensable for successful prosecution, and on the other, there is a wider awareness that the duty of the state to ensure protection from human rights violations is at stake. 36 member states now have the legal foundation for competent authorities to issue **emergency barring orders**. These answers do not, however, tell us how quickly and by what agency ‘immediate danger’ is identified, nor whether the barring order remains in force until a judicial restraining order can be issued. The EIGE report found only ten EU member states in which the ban could be imposed by the police directly on site, and of these, three had a very short duration¹⁹. In a further ten states, immediate protection measures were available on application to the court or the prosecutor, but it may be very difficult or even impossible for a woman living with the threat of severe violence to seek out these institutions; in some cases she is required to produce evidence sufficient to start prosecution.

Legal systems differ widely in the regulation of the respective powers of police, prosecutors, local authorities and courts. While there is a general recognition that the police need to be able to intervene in emergencies, the power to impose protective measures such as emergency barring orders, that by their nature restrict the liberties of the person deemed to pose a danger or threat of (further) violence, may be limited or require confirmation by a senior officer. Sometimes the police can only issue a barring with power delegated from the prosecutor or from local authorities, who may review the measures; in other states the barring order must be confirmed by an investigative judge or by the court. Even in states where the police cannot issue barring orders at all, there were some replies confirming that an emergency barring order is available.

These varying regulations can all be effective, if the competent authorities are able to respond within a very short time and the police have the power to prevent further violence without any gap in protection until the measure is authorised²⁰. In Austria, the first member state to pioneer this measure, police officers act by their own authority on site and can impose a ban prohibiting return to the residence and any attempt at contact for a period of two weeks. This measure can be challenged in court, of course, but in fact, there have been very few such challenges. The success of the measure depended on a programme of systematic training of all police who attend domestic violence cases²¹.

¹⁹ EIGE 2012, p. 24.

²⁰ A six-country comparative study of Emergency Barring Order (EBO) procedures found that in most states, the police are *de facto* empowered to impose the ban, but in Spain the police power of arrest provides the necessary protection until a court order is issued. See Römken, R, and Sosa, L.: Protection, Prevention and Empowerment: Emergency Barring Intervention for Victims of Intimate Partner Violence, In: Kelly, L., Hagemann-White, C., Römken, R., Meysen, T., Realizing Rights? Mapping content and assessing impact of EU legislation on violence against women and children. London 2011, p. 51-109.

²¹ Good outcomes also seem to depend on the quality of support offered the victim when the order is imposed. EBO have been evaluated by independent researchers in Austria, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands and Switzerland. The evidence points to a reduction in re-offending.

The comments to this question pointed to some of the varying procedural structures. In France, it is the family court judge who can issue an emergency protection order; in Georgia, the police issue the order but it must be approved by the court within 24 hours. In the Netherlands, the mayor has the power to issue a ten-day restraining order, but in practice authorises a police officer to use this power, while in Malta and in Spain, emergency barring orders (Spain: precautionary protection order) are solely in the power of the courts.

Judicial protection

Judicial restraining or protection orders are now available in almost all (44) member states (exceptions: Armenia and Latvia; Latvia is preparing to introduce them in 2014), and in 40 states (not in Andorra, Azerbaijan, Serbia or Ukraine) such orders may include obliging the perpetrator to leave the residence for a set period, giving the victim its exclusive use, usually until a longer term regulation has been issued. In all 44 member states that have them, the breach of a restraining order is subject to criminal or other legal sanctions. Sometimes these are administrative sanctions, as in Georgia and the Republic of Moldova. In the Netherlands, the sanctions for violation of a temporary restraining order depend on the seriousness of the violation; in practice, this is probably true in a number of member states. It also seems likely that, as in the Netherlands or in Germany, the breach of a protection or restraining order may *de facto* only be sanctioned if the protected person reports it and asks for intervention. Fear of retribution or escalating violence may prevent victims from making such a report. Austria tasks the police with pro-active checking to see if the order is being followed, and Spain has developed a sophisticated system of electronic monitoring with rapid response in high-risk cases.

Only 36 member states report that a judicial protection order can be issued *ex parte* when necessary, and in two of these (as well as in four other states) the order is not available in addition to, or irrespective of other legal proceedings. This may mean that judicial protection presupposes that there are criminal proceedings, or that the victim, if married, should be seeking divorce. The impossibility of issuing a protection order *ex parte* in ten member states reporting is a serious deficit. In a number of member states, it can take weeks or months for courts to schedule a hearing. Additionally, perpetrators who believe themselves justified in controlling or disciplining their wives or partners may use delaying tactics. The waiting period for a court hearing gives the perpetrator ample time to threaten, assault, intimidate or otherwise persuade the victim to withdraw her request for a protection order. In comparative research, experts from countries where traditional culture is strong describe pressure also put on the victim by the larger family not to subject the man to the public humiliation of being expelled from his home. Experts from countries in Northern Europe where shared parenting has been a goal of equality policy, report pressure exercised by the relevant agencies to ensure ongoing, even daily contact between the father and the children, undercutting the mother's need for her own safety. In both cases the pressure on the woman to compromise becomes greater, the longer it takes to have a restraining order issued.

Thus, while restraining orders or protection orders have been introduced in a growing number of member states, either as specific measures to stop domestic violence or, where injunctions already existed in general law, by way of adapting the conditions for existing measures to take account of the typical circumstances of violence in close relationships, not a great deal is known about how much rapid protection these orders actually provide. Research suggests that their value depends on how effectively they are enforced, as well as on the successful linkage to prompt and qualified support for the victim during the period of relative safety that they provide.

PROVISION: Specialist services for safety and support

While general services certainly ought to be trained to respond sensitively and appropriately to the needs of victims, they cannot be expected to meet the multiple needs of victims of gender-based violence in an integrated way, as specialist services are tailored to do. Recent surveys in the United Kingdom²² and in Germany²³ covering all available services for domestic violence victims, both general and specialist, found that, by their own assessment, general services overwhelmingly consider that most victims are better served by specialist services. This is probably even more true for victims of sexual assault and rape. A significant body of research also indicates that specialised services with in-depth knowledge of the dynamics of coercive control and the dangers of violence within close relationships are best able to serve most women in seeking to escape a situation of abuse. Thus, the questionnaire asked about “*the availability of specialist services*”.

Shelters/refuges for women escaping domestic violence

The monitoring process since 2005 was designed to cover all forms of violence against women specifically addressed in Rec(2002)5, but not trafficking for sexual exploitation, as this was considered to require, and indeed was receiving, a separate monitoring and assessment process. In the monitoring framework, shelters or refuges were understood to be primarily a safety and support service for escaping the threat of intimate partner or domestic abuse, although women might go there to be safe from stalking or other threats by men known to them. The definition in the monitoring framework is thus:

“*Shelter (or refuge)* means a temporary accommodation for both women with their children and women without children where they are safe from direct threat by the abuser and are offered qualified counselling and practical support, either in-house or by arrangement. To provide safety, a shelter either includes or is linked to crisis services responding to the immediate danger of a violent situation, accessible within a realistic travel time frame and around the clock.”

To have more precise information as a baseline for the monitoring of the Istanbul Convention, in addition to the question on “*the number of existing shelters*”, the member states were also explicitly asked “*how many of these are specifically for victims of trafficking?*” (Question 11). The question on the number of beds followed, and in some responses it was not clear whether the number of beds included those in shelters for trafficked women. In some member states, there are shelters that take in both domestic violence victims and victims of trafficking, although the support needs and the risks they face may differ quite a lot. This may be due to lack of resources for more specialised services, or to relatively small numbers of trafficked women receiving support. In addition, some member states, despite the clear provisions asking for specialist services for women victims of violence, gave figures for multifunctional general accommodations or crisis centres serving different groups. Although this was usually explained in the comments, the numbers given by member states can differ in their frame of reference.

As will be seen below and in Table 11 in the Appendix, there are still great differences among Council of Europe states in the availability of shelters, and these do not merely reflect size and population of the countries. The WAVE Country Report 2012, with data from 46 European states (with three Council of Europe member states missing and Belarus included), provides a regional analysis that shows quite dramatic differences. The vast majority of shelters and shelter places are to be found in the 15 old EU member states, while a far lower level of provision is to be found both in the new EU member states and in the


²² Quilgars, D. and Pleace, N.: *Meeting the needs of households at risk of domestic violence in England. The role of accommodation and housing-related support services*. London: Department for Communities and Local Government 2010

²³ Helfferich, C., Kavemann, B., Rixen, S.: *Bestandsaufnahme zur Situation der Frauenhäuser, der Fachberatungsstellen und anderer Unterstützungsangebote für gewaltbetroffene Frauen und deren Kinder*, Berlin 2012, Bundestagsdrucksache 17/10500

Council of Europe states outside the EU (WAVE calculates for both groups that 86-87% of the shelter spaces that would be needed, based on the population, are missing²⁴. Although the data and calculations differ somewhat from those used here, they are internally consistent and thus provide a clear picture of unequal provision across Europe.

Nonetheless, there has been measureable improvement. Figure 7 shows that accessibility around the clock has risen and has the highest level of confirmation: 43 respondents. Note, however, that the monitoring framework did not ask if women have direct access to a shelter on their own initiative at any time, that is, when they feel acutely threatened. In some countries, women must apply to social services for referral to a shelter, and these services are less likely to be open at any time when a violent situation might escalate. Shelters being free of charge rose to 35 member states in 2010 and then levelled off, now standing at 36 (with more states reporting than in 2010), so that the gap between accessibility and the potential barrier of cost has widened. There has been a fairly strong increase (to 40 member states) in establishing minimum standards, but we have no information about what those standards are. The greatest challenge, as might be expected, is to provide shelters in a sufficiently wide geographic distribution, so that a woman seeking safety and support from the threat of an abusive relationship can reach the shelter within a realistic time frame. Only 29 member states consider this to be the case, and 20 of these are EU member states.

Figure 7: Shelters and their accessibility 2005-2013



As in previous reports, the data on the number of beds available in shelters were analysed²⁵. Consistent with the Istanbul Convention (in particular, with the Explanatory Report to Article 23), the present analysis is based, as far as possible, on data that refer to specialist services offering accommodation and support to women victims of domestic violence. Regrettably, there are still seven member states that cannot say how many shelters offering specialised services exist (three of these states report the number of general services that offer help to domestic violence victims as well as other target groups). 15 member states were not able to say, even approximately, how many beds are available for women seeking to escape domestic violence. While this may be partly due to a highly volatile situation in which NGOs

²⁴ WAVE Country Report 2012, p.21

²⁵ "Beds have become the established measure of take-in capacity, recognising that the number of women who can stay in a shelter varies depending on the number of children they bring with them. It refers to the number of persons, women and/or children, who can stay at the shelter at any one time." – explanatory note in the monitoring framework.

are struggling to survive and may close and/or re-open at short notice, one might have expected member states with a long-standing policy on addressing violence against women to have found, by now, some way of tracking the intake capacity of an institution crucial to their policy against domestic violence.

For the following table, the numbers of shelter beds for the reporting member state were used as given when it seemed clear that they referred to specialist shelters for women victims of violence, especially domestic violence. Member states that could give data only on general crisis accommodation or that declared that no specialist services exist (Azerbaijan, Hungary, Latvia and Lithuania²⁶) were not included, nor were member states that had no data on places available (Monaco, Romania and San Marino), if no alternate European source (such as the EIGE 2012 study or the WAVE country report 2012) was located. Where the figures evidently included shelters for trafficked women and a number was available, these were subtracted. As an aid to clarification the descriptive material in the WAVE country report 2012 was consulted²⁷. A total of 39 member states could be included in the table below.

In the interest of consistency within this monitoring process and tracing developments over time, the measure of number of beds was retained as the measure of capacity and set in relation to the total population of each country. The Explanatory Report to the Istanbul Convention recommends safe accommodation in specialised women's shelters available in every region, with one family place per 10,000 head of population. The reference to "family places" may reflect to some extent the development of shelters. In the early stages, when other agency response had not yet been established, the urgency of immediate safety made highly flexible use of beds and rooms seem imperative. Thus, a room with 6 beds might accommodate different numbers of women and children as needed. This is still probably the case in many shelters, depending on how many women need accommodation. As police and social work responses became more qualified, some shelters have established the principle of family rooms or have part of their space set apart for families (women and their children), allowing more privacy. In most countries, however, the level of provision is not so high as to permit such arrangements on a regular basis.

Where the figures reported clearly meant such "family places" (for example, Cyprus reports that the shelter for victims of family violence can take in nine women and their children), that figure was doubled for better comparability²⁸. However, it was often not clear whether the figures reported to this monitoring framework referred to family places or beds. The EIGE 2012 study and the WAVE 2012 Country report were helpful in filling gaps or interpreting sometimes puzzling data. However, in these studies as well, it is not clear whether the data provided refers to 'number of beds' or 'number of family places'. Thus, the resulting numbers as reported in the table below can only be seen as an estimate.

As an additional complication, the WAVE Country Report now sets the number of family places in relation to the total female population of the country, and future monitoring may wish to use this reference point. In absolute terms, it makes less difference than one might think. For example, in 2013 Denmark reported shelter capacity in beds for both women and children. If the number of family places is taken (450 women) in relation to the female population (2,783,458), the proportion is 1.61. Calculating the total number of beds (875) relative to total population yields a proportion of 1.56.

²⁶ See EIGE 2012, p. 120; this agreed with the explanatory information from the member states.

²⁷ The WAVE 2012 Country report does not include Andorra, Monaco or San Marino, but does include Belarus.

²⁸ Where information was given about the number of places available for women and, separately, for children, as was the case for England and for Denmark, the numbers were about equal. Of course this can vary by country.

The table below follows the calculation model in previous reports, using number of beds and total population²⁹, so as to show developments over time.

Number of shelter beds relative to population

Country	Number of shelter beds specifically for women and children victims of DV 2013 - Figures reported or best estimate	Population (2012)	Ratio of shelter beds relative to population			Overall trend ³⁰
			2007	2010	2013	
Norway*	1815	4 985 870	1.63	/	3.64	↑
Liechtenstein	12	36 475	1.13	1.12	3.29	↑
Luxembourg****	170	524 853	3.42	3.44	3.24	→
Slovenia	390	2 055 496	0.89	1.00	1.88	↑
Denmark	875	5 573 894	0.65	0.64	1.56	↑
United Kingdom	9000	63 256 141	0.61	/	1.42	↑
Andorra	10	76 246 [iii]	1.48	/	1.31	→
Netherlands	2200	16 730 348	1.50	1.93	1.31	↓
Ireland	591	4 582 769	1.29	0.30	1.29	→
Malta****	41 in 1 st stage	417 520	0.83	0.63	0.98	↑
Spain***	4500	46 196 276	0.64	0.64	0.97	↑
Sweden*	915	9 482 855	0.87	1.09	0.96	→
Austria	777	8 443 018	0.93	0.90	0.93	→
Germany	6800	81 843 743	0.89	0.85	0.83	→
Iceland	25	319 575	0.64	0.63	0.78	→
Estonia	101	1 339 662	0.25	0.84	0.75	↑
Belgium	815	11 094 850	0.48	0.92	0.73	(?)
Croatia**	283	4 398 150	0.71	0.82	0.66	(?)
Finland	339	5 401 267	0.24	0.23	0.63	↑
Portugal	645	10 542 398	0.47	0.52	0.62	↑
Slovakia	285	5 404 322	0.95	0.08	0.53	(?)
Bosnia and Herzegovina	183	3 839 737	0.33	0.48	0.48	↑
Montenegro*	30	621 240	/	0.52	0.48	→
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	30	2 059 794	0.29	0.29	0.46	↑
Switzerland	262	7 954 662	0.26	0.33	0.33	→
Serbia	225	7 258 745 [ii]	/	/	0.31	(?)
Turkey	2239	74 724 269	0.05	0.18	0.30	↑
Greece	330	11 290 067	0.15	0.14	0.29	↑
France*	1563	65 327 724	0.87	0.54	0.24	↓
Cyprus	18	862 011	0.15	0.14	0.23	↑
Albania	70	3 194 417 [i]	/	0.39	0.22	(?)
Georgia	77	4 483 434 [ii]	0.07	0.05	0.17	↑
Armenia	52	3 268 468 [ii]	/	0.07	0.16	↑
Republic of Moldova*	50	3 559 986 [ii]	/	0.03	0.14	↑
Italy	560	59 394 207	0.18	0.04	0.09	(?)
Czech Republic***	80	10 505 445	/	0.74	0.085	(?)
Bulgaria*	60	7 327 224	0.04	0.06	0.08	↑
Ukraine*	200	45 525 730 [ii]	/	0.02	0.04	↑
Poland****	56	38 538 447	/	1.01	0.01	(?)

General note: The data for Cyprus, Malta, Republic of Moldova, Sweden and Ukraine either gave numbers for family rooms/bedrooms, or the relation between shelters and “places” made this plausible. Thus, the number of places was raised to arrive at a “best estimate”.

* No data provided by focal point, or no data on shelters specifically for women victims of domestic violence; figure taken from WAVE 2012; /** The 2013 data from Croatia refer only to state-funded shelters; this may explain an apparent decrease in provision, as NGO shelters not funded by the state also exist./*** Figure taken from EIGE 2012/**** First stage shelters only, for comparability; there are also second stage shelters.

Population figures: Figures from Eurostat (2012) unless stated otherwise. [i] Figures from UNECE (2009) / [ii] Figures from UNECE (2011) / [iii] Official statistics (2012)

²⁹ The responses from Cyprus, Malta, the Republic of Moldova, Sweden and Ukraine either gave numbers for family rooms/bedrooms, or the relation between shelters and “places” made it plausible to interpret the figures as such. In these cases, the number of “places” was raised to arrive at a “best estimate” of number of beds.

³⁰ Question marks indicate states for which the figures do not seem comparable from one report to another.

The table clearly shows that the provision of specialist services for women seeking refuge from domestic violence has increased overall³¹. There are now nine member states where the proportion of shelter places relative to population is higher than one. In 2010 there were only six and in 2007 only four. The “overall trend” for each state is indicated by arrows in the last column; they indicate member states where the level of provision has increased, stayed about the same or decreased. Member states with high or middle level of provision have mostly either increased the number of beds or maintained the existing level, while in member states with low levels of provision (below .33) there is either an increase, or inconsistency in the data suggests possible changes in what is considered a shelter, or in the means of data collection.

As the arrows under “overall trend” show, in 20 member states the monitoring documents an increase since 2007 and frequently since 2010; this is to be found both in states with a relatively high level of provision and those that began at a low level. In nine member states the level of provision has remained stable. In the Netherlands and France the figures suggest a decrease in provision; this may reflect changes in how data are collected and calculated; perhaps earlier data were inaccurate. For the remaining eight member states in the table, the development is not clear, because earlier data were either missing or seem to have been calculated very differently. Seven of the member states reporting to this round of monitoring are not included in this table due to lack of data or lack of specialist shelter services.

All in all the data on shelter provision are rather unsatisfactory, with only 25 member states actually reporting the number of beds in specialist shelters, and reported figures sometimes being inconsistent over time. A moderately informative table could only be constructed by drawing on additional sources and other comparative studies, and the results must be treated with some caution. Nonetheless, this sector of services does seem to be recognised as a necessity and is being maintained and even expanded despite the pressures of financial crisis and austerity regimes. Some of the numerical increase may reflect greater governmental attention to collecting and reporting information that in itself could be a positive impact of the Istanbul Convention. A trend towards fuller reporting can, however, also obscure real difficulties: For example, NGO-run shelters that have had to close due to lack of funds may not have been included in the numbers presented by official reporting in past years. It may also be that the full impact of the financial crisis on services for women³² does not yet appear in the data, since information may have been compiled in 2011. The concern expressed in the 2010 monitoring report that the growth of services might be stagnating is not confirmed by the current data. On the other hand, greater attention to providing accurate data is vital to effective implementation and monitoring of the Istanbul Convention.


Support services concerned with sexual assault

Services for victims of rape and sexual assault have increased, in particular with regard to their being accessible to all women. In all, 33 member states confirm that such services do exist, but the majority report the number of such services as relatively small or have no data on the number. Only 20 states consider that such services are accessible in a sufficiently wide geographic distribution within the country. 13 member states report no such services (in 2010 there were 16 with none).

³¹ The information from previous rounds of monitoring may not be comparable to the present reporting. It is possible that the confusion between family places and number of beds had already begun in earlier reports without being noticed.

³² For the United Kingdom see Hirst, A. & Rinne, S, The impact of changes in commissioning and funding on women-only services. Equality and Human Rights Commission Research Report 86, London 2012; Walby, S. & Towers, J. Measuring the impact of cuts in public expenditure on the provision of services to prevent violence against women and girls. Report for Northern Rock Foundation and Trust for London, February 2012.

Figure 8: Services for victims of sexual assault 2005-2013



Of the member states offering these services, 14 (Armenia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, France, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Monaco, Norway, Romania, San Marino, Spain and United Kingdom) confirm the entire range of criteria, and a further five (Austria, Finland, Italy, Sweden and Switzerland) fulfil all other criteria but do not confirm a satisfactory geographical spread, while in Andorra and Germany all other criteria are fulfilled but the services are not always free of charge (in Germany, this depends on the states or local authorities).

Comparative research in recent years marks a difference between what in the United Kingdom are now called “Sexual assault referral centres”, usually based in hospitals to respond to recent sexual violence with forensic examination and short-term counselling, and “rape crisis centres”, that are almost always run by NGOs and offer support, advocacy and sometimes therapy regardless of when the sexual violence took place. The finding of the EU 2010 feasibility study, that relatively few countries offer both types of service³³, seems confirmed by the brief descriptive comments in this round of monitoring. The criteria “immediate medical care” and “forensic examination” strongly suggest a hospital context, as do some brief descriptions in the data.³⁴ Where both types of service exist, it has usually been found that one does not substitute for the other; while medical care and securing evidence require immediate intervention, the victim’s emotional crisis from a rape trauma is often delayed, and she may need psychosocial support in making difficult decisions.

³³ European Union, 2010, p. 56

³⁴ Both with sexual assault services that ensure medical care and in Question 15 on services for children it is possible that some member states refer to their general health care and child welfare services, if these are considered to bear the relevant responsibility.

In 2010, a count was taken of member states in which the services for victims of sexual assault were able to offer at least three of the five aspects of immediate support specified in the monitoring framework (trauma support and counselling was not added until the 2013 round due to its specific mention in the Istanbul Convention). Taking the same count in 2013, we find 26 member states, a modest increase over 2010, offering this range of immediate support. Most of these services also offer trauma support and counselling. Thus, there has not been a significant increase in availability, but some increase in specific aspects. Support services for women who have been sexually assaulted or raped are still insufficiently well-established and women's right to support, redress and recovery less well recognised than is now the case with domestic violence.

Telephone helplines

The monitoring framework in 2013 was extended to include telephone helplines, as the Istanbul Convention specifically requires Parties to provide this service. Thus, this fourth round of monitoring asked for the first time about a national 24/7 helpline free of charge. This could be a helpline giving information, advice, and possibly referrals on all forms of violence against women, but helplines also exist specifically for domestic violence, and of course, it is possible for a member state to have both. The majority of member states – 27 in all – have one or both forms of helpline. The comments suggest that different decisions were made about how best to answer a question that set a fairly high threshold with the Convention standards. Some respondents apparently confirmed the existence of a helpline if it met one or two of the criteria (state-wide, 24/7, free), while others understood the threshold more strictly and answered “no” if any of the three criteria were not met. Seven states comment that they do have a state-wide helpline, but it is either not available 24/7 or it is not free of charge; and five commented that there are definite plans to meet all three criteria in the near future.

As this was the first step to surveying the situation, no more detailed information was requested, and the numbers in Table 13 should be seen as indicative. It is not known whether the states that checked both types of helpline provide two different telephone numbers and staffing, or whether a single helpline offers support both to all women confronting violence and to any victim of domestic violence, which might also include, for example, children. In any case, this first survey of the services does not yield any information on the extent to which the helpline staff have professional training. Further monitoring to the Convention will need to explore these questions more fully.


Services independent of criminal proceedings

An important new question in this round derives from Article 18, paragraph 4 of the Convention, stating that “*the provision of services shall not depend on the victim's willingness to press charges or to testify against any perpetrator*”. In the Explanatory Report to the Convention it is emphasised that this applies “*first and foremost to general and specialist support services referred to in Articles 20 and 22*”, thus including a wide range of potential services (health, social services housing and others) and all specialist support such as housing, support in obtaining protection measures, forensic medical examinations, counselling and others. Some typical situations where this can apply would be: a woman seeking safety in a shelter who does not want her husband prosecuted, or the victim of rape for whom the medical evidence must be preserved immediately before it is lost, but who needs recovery time to decide if she can face being a witness in a rape trial.

The legislative measures or regulations needed to meet this standard depend on the institutional infrastructure of services in each country. In some member states, women do not have direct access to shelters or to some other services on their own initiative, but must apply to local authorities or social services: this requirement is sometimes considered necessary to direct scant resources to where they are most needed. To comply with the Convention, a legal foundation might be needed to ensure that a victim's co-operation in prosecution is irrelevant to whatever assessment of risk is employed in decisions to grant access to shelter or other support.

In many states, the legal frameworks governing forensic examinations do not grant the victim control over whether the evidence is then delivered to the prosecution service. The Explanatory Report to the Istanbul Convention specifies that "Research has shown that it is good practice to carry out forensic examinations regardless of whether the matter will be reported to the police, and to offer the possibility of having samples taken and stored so that the decision as to whether or not to report the rape can be taken at a later date." (paragraph141). This ensures that the service is independent of the victim's willingness to co-operate with prosecution.

Figure 9: Support services independent of co-operating with prosecution 2013



While 43 of the 46 member states affirm that provision of services is generally independent of the victim's co-operation with prosecution, this probably needs to be explored in more detail on a country-by-country basis, since there may be preconditions operative for some services but not for others. For example, emergency services are available to all women in Spain, including undocumented migrants, but for longer term support there is a strong expectation that the victim testify against the perpetrator. In practice, therefore, the underlying tension between the due diligence obligation to prosecute and punish perpetrators and the principle that all measures should be based on empowerment of the victim is not easily resolved.

Support for children witnessing violence:

There is increasing awareness and solid research knowledge³⁵ that witnessing violence in the home, and in particular, witnessing violence against the primary carer on whom children depend for their sense of safety, does children much the same harm as being directly abused themselves. Women living with children in a situation of domestic violence often make great efforts to shield the children from exposure to the violence, but may at the same time find it difficult to act for their own safety.

The monitoring framework has explicitly asked whether children who witness violence against their mothers are given protection and assistance to meet their needs. Past reports have underlined the importance of outreach and support to meet the needs of children whose mothers have not been able to act to end the violence. The Convention does not, however, elaborate on this issue, but in Article 26 restricts itself to taking the rights and needs of children into account when providing services and assistance to their mothers.

While pointing to the importance of recognising the needs of all children who witness violence, the Convention does not specifically mention protection, support and counselling for children whose mothers are not receiving services themselves. However, it does encourage all Parties to apply the provisions to all victims of domestic violence, so that services directly for children would be in the spirit of the Convention, especially if seen in conjunction with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Following the framework set by the Convention, the indicator in the monitoring questionnaire does not differentiate between services and direct outreach to children on the one hand, and auxiliary support to children in the context of services for women on the other, but asks if it is generally the case that protection and age-appropriate counselling by trained staff are provided when their mothers receive support as victims.

42 of the 46 reporting member states affirm that protection and assistance to children, including age-appropriate counselling, are provided, and 38 member states confirm that all staff for support of child witnesses are specifically trained on violence against women and its impact on children. In 2010 only 26 member states reported that they ensure such training. Although this is an improvement, suggesting that awareness of the interconnections between violence against women and endangerment of child welfare is growing, the data do not reveal what proportion of specialised services for women, in particular shelters, have the resources to offer the necessary psychological and moral support to the children, as called for in Rec(2002)5, to help them understand, cope with and recover from experiencing violence.

Perpetrators


Intervention programmes for men perpetrators, in particular for men who use violence against a partner, were a relatively new development when the Recommendation was issued, and the monitoring framework was limited to asking how many such programmes exist. The expanded questionnaire responds to the growth of such programmes and their acceptance, seeking a more informative baseline. A distinction is now made between programmes concerning domestic (or intimate partner) violence and those concerning sexual violence, as well as among different paths of entry into programmes and their co-operation with victim support services. In analogy to data collection on shelters, the respondents were now asked for both the number of programmes and the number of places. As might be expected, some of this information is missing or will need more clarification in the future.

³⁵ Internationally, well over 500 research studies confirm this; for the current state of knowledge see Kavemann, B., Kreyssig, U. (eds): *Handbuch Kinder und häusliche Gewalt*, 3rd ed. Wiesbaden 2013, or Jaffe, P.G., Wolfe D.A., Campbell, M.: *Growing Up with Domestic Violence*. Cambridge: Hogrefe 2012

However, the Daphne Project “Work with Perpetrators”, now beginning a follow-up “IMPACT” has built up a database on perpetrator programmes from which more systematic information can be culled after its current survey to update the database is completed.³⁶

Only the questions also asked in 2007 and 2010 could be used for a comparative overview of the development in this area over time. The results show a steady growth in programmes, in establishing referral from the justice system, and in co-operation with victim services. As will be seen, referral from the justice system is rarely the only route of access (only in Serbia), but it is a significant route. Co-operation with victim services was asked very generally in the past; in 2013 the member states could choose whether this is generally the case (all services) or applies to some but not all programmes. Since past reporting did not make this distinction, for the graph co-operation was coded in the tables as “either some or all”. Some of the increase may be due to this more generous coding option, but the graph does reflect a tendency towards regarding co-operation with victim services (and frequently, ensuring flow of information to and from the partner who has been target of the violence) as a standard of good practice. In networks negotiating standards either nationally or on the European level this seems to be the case.


Figure 10: Intervention programmes for men perpetrators 2007-2013



Of the 46 member states reporting, 37 now have intervention programmes for perpetrators of violence against women, and all of them include programmes specifically for violence against an intimate partner. The number of states with programmes for sexual offenders is lower at 29.

³⁶ See <http://www.work-with-perpetrators.eu/en/index.php> for the database and information about the follow-up in progress.

Figure 11: Perpetrator programmes by type of violence 2013



Looking at the information available in the comments and on the above-mentioned database³⁷, it can be seen that there are **different types of programmes**.

1. Internationally, programmes for sexually violent men serving a prison sentence have been established for some time; they are typically delivered by statutory agencies in the legal-medical system, sometimes serving to assess the risk of re-offending after release. Some programmes in member states seem to be primarily based on treatment within the prison system, but today they also include treatment for domestic violence offenders (usually in much smaller numbers, since even fewer men serve a prison sentence for domestic violence against women than for sexual assault or rape³⁸).
2. Another type are programmes for convicted offenders which are implemented by the probation service, but open as well to men who have not received a custodial sentence, or in legal systems that allow this, are given probation instead of a penalty. In some member states, probation services may be implemented by voluntary associations, and their experience and skills may enable them to offer behavioural change programmes that reach men who have not been prosecuted or convicted of a crime. Since the majority of men who commit domestic violence against women, even when there is repeated violence in a longer-term pattern of coercive control, are in fact never prosecuted, this can be an important prevention strategy.
3. Quite a number of behavioural and attitude change programmes are developed and implemented by NGOs; referral from the justice system may then be a condition for dropping criminal charges (again, when and how this can or must be done depends on the legal system: some legal frameworks permit suspending criminal proceedings in favour of an intervention programme; others dismiss proceedings conditional on entering a programme³⁹). In some member states, such as Finland, community-based programmes delivered by NGOs (often in co-operation with shelters) have no link to the justice system.

³⁷ See footnote 24.

³⁸ Sweden reports that the Swedish Prison Service has 550 special places for perpetrators of violence against women, of which 400 are for perpetrators of sexual violence. In the United Kingdom, where perpetrator programmes are run by probation services tasked with managing offenders sentenced to community service rather than prison, the relation is 3,500 places for domestic violence offenders to 2,300 for sexual violence perpetrators.

³⁹ In the first case, prosecution can be resumed if the perpetrator drops out of the programme; this is not so after dismissal.

All of these types of programmes are to be found in various member states, some having more than one type. With this diversity of programme-types, the responses on the path of entry can only give a first impression. For example, there are NGOs with a commitment to changing men's behaviour that only accept voluntary participants; but also, programmes operating within the prison system or within a psychiatric hospital may also declare that participation is 100% voluntary. In the latter case, the perpetrator has already been placed in a corrective or treatment institution and the motive for volunteering may not resemble that of a man who seeks out a community-based change programme without a referral. Reports from programmes with a significant proportion of voluntary participants frequently note that many if not most of the men turn to the programme under pressure, after their partners – or, perhaps, the child welfare services – have threatened consequences unless their behaviour changes.

That said, it can be noted that 31 member states report that participants enter on a voluntary basis, 27 operate programmes within the criminal justice system (which may or may not mean operating in prisons), and 27 report that entry is by way of referrals from the justice system (usually after there has been a criminal charge but often before or without prosecution). 18 member states have all three paths of entry, although these may not be offered by the same service organisation, and there may be a difference between domestic violence programmes and programmes for sex offenders. Among the others, we find six states (Estonia, Netherlands, Portugal, San Marino, Serbia and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”) where entry is only possible through the justice system, and six (Bosnia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Iceland, Slovakia and Ukraine) where the programmes only take participants on a voluntary basis. With the remaining seven states, we find either voluntary participation alongside programmes within the criminal justice system, or voluntary participation alongside referral from the justice system, but not both. It must be noted that in some cases, the programmes are fairly new and thus referral from the justice system may be intended but not yet operative, as in Slovakia.

PREVENTION: Awareness-raising, education and training

It is quite difficult to measure awareness-raising, much less to define an indicator that can assess this in a comparative way over time. While the media have considerable influence on the public and on their perceptions and understanding of gender issues and violence, in democracies they are not subject to direct state regulation. Thus, for the present monitoring member states were asked if there exists a code of conduct or other set of guidelines or self-regulatory standards for media professionals to prevent violence against women and to enhance respect for women's dignity. There are now 16 member states that have such a code or set of guidelines, as opposed to 11 states in 2010, and this is not due to new reporting but reflects a genuine increase. It seems likely that the establishment of such a code is linked to anti-discrimination law or related recommendations. There seems to be very little comparative study of what such codes comprise, how they are implemented, and whether they are effective.

Education

A key element of prevention and protection is education about gender-based violence and domestic violence in public schools. It can serve, on the one hand, to enable teachers to recognize and identify children in distress or in need due to witnessing domestic violence in the home, and on the other, to educate children and youth about relationships based on respect, equality and non-violence in their own lives as they grow up. There have been a number of European programmes and projects that have developed and tested modules and methods for raising school children's awareness of basic rights and for teaching young people about non-violent relationships.

Because educational systems and their regulations differ considerably across Europe, three possibilities for including such education were offered. The first followed Article 14 of the Convention, asking if "*relevant teaching material is included in formal curricula and at all levels of education*". This is most easily confirmed by the government in countries where the content of education is regulated state-wide in some detail, so that formal curricula also include (possibly mandatory) teaching material. However, member states that make a choice of teaching materials available without requiring their use were also inclined to answer with "yes". The second option is to lay a **general duty** to provide relevant education in the national (or sub-national/regional) law on schools and education; such laws generally do not specify the content of courses in detail. Such a duty may be very general, for example located in the preamble or among the goals of education, and thus not specify the level at which education occurs or the methods involved.

A general duty of schools can be combined with (mandatory) national curricula and/or material issued by authorised agencies, or it can leave the choice of methods for implementing this duty to local authorities and/or to each school. As a third approach, member states were asked "*whether, to their knowledge, relevant education is taking place in at least **some schools and some age groups***". Depending on how closely schools are regulated, the practical implementation of a general duty could vary considerably. But even without a legislative mandate, educational systems that delegate curricular decisions to the local level may support or publicise model projects or networks of projects.

These alternatives in the monitoring questionnaire created a certain amount of confusion, much of which could be cleared up in additional correspondence with the member states. There were extensive comments from member states describing how they have introduced these issues into school curricula. As might be expected, teaching for prevention of violence is placed differently – for example, in health education, civic education, education for gender equality and non-discrimination, sex and relationship education, preparation for family life. Member states also differ in their mode and degree of regulating formal curricula and teaching materials, from the provision of teaching manuals and defining specific topics and

objectives for relevant courses, as in Croatia, Cyprus, Republic of Moldova or Northern Ireland, to offers of further training and support for schools to help them develop appropriate methods, as in Germany (decentralised to the Länder), Sweden (National Agency), and England and Wales (statutory guidance), or to a general definition of end goals with schools free to determine how they teach these subjects, as in the Netherlands. Some member states are planning to develop curricular modules (foreseen, for example, in the NAP of Georgia and Hungary). A number of member states have written overarching goals such as promoting human dignity, equality and prevention of violence into their general legislative framework for education (for example, Norway and Spain).

Thirteen member states replied “yes” to all three parts of the question. However, only 23 of the 46 reporting member states confirm that it is a general duty of schools to provide education relevant to the prevention of violence against women. The number of member states able to confirm that some schools and age groups do receive such education is higher (32). This includes 11 member states in which teaching materials are not generally included in formal curricula and schools have no general duty to teach in this area.

While the numbers in Table 18 suggest at first glance that somewhat more than half of the member states are actively involved in providing the relevant education in schools, in fact, only eight member states report that none of the provisions apply; that is, 38 states can report some form of addressing the prevention of violence against women in education. There are five member states that both include teaching materials in formal curricula at all levels and lay a general duty on schools to teach about this topic, but cannot say whether some schools actually do provide such education, usually because the national governments do not have data. Especially in larger countries, such as France, Spain and Sweden, it may be unrealistic to expect national authorities to know what schools actually implement, especially if responsibility for school practice (and even school legislation) is derogated to the regional government.


The great variety among educational systems poses a challenge to monitoring implementation. Perhaps the main conclusion would be that, regardless of school regulation systems and values such as pedagogical autonomy, more activity in providing teaching materials, combined with seminars and workshops on how to use them, could significantly contribute to progress in this area.

Training professionals

As noted already in the 2010 monitoring, training professionals has been an area of growing activity across Europe. Increasingly it is recognised that especially domestic violence is a problem requiring multi-professional responses and co-operation, and requires relevant knowledge and skills not only from specialised professionals who respond to crisis situations. Educating professionals about the prevalence, the effects, the signals and symptoms and the dynamics of intimate partner violence, sexual violence, and stalking must be part of the foundation on which professional competency is built. In addition, in-service training teaches specific groups of professionals about good professional practice when they encounter situations or effects of domestic violence in their work. Many challenges to professionals in responding to violence can only be fully understood and met against a background of experience on the job.

A total of 45 member states reported regular training on some level for professionals in 2013. As in 2010, Estonia cannot report regular training of either kind in any of the professions. The following graph shows the development of any kind of specific professional training on violence against women, prevention and intervention, either initially or as further training or both. Only for lawyers and for teachers (school or pre-school) do we find increases greater than the increase in member states reporting in the fourth round of monitoring.


Figure 12: Training of professionals over time 2007-2013



The increase in training teachers is a hopeful sign; it seems to reflect the greater awareness of the negative impact of violence in partnerships on children, on the one hand, and awareness of the need as well as the potential for preventive work with youth, on the other.

Looking at the data more closely, there does seem to be growing effort to lay a foundation of relevant knowledge in the **initial vocational training** of a number of professions. Figure 13 shows the existence of initial and further training in the various professions for 2013, and points to a significantly higher level of initial training for police, lawyers, judges and social workers, while health professionals and teachers are more likely to receive in-service training.

Figure 13: Initial and further training of professionals 2013



The question to member states was “*Which of the following groups of professionals regularly receive appropriate specific training?*”. However, as the accompanying comments submitted by member states indicate, appropriate specific training can stand for a range of possibilities. Albania, for example, points out that the curricula of tertiary education generally includes issues of gender-based violence, including the fields of journalism, pedagogy, law and medicine, so that those preparing for professions in these areas are highly likely to come into contact with the problem. However, depending on different national educational systems and how they train the various professions, courses or sessions dealing with interdisciplinary issues can be optional or obligatory, short or long. For future legal professions, specific training can consist of including the paragraphs relating to violence against women in the standard course on criminal law, or offering an optional interdisciplinary course on gender issues for credit, or a module on aggressive behaviour, or an in-depth optional specialisation in family law. One might have expected that initial education for the legal professions would be the same for lawyers and judges, and thus either both or neither would encounter training in this area, but that is not the case: There are 11 member states that respond with “yes” for one and “no” for the other (seven train only future judges, and four only future lawyers).

In-service training is considerably less widespread than initial training: 11 member states provide no specific further education on violence against women and on methods of prevention and intervention to any of the professionals listed here. With regard to **further training**, both the Czech Republic and Germany report that their national Judges' Academy offers regular seminars, but judges are free to choose which seminars they select; in the questionnaire, the former replies with "yes" and the latter with "no". Although the freedom of judges is a particularly strong example (Ireland also mentions the constitutional guarantee of judicial independence), such uncertainty about whether "yes" or "no" more accurately describes the situation probably applies to a number of professions; those trained at a university level frequently can choose among optional variations of key themes during their education, and academic institutions also offer varying areas of specialisation depending on who is teaching. Generally, the training and further education of media professionals is probably the most diverse and least regulated of all of the professions listed here, and it is not surprising that they are least often regularly trained and there is no increase to be observed.

There are five member states (Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece and Ukraine) that report regular **initial specific training** for all ten professions listed, two of these (Bulgaria and Croatia) also report regular specific in-service training to all groups. A picture of broad coverage of the professions might include those member states where all except media professionals receive regular training; for initial training this group would then additionally include Cyprus, the Netherlands, Norway and San Marino, that is, a total of nine member states. Taking the same definition for **further training**, an additional five states, while not including this area in initial training, do ensure regular further training on violence against women, prevention and intervention (Belgium, France, Slovenia, Spain and Switzerland). Thus, a total of 14 states provide some training to all professions or to all but media professionals, either during their initial or further education or (frequently) both. In 2010 the numbers were almost the same (13 in all), but mostly different member states. It seems that, in the present round of monitoring, some (such as Germany, Latvia and Montenegro) have reconsidered their across-the-board positive responses in the third round and differentiate more carefully, while others that did not reach some professions in 2010, such as Greece and Ukraine, may have intensified their efforts. It is probably difficult to decide whether to answer "yes" or "no" when asked whether whole professions "regularly" receive training, and it is perhaps just more difficult to assess the situation with regard to in-service training since it is typically not located in highly visible educational institutions such as universities.

All but two member states (44 out of 46) now include violence against women, intervention and prevention in their basic training of **police** (up from 35 in 2010 and 31 in 2007), and 29 also provide in-service training for police. The numbers for further training of police were slightly higher in 2007 and 2010, so there may be a shift towards locating it in basic training of police recruits. Initial education on violence against women and on the role of the police is not enough to ensure consistently appropriate responses in practice, however. Research evaluating police training tends to find that personal experience on the job, indeed even simulated job experience such as role-play, often changes police officers' perceptions of what they can and should do in situations of domestic violence; thus, in-service further training can be crucial to ensuring the implementation of policies "on the ground". Overall, however, there seems to be a good foundation to build on.

Social workers, the second main "port of call" for crisis situations, receive initial training on violence against women in 38 of the 46 states (up from 24 in 2010), and in 26 states they receive in-service further training (in the same number as in 2010, that is, no increase despite five more states reporting, suggesting a shift towards initial training). Given that social workers may, once their training is completed, work in very different situations, in-service training tailored to qualify their responses in the context in which they work is quite important. There are still five member states (Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Latvia and Liechtenstein) that offer social workers no specific regular training in this area, neither during their initial training for the profession nor on the job.

The picture presented by the data on training of other professions is very diverse. Training in the **health professions** has remained at about the same level or even decreased, although the differences may be a matter of how the situation is assessed in each round of reporting, and also depend on the degree of central regulation. 14 member states report that relevant education is given regularly during initial training of all three health professions (physicians, psychologists and therapists, nurses and midwives), and 14 states provide further training to all three groups. Nine of the 14 states regularly provide both initial and in-service training (Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Ireland, Netherlands and Spain). This suggests that in these states, the health system is highly salient for prevention and intervention. In other member states, it can be seen that some health professions are educated on the topic in their initial training, and others in further training, but in many states, some healthcare professions receive no training of this kind. In ten member states, no regular training on violence against women in any of the health professions is reported (Azerbaijan, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia and Sweden). In a few states, such as Malta, Montenegro and Poland, in the health field only nurses and midwives receive training.

There are considerable differences in the degree to which national governments regulate or shape the content of education and training and in the mechanisms they use to influence what is taught and to whom. It can be argued that horizontal influence through models of effective practice has more real impact on education than requiring certificates or issuing formal curricula. Despite a wide consensus on the importance of training, comparing the responses from 2007 to 2013 did not uncover a notable overall increase; the reasons for this would be worth studying.

Data collection

Data can be a key resource in developing and evaluating policy. Administrative data reveals how many cases of different forms of violence have come to the attention of agencies, and may help institutions evaluate whether their responses, procedures and outcomes are satisfactory. Population-based data give a picture of prevalence and incidence of violence, as well as their context and background, whether certain groups are disproportionately affected, whether and where they have sought help or redress, and if not, why not.

For some years there has been dissatisfaction with the lack of administrative data in general and with the difficulty or impossibility of extracting information about violence against women from police crime statistics. At the beginning of the monitoring process, it seemed necessary to ask – in connection with criminal justice – *“whether the police are required by law, by regulation or by written instruction to record all reported cases of violence within the family and to investigate such cases”*. By the second round of monitoring, nearly all member states confirmed that this was the case, but it had also become clear in the course of exchanges of good practice that the diverse nature of the duties and powers of the police and their role in the criminal justice system undermines the usefulness of the question. If the police are tasked with deciding whether a crime has occurred, then the obligation to record and/or investigate all cases may not mean that every report of violence in the family will be recorded. Indeed, one could debate whether the police should record every instance of alleged misconduct that comes to their attention. To ask whether the police record all cases implicitly presumes that violence in the family will be recognised as such.

Thus, the indicator was broken down into a number of specific questions: *“Do police statistics systematically record in standardised categories according to criminal offences age, and sex of victim and perpetrator as well as the relationships between them? Do police statistics combine sex of perpetrator, sex of victim and their relationship in reporting on the most common criminal offences within the family? Are disaggregated statistics on cases of the different forms of violence against women regularly made available in a national report? Does this report specifically report on domestic violence?”*.


The focus of the debate has thus shifted to whether **general police statistics** yield adequate information about violence against women and domestic violence. As there are numerous possible offences that may be involved, a broad consensus has emerged. At a minimum, with offences against the person where the alleged offender is known, as in the family or in the immediate social environment, police records should include the sex and age of victim and perpetrator and the relationship between them, and this information should be linked in statistical reporting. Article 11 of the Istanbul Convention provides that Parties shall *“collect disaggregated relevant statistical data on all forms of violence covered by this Convention”*, while the Explanatory Report, paragraph 76, further recommends that *“as a minimum requirement, recorded data on victim and perpetrator should be disaggregated by sex, age, type of violence as well as the relationship of perpetrator to the victim, geographical location, as well as other factors deemed relevant, such as disability”*.

Most member states systematically record sex of victim and perpetrator for all criminal offences, and 31 confirm that the police systematically record the relationship. Of those that do not, some report that this is done only for domestic violence (Iceland), or it is recorded in the incident report but not entered into the statistical database (Malta), or it can be made available on request (Greece), or it is recorded only for assault (Sweden). There are also two states (Finland and Poland) that do not systematically record the relationship for all offences, but do combine age, sex and relationship data for the most common offences within the family. Since a few states that do record relationship systematically do not combine these data systematically, a total of 29 states produce integrated statistical data on domestic violence based on combining age, sex and relationship. As the graph below shows, not all of these publish the disaggregated police statistics in a national report.

Integrated, disaggregated statistics (that is, statistics that combine the information on age, sex and relationship) on all relevant offences and/or on the offences most frequent within the family have been strongly recommended as a uniform way to measure reported acts of violence and identify those that occur within some kind of previously existing relationship. For example, published statistics for Austria indicate whether the perpetrator was a family member or relative, an acquaintance, or a stranger. In this way, knowledge about domestic violence or intimate partner violence is anchored in the general crime statistics and can be compared with the same offences in another context. Such a procedure does, however, demand a high level of training and effort to ensure that police enter these data every time an offence comes to their attention.

This may be a reason why some states, such as Iceland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Poland, have developed a **separate system** of recording domestic violence offences. Rather than extracting from the general crime statistics for each offence category the cases that have a relationship background, the police “flag” situations of domestic violence as they come to their attention, and then record for each case the offences committed or charged. In Luxembourg, where the police ban is in use, the statistical police report on domestic violence presents the frequency of various offences (in great detail) both for all domestic violence cases and for cases where an emergency banning order was imposed. Table 20 shows that Luxembourg replied with “no” to all other parts of the question, but does produce a report on domestic violence. As a result of such alternate methods of recording domestic violence offences, the 30 member states that publish a police report on domestic violence are not identical with the 29 that produce integrated statistics from their general crime data. There are eight states that produce integrated statistical data from their crime statistics but do not publish a report on domestic violence, and nine others for which the reverse is true.

Figure 14. Collection and publication of police statistics 2013



There are now 15 member states that systematically record all (or nearly all) of the recommended data, publish the disaggregated statistics in a national report, and also publish a police statistical report on domestic violence (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Republic of Moldova⁴⁰, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”). Three further states, Armenia, Austria and Serbia, collect all data and publish statistics, but do not prepare a specific report on domestic violence; this information can probably be extracted from the disaggregated general crime statistics. There are also five member states (Montenegro, Poland⁴¹, Portugal, Slovenia and Turkey) that collect all of the recommended data systematically, but do not publish disaggregated statistics, but only a national report on domestic violence. By this count, in a total of 23 member states the police record the recommended data, combine them, and publish the results. There are in addition five member states (Azerbaijan, Greece, Hungary, Italy and Monaco) that have all the data and combine them, but do not publish either disaggregated statistics or a report on domestic violence.

15 of the 46 reporting member states do not systematically record the relationship between perpetrator and victim, although a few do so for some offences. Denmark, France, Liechtenstein, Malta and Ukraine have not begun to record the relationship, but combine this with the other data and publish statistics; Ireland and the Czech Republic have relationship recorded but do not combine the data (although the latter publishes reports on criminal acts related to domestic violence). Finland and the Netherlands publish both disaggregated statistics and a domestic violence report without systematically collecting data the relationship, while Norway produces both kinds of report without systematically recording sex and age of perpetrator or victim. This may mean that these data are only recorded for some offences. Sweden, for example, collects some data only for assault and publishes reports on this basis. Finally, Andorra, Belgium and the United Kingdom could not confirm any of the data or publishing any reports, although in the United Kingdom there is a police practice of flagging domestic violence cases, but this information is not gathered nationally.

To sum up: while there is still considerable variety in the collection, analysis and publication of police data, procedures for compiling disaggregated and integrated statistics on violence against women, or at least on domestic violence, have been increasing. We can speak of an overall trend towards building a foundation of police statistics on domestic violence, but it is not yet clear whether the trend is also moving towards comparable data across national borders. Reporting systems based on police-identified cases of domestic violence may prioritize violent incidents in the home (although in fact much violence by intimate partners takes place outside the home), and incidents to which the police have been called, and may fail to capture complaints and offences that are not obviously “domestic”, such as aggression by neighbours, co-workers, or by a man who thinks himself entitled to a relationship even after the woman refuses. Furthermore, offences such as deprivation of liberty and physical abuse of young girls, committed in the name of protecting the honour of the family, might not be identified as domestic violence cases. Like protection orders, police statistics may prove too narrowly defined when they categorize the situation first and only then take account of the violence. Statistics should permit the discovery of unexpected patterns, as well as expected ones.

⁴⁰ Republic of Moldova does not systematically record age of victim and perpetrator, but has all other data and both types of reports.

⁴¹ Poland does not systematically collect relationship data, but does combine the relationship with sex of victim and perpetrator.

National surveys on violence against women

Representative, population-based national surveys on experiences of violence as a victim are generally recognised as the best method of assessing prevalence and incidence, especially for harmful acts and acts of unlawful violence that are often not disclosed to any official body, as is the case with violence against women. The discrepancy between the numbers of those who fall victim to violence and the numbers who report this to the police, the healthcare system, or any other authorities able to offer help can be seen as a measure of the effectiveness of agency intervention and of successful policy implementation.

Figure 15: National surveys on violence against women




Figure 15 suggests that the trend towards carrying out national prevalence studies peaked in 2010 and has decreased. However, the monitoring framework did not specify a time frame, and in 2010 member states reported older studies, from 1997 onwards. Furthermore, the fourth round of monitoring made a distinction between surveys on all forms of violence against women and surveys on domestic violence; in earlier rounds, some member states cited their studies on domestic violence under the heading of the prevalence of violence against women. As will be seen in the following detailed analysis, if we count the member states that have carried out a national prevalence survey either on all forms of violence against women or on domestic violence or both, the total (36) is actually higher than in 2010.

Seven member states (Andorra, Armenia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia, Monaco and Ukraine) have no national representative data collection in this area. All others have employed one or more of the three options presented as indicators: Question 21: **Including questions** on violence against women in a more general regular national survey (such as a crime survey, a survey on health and quality of life or on social welfare); Question 22: carrying out a **broad specific survey** on the prevalence and effects of all (or at least the major) forms of violence against women (these two options are represented in Figure 15), and Question 23: carrying out a **survey specifically on domestic violence**. Obviously, a module or set of questions added to more general survey will be less expensive and might be easier to repeat regularly, but will gather far less information, and with sensitive topics such as intimate violence the disclosure rate is likely to be significantly lower than in dedicated surveys devoted to exploring victimization. A broad survey on all or most forms of violence against women can capture more interrelationships and linkages, and offers a fuller picture of the dimensions of the problem for a comprehensive policy approach, while a survey restricted to domestic violence may be able to include more detail on that particular problem. How broad a survey

can be and how much depth it can probe is an issue of resources, but also of other practical considerations.

Three member states, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Serbia, have used only the method of adding questions on violence against women to a general survey. The other 12 states that have used this option also have carried out at least one dedicated survey on violence experiences.

20 states report a survey on multiple forms of violence against women, some (Czech Republic and Finland) give dates for as many as three such surveys. Some indicate that such a survey is being carried out regularly or annually (Norway, Sweden and United Kingdom). It should be noted that a number of member states focus on what has been done recently, and do not cite studies that already appeared in earlier rounds of monitoring.

15 of these member states also report having had national prevalence studies focusing on domestic violence, and give the same years. Evidently, since the survey on violence against women always included a section focussing on intimate partner violence, the respondents did not think it right to answer in the negative to the second question. Five cited two different surveys, one on violence against women generally (Denmark, Netherlands, Switzerland, and for Ireland, on sexual violence) and the other in a different year on domestic violence; the United Kingdom (referring to its crime surveys) notes that a module on violence against women, covering variably different forms of violence (sexual violence, stalking) has been included every year since 2004/5, and a module on domestic violence in alternate years.

In total Table 21-23 shows that 36 member states have had a representative national survey focussing on domestic violence, but as noted above, 15 of these were also general surveys on violence against women, while 20 states have had surveys focusing on domestic violence only. In thirteen states (Belgium, Cyprus, Estonia, Greece, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Republic of Moldova, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Slovenia,) there has been national prevalence research only on domestic or intimate partner violence. Thus, they lack a knowledge base on the prevalence and effects of the different forms of sexual violence and on violence against women outside the family (for example, in the workplace).

Comprehensive surveys are a vital tool for policy and monitoring, and can help stimulate public awareness that violence against women continues to be a serious problem. For this reason, the Convention obligates all Parties to endeavour to conduct population-based surveys at regular intervals on all forms of violence (Article 11). The Explanatory Report underlines that prevalence data enables Parties to track developments longitudinally. In addition, they are crucial to raising awareness of the prevalence of predatory and dominance-based sexual activity, and of the resulting distress and actual harm to the victims and thus a key tool for designing prevention measures aiming to promote changes in the social and cultural patterns of behaviour that contribute to gender-based violence (Article 12 paragraph 1).

CONCLUSIONS

Seen as a whole, the monitoring process documents that Rec(2002)5 and its follow-up have had a significant effect in promoting more active and more coherent policies and in furthering some degree of convergence within the Council of Europe. The 2008 report on the second round of monitoring concluded that *“the Recommendation Rec (2002) 5 [was] functioning as a **common framework** for the great majority of its member states, because it articulated guiding principles and formulated practical challenges, without defining obligations and procedures narrowly”*, and that *“the data on indicators suggested that a process of converging visions and policies across the European landscape [was] underway.”*⁴²

In 2010, the monitoring confirmed that Recommendation (2002)5 had *“a real impact in a process of converging policy and legislation in the member states”*.⁴³

The preparation, adoption, and ratification process of the Istanbul Convention has given further impetus to this development. The Istanbul Convention not only lays down binding obligations, but also defines duties of the Parties and standards of practice in more detail. As ratification goes forward, diverse tendencies also emerge, and perhaps are necessary to achieve common goals. The cultural, historical and institutional diversity across Europe means that different regulatory frameworks may be capable of bringing about similar results, while apparently similar frameworks and models of practice may play out quite differently from one member state to another. The Istanbul Convention allows for a rather high degree of flexibility in its implementation, with the concrete ways in which its measures would be put into practice often left up to the Parties. This means that the monitoring process of the Istanbul Convention will often need to account for significant diversity in the application of common principles and standards among Council of Europe member states.

General progress

The indicators of general progress show a steady increase in the political will to establish a national policy on violence against women, as well as on domestic violence. NAP have gained acceptance as a key tool for implementation of policy, although the more precise questions in the fourth round of monitoring reveal that in less than half of the member states do NAP (or national strategies) cover all (or almost all) forms of violence against women. Equally frequent is a policy approach that sets up partial NAP for forms of violence that are seen as needing priority attention (often domestic violence).

Regardless of the tools for implementation being employed, the monitoring shows a clear increase in the number of forms of violence now included in the scope of a national policy, as well as a gradual increase in the number of member states that have established a national co-ordinating body. The great variety of implementation bodies, as well as the various tools employed and (when it comes to data collection) frameworks of research on the problem reflect different trends in how the problems and the approaches to solutions are framed.

Overall policy development is particularly difficult to capture with indicators, because it is necessarily embedded in the overall political process and the institutions of each country. For example, member states may locate primary responsibility for action within gender equality, with general social welfare, with family policy, or with justice and law enforcement. Short of examining all the documents in question, this variability of context makes comparison difficult. While it can be seen from the data collected here that the scope of national action

⁴² *Protecting women against violence. Analytical study of the results of the second round of monitoring the implementation of Recommendation Rec(2002)5 on the protection of women against violence in Council of Europe member states.* Strasbourg 2008: Council of Europe.

⁴³ *Protecting women against violence. Analytical study of the results of the third round of monitoring the implementation of Recommendation Rec(2002)5 on the protection of women against violence in Council of Europe member states.* Strasbourg 2010: Council of Europe.

plans and strategies has become broader (see Figures 1 and 2 above), the number of member states that set forth a holistic strategy covering all forms of violence in Rec(2002)5 and/or the Istanbul Convention is still quite small. There does not yet seem to be a strong sense of the added value accruing from a comprehensive strategy document as opposed to a fragmented approach reacting to the waves of attention and concern in public and media debate. The primary importance attached to prevention in the very name of the Istanbul Convention points, however, to the need for sustained and considered policy across the entire fields of violence against women and domestic violence.

Punishment

In the responses to the 2013 monitoring, there are both increases compared to past rounds in the penalisation of specific forms of violence, and a number of comments indicating that member states are in the process of reviewing their criminal law in view of the provisions of the Istanbul Convention. The Convention is thus showing a measurable effect on consistency of legal frameworks across member states.

However, with regard to the obligation to criminalise all of the various forms of violence against women covered by the Convention, diversity persists and cannot be simply replaced by model laws copied across Europe. In countries whose criminal justice system is influenced by common law, or that have a mixed legal tradition due to multiple influences, it may be useful and feasible to construct a dedicated law on domestic violence, or on gender violence⁴⁴. In states where criminal offences, civil redress and protection, police/administrative law and social welfare law are each regulated in a systematically structured Code, an overarching law on domestic violence or gender violence might be found counter-productive. Despite such profoundly different legal traditions, Parties to the Convention have agreed that no act of violence against women should be exempt from legal sanctions or legally regarded as less serious and less reprehensible than the same acts against another person, and this can be seen as a measure of success. A second measure of penalisation is the establishment of circumstances defining aggravated cases, allowing a judge or magistrate to impose a higher penalty. This has not been monitored in the past, so that no trend can be described. The Convention foresees a range of nine such circumstances, of which only four were included in the new indicator. Whether judges actually do consider these circumstances will be hard to track, but improving statistics not only on police reporting but also how cases move through the criminal justice system would be useful in assessing what kinds of offences are taken more seriously.

There has also been some increase in enabling the prosecutor to initiate proceedings, both in cases of violence within the family and in cases of sexual violence. The monitoring framework is not sufficiently differentiated to give information on what circumstances permit a decision not to prosecute, whether this has to be justified in any way, and what part the wishes of the victim can play in such a decision. Statistics on prosecution of reported offences and on convictions would be needed, as well as research analysing how cases fare within the criminal justice system, in order to evaluate whether existing provisions actually do ensure that prosecution is pursued with due diligence, when the evidence and the nature of the offences call for it.

⁴⁴ Note that Spain, while not a common law country, has a tradition of "Organic Laws" in which the law on gender violence is embedded.

Protection

Two main elements of protection are considered in the monitoring framework: *emergency barring measures* ensuring immediate physical distance to protect the victim from further harm, when she has reported an act of violence or has called the police, and *judicial protection orders* that can include provisions for fuller and longer-lasting safety. Both types of measure are gaining ground, and legal provision for judicial protection orders now either exists or is being introduced in almost all member states. The findings of this monitoring round point to a growing recognition that providing protection, without delay and with measures that can be effective until the danger is no longer imminent, is increasingly recognised as an obligation of due diligence as well as a necessary precondition for prosecution. The Istanbul Convention underlines these obligations in Articles 52 and 53.

There is, however, considerable variety in the statutory agencies authorised to issue an emergency barring order, and a variety of procedural conditions attached. There is at present no clear picture available of how many member states are, in fact, able to secure immediate physical distance preventing an aggressor from contacting, threatening or attacking the victim, until she has had time to seek fuller judicial protection. It is also not clear what level of endangerment is considered to justify the “emergency” and how this is assessed. Furthermore, barring orders are only as good as the enforcement provisions ensuring that an abuser does in fact keep his distance, and little information about enforcement is available, and that only from few countries, like Austria and Spain. To issue an emergency barring order that is then not enforced may increase the level of danger to the victim, rather than decreasing it. This will be a crucial question for the monitoring of the Istanbul Convention.

Only 36 member states currently allow issuing a judicial protection order *ex parte* even when necessary. The information on protection orders (or restraining orders) needs to be expanded with information on the average waiting time for a court decision, either for an urgent application requested without hearing both Parties, or for an application that would require a full court hearing. The cost of applying for a protection order should also be included in future monitoring.

Thus, we see an overall convergence of legal frameworks for both emergency and medium-term protection, but little evidence of the extent to which access to protection is rapid and effective.

Provision

A striking result of the 2013 monitoring is an overall increase in provision of beds in shelters for women victims of violence, despite the financial crisis and accompanying austerity measures in many member states. Although it is not clear how far the data are collected in a comparable way from year to year, and the analysis of developments over time was not possible for seven of the reporting member states and for some others was based on information from other published comparative reports, it does seem that most member states with a relatively high level of provision have been able to maintain or increase that level, while a number of member states at a low level of provision have succeeded in increasing the availability of such services.

While services for victims of rape or sexual assault have also increased, especially with regard to their accessibility, only a minority of member states fulfil all of the criteria. Even when the analysis assessed the number of member states that fulfil at least three criteria, the responses show this has not increased since 2010. Thus, it must be said that the obligation of states to provide medical and psychological support, advice concerning possible legal redress, and empowerment towards recovery to women victims of sexual violence is still lagging well behind the provision for victims of domestic violence.

The Istanbul Convention seems to have triggered some of the changes to be seen regarding provision, such as the increase in accessibility of services to all women (for both domestic violence and rape) and the increase in elaboration of minimum standards for shelters. Programmes aiming to change the violent behaviour of men, and in particular for perpetrators of violence against an intimate partner, have increased in number as well as in the establishment of co-operation with victim services; this is a further promising development that has gained impetus since the Convention was agreed.

Prevention

Awareness-raising, education and training have been a focus of increasing attention in the member states since the 2006-2008 Council of Europe Campaign to Combat Violence against Women, including Domestic Violence. The fact that prevention is now a central focus of the Istanbul Convention seems to be pushing this development forward. While cross-national comparability of school systems and their regulation is low, the great majority of states report that prevention of violence against women and domestic violence is being addressed in schools, and many member states delivered more detailed information, for example on curricular materials or on the legal duty of schools to teach in this area. The data on appropriate specific training of professionals also shows an increase in the number of states that regularly train school teachers and pre-school teachers, both during their initial vocational training and (less often) through later in-service training. Together, this information shows a growing recognition of the importance of preventive work in the public school system and in pre-schools.

All but two member states now include violence against women intervention and prevention in their basic training of police, and a majority also provide in-service training to police. Initial training of social workers in this area has also increased significantly. There is some increase in the number of states providing regular training to lawyers and to judges, although most of this appears to be initial training where the problems of practical application of the law are less likely to be in focus. Training for healthcare professionals seems to have stagnated at the level reported in 2010. Thus, an overall effort to develop the competence of professionals to respond appropriately when they encounter reports or other indications of violence against women can be seen from comparison of the current data from that in past rounds of monitoring, but this effort is somewhat uneven and may be hampered to some extent by lack of resources for innovative work.

Data Collection

While the monitoring data show an overall increase both in the collection of administrative statistics and in the implementation of population-based prevalence surveys, comparability is still rather low. There are different methods of compiling police data on reported offences by sex and relationship, or reporting on domestic violence, and bringing these reporting systems into a common framework will be a challenge. Some research surveys have covered a wide range of forms of violence against women, and others have focussed on domestic violence. There is a considerable amount of work to be done, both within the member states and in developing comparability, to meet the standards set by the Istanbul Convention in Article 11 and their elaboration in the Explanatory Report.

Challenges of monitoring

The monitoring framework was based on indicators, with the aim of assessing progress in implementing the Recommendation. Indicators are, by their nature, pointers, measurable facts that represent the reality concerned; they are not the reality itself. The Group of Experts charged with developing the monitoring framework sought *“to identify information that is, or could be, readily available to the responsible administrators in each member state, and that can be considered indicative of an overall policy addressing violence against women, and in particular indicative of the implementation of Rec(2002)5.”* The questions were thus never intended to draw a full picture of what is being done to combat violence against women; good indicators were expected to point to the existence of other activities as well⁴⁵.

Selecting items such that all member states can provide information that is reasonably comparable and valid across Europe not only encounters difficulties due to the great variety of legal systems, institutional structures, procedural traditions and established practices, it is intrinsically difficult because violence against women is a “transversal” policy issue. An act of gender-based violence is not simply an offence that can be defined as a crime, prosecuted and punished; it is embedded in relations of gender and sexuality, as well as social norms and expectations of the family; and the measures that need to be taken to stop the violence and protect the victim cut across all domains of the law: not only criminal law, but family law, civil law, administrative and police law are involved.

An example of the difficulty of monitoring is the attempt to measure the engagement of member states by their financial investment in combating violence against women. As plausible as this idea is, it runs counter to the way budgeting of public money is handled. In larger countries, the activities required to deal effectively with the problem typically include responsibilities at the national, regional and local authority levels. Furthermore, mainstreaming key activities such as professional training is typically not monetized in distinct budget items. If hospitals open a sexual assault referral service, this may not appear as a separate budget item except in the house budget of the hospital in question.

Because violence against women is embedded in the cultures, traditions, institutions and practices of European societies, the measures to overcome it must be similarly embedded; a “cookie-cutter” approach will not be effective, nor will it find acceptance. The monitoring framework has thus been revised twice to achieve more accurate information, but requesting additional information was also open to variable interpretations by the respondents. While the member states have developed an impressive willingness to participate in the monitoring process and to allow their policies and practices to be measured against a common standard, the data always require careful qualitative consideration of what is, or might be, the understanding from which the answers are given. Despite best efforts to define the concepts and options for answering in explanatory notes, there is seldom an exact fit between the indicators and the legal, institutional or practical realities in different member states, and requests for clarification remain indispensable. Thus, monitoring the Istanbul Convention will need to consider the fuller picture and the context of measures and policies for each country.

⁴⁵ See final report of the Group of Specialists EG-S-MV (2004) RAP FIN rev, p.49

APPENDIX

1. Have you established a comprehensive and co-ordinated policy addressing all forms of violence covered by the Istanbul Convention and offering a holistic response to violence against women? If there is such a comprehensive policy, is it laid out in an overarching Plan of Action (NAP) or National Strategy? Or in several interrelated Plans or Strategies? What is the time frame? (Please indicate in comments, if there are several NAP, what time frames have been set for each)

If no, do you have Plans of Action or National Strategies for some of the forms of violence covered by the Istanbul Convention? If yes, please indicate in comments which these are.

Table 1 - Existence of comprehensive and co-ordinated policy

Country	Establishment of a comprehensive and co-ordinated policy ?	Is such a policy laid out in an overarching NAP or NS?	In several interrelated Plans or Strategies?	What is the time frame?	If no, do you have NAPs or Strategies for some of the forms of violence covered by the Istanbul Convention?	If yes, indicate which these are
Albania	Yes	Yes	Yes	2011-2015	/	/
Andorra	No	No	/	/	Yes	Integral action for victims of GBV at the level of Ministry of Social Affairs and Health. Work underway on Draft specific law to combat VAW.
Armenia	No	No	/	/	Yes	Strategic AP to combat GBV 2011-2015
Austria	No	No	No	NAP on VAW under preparation	Yes	Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2014
Azerbaijan	Yes	Yes	Yes	National Activity Program in area of improving effectiveness of protection of HR and freedoms permanently / State Program on poverty reducing and sustainable development 2008-2015	/	/
Belgium	No	/	/	/	Yes	NAP to combat violence between partners and certain forms of intra-family violence 2010-2014 / Women, Peace and Security: Belgian AP for the implementation of UNSC Res 1325 / Joint AP of the Francophone governments to combat violence between partners, expanded to other forms of GBV
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Yes	Yes	NS for Prevention and Combating DV for period 2009-2011 / Programme for victims of rape, sexual abuse and torture in BiH 2013-2016 / Strategy for Combating DV in Republika Srpska until 2013 / AP for the Implementation of UN Res 1325 "Women, Peace and Security" in BiH / Strategy for Prevention of and Fight against DV in Federation of BiH 2013-2017	Yes	/

Country	Establishment of a comprehensive and coordinated policy ?	Is such a policy laid out in an overarching NAP or NS?	In several interrelated Plans or Strategies?	What is the time frame?	If no, do you have NAPs or Strategies for some of the forms of violence covered by the Istanbul Convention?	If yes, indicate which these are
Bulgaria	No	/	/	/	Yes	National Programme for Prevention and Protection against DV, Council of Ministers Decree № 207 by 29.03.2013 (developed annually) / National Plan for prevention of violence against children (2012 -2014), adopted by the Council of Ministers on 23.05.2012 / Action Plan for 2013 for the implementation of the Strategy for Crime Prevention (2012 -2020), Council of Ministers Decision № 133 by 04.03.2013 / National Strategy for Promotion of Gender Equality 2009-2015 (ch on violence) / National Strategy for the Child 2008-2018 and Annual National Programmes for Child Protection
Croatia	No	/	/	2011-2016 2011-2015 2011-2014	Yes	NS of Protection against Family Violence 2011-2016 / National Policy for GE 2011-2015 / NAP for Implementation of UNSC Res 1325 on Women, Peace and Security and related Resolutions 2011-2014
Cyprus	No	No	No	/	Yes	NAP on Prevention and Handling of Family Violence 2010-2013 NAP against Trafficking in Human Beings 2013-2015 / NAP on GE 2007-2013
Czech Republic	No	/	/	/	Yes	NAP for the Prevention of DV 2011 - 2014
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	2002-2004 2005-2008 2009-2012	/	NSs contribute to supplement and strengthen broad range of services within the social, health and legal systems. All ensure victims of violence get the necessary support and treatment and that perpetrators are prosecuted.
Estonia	No	No	No	/	Yes	National Development Plan for Reducing Violence 2010-2014
Finland	No	/	/	/	Yes	AP to reduce VAW 2010-2015 / AP for the prevention of circumcision of girls and women 2012-2016 / NAP on Women, Peace and Security (second AP based on UNSC Res 1325) / "A Safer Tomorrow", 3rd Internal Security Programme
France	Yes	Yes	No	2011-2013 2014-2016	/	/
Georgia	Yes	Yes	/	2013-2015 NAP for prevention and combating DV	/	/
Germany	Yes	Yes	/	1999 - 2007 2007 -	/	/
Greece	Yes	Yes	No	Programme national pour l'égalité substantielle 2010-2013 (+ 2 ans)	No	/
Hungary	Yes	Yes	No	2010-2021	/	National Strategy for the Promotion of GE 2010–2021
Iceland	No	No	No	/	No	/

Country	Establishment of a comprehensive and coordinated policy?	Is such a policy laid out in an overarching NAP or NS?	In several interrelated Plans or Strategies?	What is the time frame?	If no, do you have NAPs or Strategies for some of the forms of violence covered by the	If yes, indicate which these are
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	2010 - 2014 NAP on Domestic, Sexual and Gender-based Violence	/	/
Italy	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	NAP against GBV and Stalking
Latvia	No	No	No	/	Yes	Guidelines for State Family Policy 2011-2017 / Plan for GE implementation 2012-2014
Liechtenstein	No	/	/	/	Yes	Annual report from Office of Equal Opportunity of action and measures regarding DV
Lithuania	Yes	No	Yes	Preparation of 2013-2020 NP for Prevention of DV and Provision of Assistance to Victims in final stage	/	/
Luxembourg	No	/	/	/	Yes	AP for GE
Malta	No	/	/	/	Yes	In the process of formulating and establishing an AP to address all forms of VAW covered by the Istanbul Convention. The PA 2007- 2012 focused mainly on DV.
Moldova	No	No	No	/	Yes	NP and AP on GE for 2010-2015 / NAP for preventing and combating human trafficking 2012-2013 / NAP of HR 2011-2014 / NS on reproductive health 2005-2015 / National policy on health 2007-2021 / Strategic Development plan of the Ministry of Internal Affairs
Monaco	No	/	/	/	Yes	/
Montenegro	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strategy on Protection from DV 2011-2015 AP for the Achievement of GE 2013-2017	/	/
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Biannual report published on progress within framework of the national action on the combat of violence in dependency relations.	Yes	A plan of action on the prevention of forced marriages and a plan of action "elder people in safe hands".
Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes	2011-2015 for DV NAP	/	Overall strategies are: protection, prevention and prosecution.
Poland	No	No	No	/	Yes	NP for Prevention of Family Violence / NP for Prevention of Alcohol-Related Problems, with a section on family violence.

Country	Establishment of a comprehensive and coordinated policy?	Is such a policy laid out in an overarching NAP or NS?	In several interrelated Plans or Strategies?	What is the time frame?	If no, do you have NAPs or Strategies for some of the forms of violence covered by the Istanbul Convention?	If yes, indicate which these are
Portugal	No	/	/	/	Yes	NAP Against DV 2011-2013 / Action Programme to Eliminate Female Genital Mutilation 2011-2013 / NAP for the implementation of the UNSC Res 1325 2009-2013 / NAP Against Trafficking in Human Beings 2011-2013 / NAP for Equality - Gender, Citizenship and Non-discrimination 2011-2013 - ensures the articulation between all the other Plans
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes	2013-2017	/	2013-2017 NS on Preventing and Combating DV and the Operational Plan for its implementation
San Marino	No	/	/	/	Yes	20.5.2013 Report by Secretary to Parliament about phenomenon of VAW
Serbia	Yes	Yes	Yes	2011-2015 for NS for Prevention and Elimination of VAW in Family and Partnership Relations / 2009-2015 NS for Improving the Status of Women and GE	/	/
Slovakia	Yes	Yes	Yes	2009 - 2012 - 2015	No	NAP on VaW 2009-2012 NS on GE 2009-2013 NAP on GE 2010-2013 NS on crime prevention 2012-2015
Slovenia	Yes	No	Yes	NP for Equal Opportunities of Women and Men: 2005-2013 (APs adopted biennially) / NP of Family Violence Protection: 2009-2014 (APs adopted biennially) / NP on Prevention and Combating of Crime: 2012-2016 / AP for Implementation of UNSC Res 1325 and 1820 on Women, Peace And Security: 2010-2015	/	See reply under time frames
Spain	Yes	Yes	No	2013-2016	/	/
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	2007-2010	Yes	/

Country	Establishment of a comprehensive and coordinated policy ?	Is such a policy laid out in an overarching NAP or NS?	In several interrelated Plans or Strategies?	What is the time frame?	If no, do you have NAPs or Strategies for some of the forms of violence covered by the Istanbul Convention?	If yes, indicate which these are
Switzerland	No	/	/	/	Yes	see question 2
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	No	/	Yes	NS for prevention and protection from family violence 2012-2015 NS for GE 2013-2020 NAP for GE 2013-2016	/	/
Turkey	Yes	Yes	No	2012-2015	No	/
Ukraine	Yes	Yes	No	/	/	Law on prevention of family violence entered into force on 15.11.2001 / AP on national campaign against violence 2010-2015
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	/	Various	/	/
Frequency of yes answers	23	21	15		24	
NAP - National Action Plan; AP - Action Plan; NS - National Strategy; NP - National Programme; VAW - Violence Against Women; GE - Gender Equality; HR - Human Rights; DV - Domestic Violence; GBV - Gender-based Violence						

2a. Do national plans or strategies address both domestic violence (as defined in Article 3 (b) of the Istanbul Convention) and the forms of violence against women defined in the Recommendation Rec(2002)5?

Table 2a – National plans or strategies address both domestic violence and violence against women

Country	Do national plans or strategies address both domestic violence (as defined in Article 3 (b) of the Istanbul Convention) and the forms of violence against women defined in Rec(2002)5?
Albania	Yes
Andorra	Yes
Armenia	/
Austria	/
Azerbaijan	Yes
Belgium	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes
Croatia	Yes
Cyprus	Yes
Czech Republic	Yes
Denmark	Yes
Estonia	No
Finland	Yes
France	Yes
Georgia	Yes
Germany	Yes
Greece	Yes
Hungary	Yes
Iceland	No
Ireland	Yes
Italy	Yes
Latvia	Yes
Liechtenstein	No
Lithuania	Yes
Luxembourg	No
Malta	No
Moldova	Yes
Monaco	No
Montenegro	Yes
Netherlands	Yes
Norway	Yes
Poland	No
Portugal	No
Romania	Yes
San Marino	Yes
Serbia	Yes
Slovakia	Yes
Slovenia	Yes
Spain	Yes
Sweden	Yes
Switzerland	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	No
Turkey	Yes
Ukraine	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	35

2b. In particular does national policy specifically address the following?

Table 2b – Forms of violence specifically addressed in national policy

Country	Rape and sexual violence	Violence within the family or domestic unit	Sexual harassment	Female genital mutilation	Violence in conflict and post-conflict situation	Violence in institutional environments	Failure to respect freedom of choice with regard to reproduction	Killings in the name of honour	Forced and early marriage	Total
Albania	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Andorra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
Armenia	/	Yes	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1
Austria	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	0
Azerbaijan	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	6
Belgium	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	5
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	5
Bulgaria	/	Yes	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	6
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	3
Czech Republic	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	2
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
Estonia	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	1
Finland	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	4
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	5
Georgia	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	4
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
Greece	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	6
Hungary	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7
Iceland	/	Yes	Yes	/	/	/	/	/	/	2
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	6
Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	6
Latvia	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	5
Liechtenstein	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	4
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	4
Luxembourg	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	1
Malta	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	/	Yes	No	Yes	5
Moldova	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	4
Monaco	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
Montenegro	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	4
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
Poland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	3
Portugal	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	4
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	6
San Marino	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	7
Serbia	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	5
Slovakia	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	6
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	/	No	No	/	4
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	7
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	5
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
Turkey	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	1
Ukraine	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	4
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
Frequency of yes answers	36	45	35	17	18	25	21	11	22	

3. Do you have a governmental co-ordinating body for implementation of policies and measures to prevent and combat all forms of violence against women? Do you have a national body entrusted with monitoring and evaluation of such policies and measures?

Table 3 – Existence of a governmental co-ordinating body

Country	Governmental co-ordinating body for implementation and evaluation 2005/2006	Governmental co-ordinating body for implementation and evaluation 2007/2008	Governmental co-ordinating body for implementation and evaluation 2009/2010	Governmental co-ordinating body for <i>implementation</i> of policies and measures to prevent and combat all forms of violence against women 2013	National body entrusted with <i>monitoring and evaluation</i> of such policies and measures 2013
Albania	/	/	Yes	Yes	Yes
Andorra	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes
Armenia	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Austria	No	No	No	No	No
Azerbaijan	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bulgaria	No	Yes	Yes	/	/
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cyprus	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Czech Republic	Yes	/	No	Yes	Yes
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Estonia	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Finland	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgia	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greece	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	No
Hungary	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iceland	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Latvia	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Liechtenstein	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Luxembourg	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Malta	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Moldova	/	/	Yes	Yes	Yes
Monaco	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Montenegro	/	No	No	No	No
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	No
Poland	/	/	Yes	Yes	Yes
Portugal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Romania	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes
San Marino	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes
Serbia	Yes	No	/	Yes	Yes
Slovakia	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sweden	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	/	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Turkey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ukraine	/	/	Yes	Yes	Yes
United Kingdom	/	No	Yes	Yes	No
Frequency of yes answers	26	32	35	39	30

4. Are specific funds at governmental levels allocated for activities to combat violence against women?

Table 4 - Funds at governmental levels allocated for activities to combat violence against women

Country	Funds for governmental activities*					Funds for NGO activities*				
	at national level	and/or regional level	and/or local level	If so, how much per year?	Data not available because of decentralised budgeting	at national level	and/or regional level	and/or local level	If so, how much per year?	Data not available because of decentralised budgeting
Albania	Yes	No	Yes	437 000	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	44 000	/
Andorra	Yes	Yes	Yes	192 300	/	Yes	No	No	3390	/
Armenia	No	No	No	/	/	No	No	No	/	/
Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Azerbaijan	No	No	No	/	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	/
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	No	Yes	250 000	/	Yes	No	No	250 000	/
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	approx. 1 364 632	/
Cyprus	Yes	No	No	50 000 Annual budget of Advisory Committee on Prevention and Combating of Violence in the Family	/	Yes	No	No	A.1.) 40 000 A.2.) 112 000 A.3.) In 2012, 224 000 A.4.) The Association for the Prevention and Handling of Domestic Violence received 140 000 in 2012	/
Czech Republic	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	In 2010 violence against women cost an estimated 40 million	/	Yes	No	Yes	/	Yes
Estonia	No	No	No	/	/	Yes	No	No	300 000-400 000 euros per year in 2011-2013 for women's shelters through the Gambling Tax Foundation	/
Finland	Yes	No	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Georgia	Yes	No	No	Data not available	/	No	Yes	Yes	Data not available	/
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Greece	Yes	Yes	Yes	7 500 000 (at national level)	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	300,000 (at national level)	/
Hungary	Yes	No	No	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Iceland	Yes	No	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	/	Yes
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	18.5 million (for NGO operational costs)	Yes
Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	18 million (2012)	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	18 million (2012)	/
Latvia	Yes	No	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	/	Yes
Liechtenstein	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Lithuania	Yes	/	Yes	385 000 National budget	/	Yes	/	Yes	385 000 National budget	/
Luxembourg	Yes	No	No	8 486 734 (2012)	/	Yes	No	No	8 379 266 (2012)	/
Malta	Yes	No	No	Data not available	/	No	No	No	/	/
Moldova	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	No	No	No	/	/
Monaco	No	No	No	/	/	Yes	/	/	No data	/
Montenegro	No	No	No	/	No	Yes	No	Yes	/	Yes
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	105 million	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data not available	/
Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	No	No	approx. 400 000	Yes
Poland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data not available	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Portugal	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Romania	Yes	No	Yes	/	Yes	No	No	Yes	/	Yes
San Marino	No	No	No	/	/	No	No	No	/	/
Serbia	No	No	No	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Slovakia	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Slovenia	Yes	No	Yes	2 271 921 (2012, national level)	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	approx. 80 % of the 2 271 921	Yes
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	325M at national level	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data not available	Yes
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	12 000 000	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	190 000	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	Yes	/	Yes	/	/	Yes	/	Yes	50 000	/
Turkey	Yes	Yes	Yes	68 million	/	No	No	No	/	/
Ukraine	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	No	No	No	/	/
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	Yes	£40 million until 2015	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	39	25	34		24	37	24	33		25

*Funds are in Euros unless otherwise stated.

5. Are the following acts of violence against women penalised / criminalised?

Table 5 - Acts of violence against women penalised / criminalised

Country	All forms of intentional physical violence, irrespective of the nature of the relationship	Psychological violence irrespective of the nature of the relationship	Stalking	All forms of sexual assault to spouses, regular or occasional partners and cohabitants	All sexual acts against non-consenting persons	Rape within marriage on the same basis as rape outside marriage	Sexual harassment at work is a specific criminal offence	Other remedies are provided by the law in cases of sexual harassment at work	Sexual harassment in any other environment is a specific criminal offence	Other remedies are provided for by the law in cases of sexual harassment in any other environment	Female genital mutilation is a specific criminal offence	Other sanctions provided for by the law for female genital mutilation	Forcing an adult or child to enter into marriage is a specific criminal offence	Other sanctions provided for by the law for forced marriage	Performing abortion or sterilisation without prior and informed consent is a specific criminal offence	Other sanctions provided for by the law for non-consensual abortion or sterilisation
Albania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Andorra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Armenia	Yes	/	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Azerbaijan	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	/	Yes	/	Yes	/
Czech Republic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Estonia	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Finland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	/	Yes	Yes
Georgia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	/	Yes	/
Greece	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	/	/	/	/	/	/
Hungary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iceland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	/	No	Yes	Yes	/
Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Latvia	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Liechtenstein	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Luxembourg	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	/
Malta	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Moldova	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	/	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	/
Monaco	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montenegro	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Norway	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	/	Yes	/	Yes	/	Yes	/
Poland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Portugal	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
San Marino	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Serbia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	/	Yes	/	Yes	/
Slovakia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Turkey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	/
Ukraine	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	/
United Kingdom	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	46	40	35	44	44	46	21	34	23	28	19	24	22	24	36	20

6. Is there a legal provision for consideration of the following as aggravating circumstances in sentencing?

Table 6 - Aggravating circumstances considered in sentencing

Country	Act was committed against a former or current spouse or partner	Acts were committed repeatedly	Act was committed against a person made vulnerable by particular circumstances	Act was committed against or in the presence of a child	No general provision, but these circumstances are usually constituent elements of relevant offences
Albania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Andorra	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Armenia	/	Yes	/	Yes	/
Austria	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Azerbaijan	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	No	No	No	No	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Czech Republic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Denmark	No	No	Yes	No	No
Estonia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Finland	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Georgia	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Germany	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Greece	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hungary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iceland	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Latvia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Liechtenstein	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Luxembourg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Malta	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Moldova	No	No	Yes	Yes	/
Monaco	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Montenegro	No	No	No	No	Yes
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Norway	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Poland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Portugal	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
San Marino	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Serbia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Slovakia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Slovenia	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Switzerland	No	No	No	No	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Turkey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Ukraine	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Frequency of yes answers	30	40	41	38	16

7. Has the state made provisions to ensure that the public prosecutor can initiate criminal proceedings in cases of violence within the family and/or cases of sexual violence?

Table 7 - Prosecutor can initiate criminal proceedings

Country	Violence within the family		Sexual violence	
	in all cases?	...only in more severe cases?	in all cases?	...only in more severe cases?
Albania	Yes	/	Yes	/
Andorra	Yes	No	Yes	No
Armenia	Yes	/	Yes	/
Austria	Yes	/	Yes	/
Azerbaijan	No	Yes	No	Yes
Belgium	Yes	No	Yes	No
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bulgaria	No	Yes	Yes	No
Croatia	No	Yes	Yes	No
Cyprus	Yes	/	Yes	/
Czech Republic	Yes	/	Yes	/
Denmark	Yes	/	Yes	/
Estonia	Yes	/	Yes	/
Finland	Yes	/	Yes	/
France	Yes	/	Yes	/
Georgia	Yes	/	Yes	/
Germany	Yes	/	Yes	/
Greece	Yes	/	Yes	/
Hungary	No	Yes	No	Yes
Iceland	Yes	No	Yes	No
Ireland	Yes	/	Yes	/
Italy	Yes	No	No	Yes
Latvia	No	Yes	No	No
Liechtenstein	Yes	No	Yes	No
Lithuania	Yes	/	Yes	/
Luxembourg	Yes	/	Yes	/
Malta	Yes	/	Yes	/
Moldova	Yes	/	Yes	/
Monaco	Yes	No	Yes	/
Montenegro	Yes	/	Yes	/
Netherlands	Yes	No	Yes	No
Norway	Yes	No	Yes	No
Poland	Yes	No	No	Yes
Portugal	Yes	No	No	Yes
Romania	No	Yes	Yes	No
San Marino	Yes	/	Yes	/
Serbia	Yes	/	Yes	/
Slovakia	Yes	/	Yes	/
Slovenia	No	Yes	Yes	No
Spain	Yes	/	Yes	/
Sweden	Yes	No	Yes	No
Switzerland	Yes	No	Yes	No
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	No	Yes	Yes	No
Turkey	Yes	No	Yes	No
Ukraine	No	No	No	No
United Kingdom	Yes	No	Yes	No
Frequency of yes answers	37	9	39	6

8. Are mandatory alternative dispute resolution procedures, including mediation and conciliation, prohibited in all cases of violence against women as defined in Rec(2002)5?

Table 8 - Prohibition of mandatory alternative dispute resolution procedures

Country	Prohibition of mandatory alternative dispute resolution procedures
Albania	No
Andorra	Yes
Armenia	No
Austria	Yes
Azerbaijan	No
Belgium	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	No
Bulgaria	No
Croatia	Yes
Cyprus	Yes
Czech Republic	Yes
Denmark	Yes
Estonia	No
Finland	Yes
France	Yes
Georgia	No
Germany	Yes
Greece	No
Hungary	Yes
Iceland	No
Ireland	N/A
Italy	Yes
Latvia	Yes
Liechtenstein	No
Lithuania	Yes
Luxembourg	Yes
Malta	No
Moldova	No
Monaco	Yes
Montenegro	Yes
Netherlands	No
Norway	No
Poland	No
Portugal	Yes
Romania	No
San Marino	No
Serbia	No
Slovakia	No
Slovenia	Yes
Spain	Yes
Sweden	Yes
Switzerland	No
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	No
Turkey	Yes
Ukraine	No
United Kingdom	No
Frequency of yes answers	22

9. Do the competent authorities (such as the police) have the power to issue emergency barring orders in situations of immediate danger, to prohibit the perpetrator from entering the residence or contacting the person at risk?

Table 9 – Competent authorities have the power to issue emergency barring orders

Country	Competent authorities have the power to issue emergency barring orders
Albania	No
Andorra	No
Armenia	Yes
Austria	Yes
Azerbaijan	Yes
Belgium	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes
Croatia	Yes
Cyprus	Yes
Czech Republic	Yes
Denmark	Yes
Estonia	Yes
Finland	Yes
France	Yes
Georgia	Yes
Germany	Yes
Greece	No
Hungary	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Ireland	No
Italy	Yes
Latvia	No
Liechtenstein	Yes
Lithuania	Yes
Luxembourg	Yes
Malta	No
Moldova	No
Monaco	Yes
Montenegro	Yes
Netherlands	Yes
Norway	Yes
Poland	Yes
Portugal	No
Romania	Yes
San Marino	Yes
Serbia	Yes
Slovakia	Yes
Slovenia	Yes
Spain	Yes
Sweden	Yes
Switzerland	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	No
Turkey	Yes
Ukraine	No
United Kingdom	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	36

10. Are judicial restraining or protection orders issued for a specified period available to victims of violence for their protection? Can these be issued *ex parte* when necessary? Are they available irrespective of, or in addition to other legal proceedings? Can such orders include giving the victim exclusive right to the residence? Is the breach of a restraining order subject to criminal or other legal sanctions?

Table 10 – Judicial restraining or protection orders

Country	Judicial restraining or protection orders				
	...issued for a specified period available to victims of violence for their protection?	...issued <i>ex parte</i> when necessary?	...available irrespective of, or in addition to other legal proceedings?	...include giving the victim exclusive right to the residence?	Is the breach of a restraining order subject to criminal or other legal sanctions?
Albania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Andorra	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Armenia	No	No	No	No	No
Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Azerbaijan	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Czech Republic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Estonia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Finland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgia	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greece	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hungary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iceland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Latvia	No	No	No	No	No
Liechtenstein	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lithuania	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Luxembourg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Malta	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Moldova	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Monaco	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montenegro	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Poland	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Portugal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Romania	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Marino	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Serbia	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Slovakia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Turkey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ukraine	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	44	36	38	40	44

11. How many shelters exist where women who are victims of any form of violence can find safe temporary accommodation with their children and receive counselling and support by specifically trained staff?

Table 11 - Number of shelters, places and their accessibility

Country	Number of shelters	No. of such shelters dedicated only for women victims of violence	No. of such shelters specifically for victims of trafficking	No. of beds	Accessible 24/7	Accessible in sufficiently wide geographical distribution	Free of charge	Minimum standards established
Albania	9	4	5	70	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Andorra	4	4	4	10	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Armenia	6	6	2	52	Yes	No	No	Yes
Austria	33	33	2	777	Yes	Data not available	Yes	Yes
Azerbaijan	0	0	1	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Belgium	23 (7 -Flemish region, 15 - Walloon region, 1 - Brussels-Capital region)	23	None. But there are 3 specialised reception centres in accommodation and assistance to victims of trafficking (1 in Flemish region, 1 in Walloon region, one in the Brussels-Capital)	815 (113 in Flemish region, 678 in Walloon region, 24 in Brussels-Capital region)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	10	/	/	183	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Bulgaria	20	18 crisis centers - no specialised services for women	2	190 beds in crisis centers; 205 beds in total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Croatia	19	17	2	approx. 283 beds	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Cyprus	2	1	1	9 victims of domestic violence with their children	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Czech Republic	100 shelters providing services to other target groups also (eg people in crisis in general).	Data not available	18 shelters providing services to victims of trafficking. Majority also provide services to other target groups.	approx. 3 500	/	No	No	Yes
Denmark	46	41	1	450 for women / 425 for their children	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Estonia	13	11	2	101	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Finland	19	0	Data not available	113 for women, altogether 339 beds for women/victims and children	Yes	No	No	Yes
France	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgia	5 state + 3 NGO-run	All state shelters are for women, children and men	2 shelters under State Fund for the Protection and Assistance of (Statutory) Victims of Trafficking in Persons	77 beds in total (including 26 beds in NGO-run shelters)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Germany	394	353	40	6800	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Greece	13	10	1	330	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Hungary	16	0	1	106	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iceland	2	1	1	25	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Ireland	20	20	0	141 beds for women and at least 450 bed spaces for children	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Italy	70	70	Data not available	560	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Latvia	approx. 30	0	1	Data not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Liechtenstein	1	1	0	4 (+ about 8 beds for accompanying children)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Country	Number of shelters	No. of such shelters dedicated only for women victims of violence	No. of such shelters specifically for victims of trafficking	No. of beds	Accessible 24/7	Accessible in sufficiently wide geographical distribution	Free of charge	Minimum standards established
Lithuania	35	Shelters are dedicated to victims of any form of violence.	5 NGO's working in the field of support for the victims of trafficking provide special shelters.	628	/	No	/	Yes
Luxembourg	12	12	Assistance to victims of trafficking is provided in an <i>ad hoc</i> manner.	227 (170 in conventional shelters, and 57 in second stage housing).	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Malta	1st stage shelters: 2; 2nd stage shelter: 1	1	1	See answer under No of shelters	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Moldova	8	1	2	163	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Monaco	1	/	/	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montenegro	5	3	1	Data not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Netherlands	34 organisations providing women's shelters	/	Besides the women's shelters there are 70 'beds' for sheltering victims of trafficking	2200 beds for women and children, 1/3 used for children	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Norway	48	/	0	Data not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Poland	368	Data not available	19	174 for victims of trafficking	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Portugal	38	37	1	645	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Romania	59	/	/	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Marino	1	1	Data not available	Data not available	/	/	/	/
Serbia	12	12	1 in Belgrade (part of Center for Human Trafficking Victims Protection)	225	Yes	No	Yes	/
Slovakia	52	16	2	984 / 285 specialised women places	Yes	No	No	/
Slovenia	2012: 14 shelters (17 locations), 1 crisis centre, 7 mother's homes (11 locations)	14 shelters (17 locations), 1 crisis centre	1 (not included in the above listed numbers)	427 (137 mother's homes, 390 shelters)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Spain	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Sweden	Most municipalities (290) can provide temporary safe accommodation, but only half of them have permanent organisation as described in the question.	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Switzerland*	19	19	0	262	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	5	4	1	30	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Turkey	85	85	1 (NGO shelter)	2239	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ukraine	55	2*	4	n/a	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
United Kingdom**	Data not available	Data not available	14	About 8000 beds for women and their children in England About 1,000 beds for women and children in Scotland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Frequency of yes answers					43	29	36	40

*Data valid end of 2012

** UK numbers for England based on Quilgars and Pleace, 2010

12. Are there services available with specifically trained staff for women who are victims of sexual assault?

Table 12 - Existence of services for victims of sexual assault

Country	Existence of services with specifically trained staff for women victims of sexual assault	Number of such services	Services that ensure immediate medical care	Services that ensure forensic examination and documentation	Services that ensure trauma support and counselling	Services accessible to all women	Services accessible in sufficiently wide geographical distribution	Services accessible for all women and free of charge
Albania	No	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Andorra	Yes	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Armenia	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Austria	Yes	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Azerbaijan	No	/	No	No	No	No	No	No
Belgium	Yes	Data not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	10	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Croatia	No	/	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Cyprus	Yes	Data not available	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Czech Republic	Yes	Data not available	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Denmark	Yes	4 regional centres for victims of rape	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Estonia	No	/	No	No	No	No	No	No
Finland	Yes	In 2 hospitals	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
France	Yes	78 structures	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgia	No	/	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Germany	Yes	183	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Greece	Yes	41	No	No	No	No	No	No
Hungary	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iceland	Yes	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ireland	Yes	17 Sexual Support Services and 6 Sexual assault Treatment Units	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Italy	Yes	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Latvia	No	/	No	No	No	No	No	No
Liechtenstein	No	/	No	No	No	No	No	No
Lithuania	Yes	5	No	No	No	No	No	No
Luxembourg	Yes	/	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Malta	Yes	1 service: the Domestic Violence Unit	No	No	No	No	No	No
Moldova	No	/	No	No	No	No	No	No
Monaco	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montenegro	No	/	No	No	No	No	No	No
Netherlands	Yes	2 rape centres (Utrecht en Nijmegen)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Norway	Yes	approx. 21	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Poland	Yes	35	No	No	No	No	No	No
Portugal	No	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Romania	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Marino	Yes	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Serbia	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	No	Yes
Slovakia	No	/	No	No	No	No	No	No
Slovenia	Yes	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Spain	Yes	Data not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sweden	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Switzerland	Yes	Data not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	No	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Turkey	No	/	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ukraine	Yes	/	No	No	No	No	No	No
United Kingdom	Yes	46 in England and Wales	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	33		25	24	26	28	20	25

13. Is there a state-wide round-the-clock (24/7) telephone helpline free of charge to provide advice to callers confidentially in relation to:
- all forms of violence against women?
 - domestic violence specifically?

Table 13 - Existence of state round-the-clock (24/7) telephone helpline free of charge

Country	Existence of state-wide round-the-clock (24/7), free of charge and confidential telephone helpline in relation to	
	...all forms of violence?	...domestic violence specifically?
Albania	No	No
Andorra	No	No
Armenia	Yes	Yes
Austria	Yes	/
Azerbaijan	No	No
Belgium	No	No
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	/
Croatia	Yes	Yes
Cyprus	No	No
Czech Republic	No	No
Denmark	No	Yes
Estonia	No	No
Finland	No	No
France	No	No
Georgia	Yes	Yes
Germany	Yes	/
Greece	Yes	No
Hungary	Yes	Yes
Iceland	Yes	Yes
Ireland	No	No
Italy	Yes	Yes
Latvia	Yes	Yes
Liechtenstein	Yes	Yes
Lithuania	No	No
Luxembourg	No	No
Malta	Yes	Yes
Moldova	No	No
Monaco	No	No
Montenegro	No	No
Netherlands	No	No
Norway	Yes	Yes
Poland	No	No
Portugal	No	Yes
Romania	No	No
San Marino	Yes	Yes
Serbia	Yes	Yes
Slovakia	No	No
Slovenia	No	Yes
Spain	No	Yes
Sweden	Yes	Yes
Switzerland	No	No
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	No	Yes
Turkey	Yes	No
Ukraine	Yes	Yes
United Kingdom	No	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	20	21

14. Is the provision of all victim support services independent of the victim's willingness to press charges or testify against any perpetrator?

Table 14 – Provision of support services independent of co-operating with prosecution

Country	Provision of all victim support services independent of the victim's willingness to press charges or testify against any perpetrator
Albania	Yes
Andorra	Yes
Armenia	Yes
Austria	Yes
Azerbaijan	Yes
Belgium	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes
Croatia	Yes
Cyprus	Yes
Czech Republic	Yes
Denmark	Yes
Estonia	Yes
Finland	Yes
France	Yes
Georgia	No
Germany	Yes
Greece	Yes
Hungary	Yes
Iceland	Yes
Ireland	Yes
Italy	Yes
Latvia	Yes
Liechtenstein	Yes
Lithuania	Yes
Luxembourg	Yes
Malta	Yes
Moldova	Yes
Monaco	Yes
Montenegro	Yes
Netherlands	Yes
Norway	Yes
Poland	No
Portugal	Yes
Romania	Yes
San Marino	Yes
Serbia	No
Slovakia	Yes
Slovenia	Yes
Spain	Yes
Sweden	Yes
Switzerland	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	Yes
Turkey	Yes
Ukraine	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	43

15. Are children who witness violence against their mothers given protection and assistance to meet their needs, including age-appropriate psychosocial counselling? Are staff for support of child witnesses specifically trained on violence against women and its impact on children? Are the services for children free of charge?

Table 15 – Support services for child witnesses

Country	Protection and assistance for children, including age appropriate psychosocial counselling	All staff specifically trained on violence against women	Services for children free of charge
Albania	Yes	Yes	Yes
Andorra	No	No	No
Armenia	Yes	Yes	Yes
Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes
Azerbaijan	No	No	No
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Yes
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	Yes
Czech Republic	Yes	Yes	Yes
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes
Estonia	Yes	No	Yes
Finland	No	No	Yes
France	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greece	Yes	No	Yes
Hungary	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iceland	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes
Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes
Latvia	Yes	No	Yes
Liechtenstein	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	Yes
Luxembourg	Yes	Yes	Yes
Malta	Yes	No	Yes
Moldova	Yes	Yes	Yes
Monaco	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montenegro	Yes	Yes	Yes
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes
Poland	No	Yes	Yes
Portugal	Yes	Yes	Yes
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Marino	Yes	Yes	Yes
Serbia	Yes	/	Yes
Slovakia	Yes	Yes	Yes
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	Yes
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	Yes	Yes	Yes
Turkey	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ukraine	Yes	Yes	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	42	38	43

16. Are there specifically designed intervention programmes, conducted by professionals, offered to men perpetrators of violence against women?

Table 16 - Intervention programmes for men perpetrators

Country	Existence of intervention programmes for men perpetrators of violence against women	...for men perpetrators of violence against an intimate partner	...for men perpetrators of sexual violence	Number of existing programmes	Number of places	... on a voluntary basis?	...within the criminal justice system?	... after referrals from the justice system?	All programmes cooperate regularly with services that protect and support victims	Some programmes cooperate regularly with services that protect and support victims
Albania	No	No	No	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Andorra	No	No	No	/	/	No	No	No	No	No
Armenia	No	No	No	/	/	No	No	No	No	No
Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Azerbaijan	No	No	No	0	0	No	No	No	No	No
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data not available	Depends on the demand	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Yes	Yes	2	/	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	/	4	/	Yes	/	Yes	Yes	Yes
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes	2	11	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	No	1	15-20 persons in each group	Yes	No	No	Yes	/
Czech Republic	Yes	Yes	Yes	In 2012 seven programmes were supported by the Ministry of the Interior. However, the total number of programmes for perpetrators of violence against women provided by NGOs is higher.	Data not available	Yes	No	No	Yes	/
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	4 plus programmes within the prison system	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Estonia	Yes	Yes	Yes	2	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Finland	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	?	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	141	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Georgia	No	No	No	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Greece	Yes	Yes	No	6-7	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Hungary	No	No	No	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Iceland	Yes	Yes	Yes	1	60	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	13 for DV perpetrators Data not available for SV perpetrator programmes	approx. 107 in DV perpetrator programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	approx. 10	Data not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Latvia	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	Data not available	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes

Country	Existence of intervention programmes for men perpetrators of violence against women	...for men perpetrators of violence against an intimate partner	...for men perpetrators of sexual violence	Number of existing programmes	Number of places	... on a voluntary basis?	... within the criminal justice system?	... after referrals from the justice system?	All programmes cooperate regularly with services that protect and support victims	Some programmes cooperate regularly with services that protect and support victims
Liechtenstein	No	No	No	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	Yes	2	313	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Luxembourg	Yes	Yes	Yes	1	No places available, since it is a consultation service for perpetrators	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Malta	Yes	Yes	No	1	14	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Moldova	Yes	Yes	No	1	10 (only day programme)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	/
Monaco	No	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Montenegro	No	No	No	/	/	No	No	No	No	No
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	1 (focused on intimate partner violence)	Data not available	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data not available	approx. 100	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Poland	Yes	Yes	Yes	200 institutions have such programmes	approx. 4000	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Portugal	Yes	Yes	Yes	1 at national level and 1 at Azores Islands (both for domestic violence perpetrators); 1 national program for convicted sexual perpetrators in custody	No limit group intervention	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	/	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
San Marino	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	/	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Serbia	Yes	Yes	No	1	3 (Belgrade, Kragujevac and Nis)	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Slovakia	Yes	Yes	Yes	1 pilot	N/A	Yes	No	No	/	Yes
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	Yes	1 at national level with several locations	/	Yes	Yes	/	Yes	/
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Data not available	Data not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	/
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	2	Swedish Prison Service has about 550 special places in prison for perpetrators of VAW, of which 400 for perpetrators of SV	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 cantons have their own programmes; most cantons offer guidance.	Data not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	Yes	Yes	No	2	2	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	/
Turkey	Yes	Yes	No	4	14	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Ukraine	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	/	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	Yes	approx. 17 in England and 4 in Northern Ireland	About 3,500 places available for 2013/14 across the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) for perpetrators of intimate partner violence. About 2,300 places available for 2013/14 across NOMS for perpetrators of sexual violence.	Yes	Yes	Yes	/	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	37	37	29			31	27	27	13	24

17. Has a code of conduct or other set of guidelines and self-regulatory standards been drawn up for media professionals to prevent violence against women and to enhance respect for women’s dignity?

Table 17 - Code of conduct or other set of guidelines and self-regulatory standards for media professionals

Country	Code of conduct or other set of guidelines and self-regulatory standards for media professionals
Albania	No
Andorra	No
Armenia	No
Austria	Yes
Azerbaijan	No
Belgium	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes
Croatia	Yes
Cyprus	Yes
Czech Republic	No
Denmark	No
Estonia	No
Finland	No
France	Yes
Georgia	No
Germany	Yes
Greece	Yes
Hungary	No
Iceland	No
Ireland	No
Italy	No
Latvia	No
Liechtenstein	No
Lithuania	No
Luxembourg	No
Malta	No
Moldova	No
Monaco	No
Montenegro	Yes
Netherlands	Yes
Norway	No
Poland	No
Portugal	No
Romania	No information available
San Marino	No
Serbia	Yes
Slovakia	No
Slovenia	No
Spain	Yes
Sweden	No
Switzerland	No
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	No
Turkey	Yes
Ukraine	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	16

18. Is teaching material relevant to the prevention of violence against women (see Article 14 of the Istanbul Convention) included in formal curricula and at all levels (primary, secondary and tertiary) of education? Is it a general duty of schools to provide such education? Is it done in some schools and age groups?

Table 18 – Inclusion of teaching material in formal curricula

Country	Teaching material included in formal curricula and at all levels of education?	...general duty of schools to provide such education?	...education provided in some schools and age groups?
Albania	Yes	Yes	Yes
Andorra	No	No	Yes
Armenia	No	Yes	Yes
Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes
Azerbaijan	No	No	No
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	No	No	No
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Yes
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	Yes
Czech Republic	Yes	Yes	/
Denmark	Yes	No	Yes
Estonia	No	No	Yes
Finland	Yes	No	Yes
France	Yes	Yes	/
Georgia	No	/	/
Germany	Yes	/	/
Greece	No	Yes	Yes
Hungary	Yes	No	Yes
Iceland	No	No	Yes
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes
Italy	No	No	Yes
Latvia	Yes	Yes	No data
Liechtenstein	No	Yes	Yes
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	Yes
Luxembourg	No	No	No
Malta	Yes	Yes	Yes
Moldova	Yes	Yes	Yes
Monaco	No	No	No
Montenegro	Yes	Yes	Yes
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes
Norway	No	No	Yes
Poland	Yes	Yes	Yes
Portugal	No	No	Yes
Romania	No	No	Yes
San Marino	No	No	No
Serbia	Yes	Yes	Yes
Slovakia	No	No	Yes
Slovenia	/	/	/
Spain	Yes	Yes	/
Sweden	Yes	Yes	/
Switzerland	No	No	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	No	No	Yes
Turkey	No	No	No
Ukraine	No	No	Yes
United Kingdom	No	Yes	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	23	23	32

19a. Which of the following groups of professionals regularly receive appropriate specific initial vocational training on violence against women, prevention and intervention?

Table 19a - Initial vocational training

Country	Police	Lawyers	Judges	Social workers	Physicians	Psychologists and therapists	Nurses and midwives	School teachers	Pre-school teachers	Media professionals
Albania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Andorra	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Armenia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Austria	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Azerbaijan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Belgium	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Czech Republic	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Denmark	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Estonia	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Finland	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
France	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Greece	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hungary	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Iceland	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Ireland	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Latvia	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Liechtenstein	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Luxembourg	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Malta	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Moldova	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Monaco	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Montenegro	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Poland	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Portugal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Marino	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Serbia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Slovakia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Slovenia	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Switzerland	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Turkey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Ukraine	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Frequency of yes answers	44	28	31	38	19	22	22	20	14	10

19b. Which of the following groups of professionals regularly receive appropriate specific further education on violence against women, prevention and intervention?

Table 19b - Further training

Country	Police	Lawyers	Judges	Social workers	Physicians	Psychologists and therapists	Nurses and midwives	School teachers	Pre-school teachers	Media professionals
Albania	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Andorra	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Armenia	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Austria	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Azerbaijan	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Czech Republic	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Denmark	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Estonia	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Finland	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgia	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Germany	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greece	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Hungary	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iceland	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Ireland	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Italy	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Latvia	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Liechtenstein	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Luxembourg	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Malta	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Moldova	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Monaco	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Montenegro	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Poland	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Portugal	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Romania	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
San Marino	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Serbia	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Slovakia	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sweden	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
Turkey	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Ukraine	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Frequency of yes answers	29	21	23	26	24	19	20	24	22	12

20. Do police statistics systematically record in standardised categories according to criminal offences: sex of victim, age of victim, sex of perpetrator, age of perpetrator, relationship of perpetrator to victim? Do police statistics combine sex of perpetrator, sex of victim and their relationship in reporting on the most common criminal offences within the family? Are disaggregated statistics on cases of the different forms of violence against women regularly made available in a national report? Does it report specifically on domestic violence?

Table 20 - Police statistics

Country	Police statistics systematically record sex of victim	Police statistics systematically record age of victim	Police statistics systematically record sex of perpetrator	Police statistics systematically record age of perpetrator	Police statistics systematically record relationship of perpetrator to victim	Statistics combine sex of perpetrator, sex of victim and their relationship	Availability of disaggregated statistics in a national report	Statistical police report specifically on domestic violence
Albania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Andorra	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Armenia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Azerbaijan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Belgium	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Czech Republic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Estonia	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Finland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
France	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greece	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Hungary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Iceland	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Latvia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Liechtenstein	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Lithuania	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
Luxembourg	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Malta	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Moldova	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Monaco	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Montenegro	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No*	Yes	Yes
Norway	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Poland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Portugal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Marino	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Serbia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Slovakia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sweden	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Turkey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Ukraine	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
United Kingdom	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Frequency of yes answers	39	36	39	36	31	29	23	30

* Information can be obtained, however, by linking of systems

21. Are questions on violence against women integrated in a regular representative national survey?

22. Has there been a representative national survey focussing on the prevalence and effects of all forms of violence against women? When? Are there plans to repeat the survey?

23. Has there been a representative national survey focussing on the prevalence and effects of domestic violence? When? Are there plans to repeat the survey?

Table 21-22-23 - Surveys on violence against women and domestic violence

Country	Integration of questions on VaW in a regular representative national survey	Representative national survey focusing on prevalence and effects of all forms of VAW	...when ?	...are there plans to repeat the survey?	Representative national survey focusing on prevalence and effects of domestic violence	...when ?	...are there plans to repeat the survey?
Albania	Yes	Yes	2009	Yes	Yes	2009	Yes
Andorra	No	No	/	No	No	/	No
Armenia	No	No	/	No	No	/	No
Austria	No	Yes	2011	/	Yes	2011	/
Azerbaijan	Yes	No	/	No	No	/	No
Belgium	No	No	/	/	Yes	2010	No
Bosnia and Herzegovina	No	Yes	2013	Yes	Yes	2013	Yes
Bulgaria	No	No	/	No	No	/	No
Croatia	Yes	No	/	Yes	Yes	2010-2012	No
Cyprus	No	No	/	/	Yes	2012	/
Czech Republic	No	Yes	2004, 2006, 2012	Yes	Yes	see Q22	Yes
Denmark	Yes	Yes	2003	No	Yes	2012	/
Estonia	No	No	/	No	Yes	2008-2009, report 2010	Yes
Finland	Yes	Yes	1997, 2005, 2010	No	Yes	1997, 2005, 2010	No
France	Yes	No	/	/	Yes	2000	Yes
Georgia	Yes	No	/	/	No	/	/
Germany	No	Yes	2004	Yes	Yes	2004	No
Greece	No	No	N/A	No	Yes	2003	Yes
Hungary	No	No	/	/	No	/	/
Iceland	No	Yes	2009	No	Yes	2009	No
Ireland	No	Yes	2002 Sexual Violence 2005 Domestic Violence	No	Yes	2005	No
Italy	No	Yes	2006	Yes	Yes	2006	Yes
Latvia	No	No	/	No	No	/	No
Liechtenstein	No	No	/	/	Yes	2003	No
Lithuania	No	No	/	No	Yes	2008	No
Luxembourg	No	No	/	No	Yes	2003-2012	Yes
Malta	No	No	/	/	Yes	2011	Yes
Moldova	No	No	/	No	Yes	2011	No
Monaco	No	No	/	/	No	/	/
Montenegro	No	Yes	2011	Yes	Yes	2011	Yes
Netherlands	No	Yes	2010	No	Yes	2010-2011	Yes
Norway	Yes	Yes	ongoing	Yes	Yes	ongoing	Yes
Poland	No	No	/	/	Yes	2010	Yes
Portugal	No	No	/	No	Yes	2007	Yes
Romania	No	No	/	No	Yes	2012	No
San Marino	Yes	Yes	2010	Yes	Yes	2010	Yes
Serbia	Yes	No	/	No	No	/	No
Slovakia	No	Yes	2005 and 2008	Yes	Yes	2005 and 2008	Yes
Slovenia	No	No	/	/	Yes	2010-2011	/
Spain	Yes	No	/	/	Yes	1999,2002,2006,2011	Yes
Sweden	Yes	Yes	annually (since 2006)	Yes	Yes	annually (since 2006)	Yes
Switzerland	No	Yes	1997 and 2004	Yes	Yes	2009	No
«the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia»	Yes	Yes	2009/10	Yes	Yes	2009/10	Yes
Turkey	Yes	Yes	2008	Yes	Yes	2008	Yes
Ukraine	No	No	/	No	No	/	No
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	continuously since 2004/5	Yes	Yes	Alternate years since 2004/5	Yes
Frequency of yes answers	15	20		15	36		21