

# ONLINE DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED INDICATORS FOR DATA COLLECTION ON INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE, RAPE AND FEMICIDE

## Report



## Table of contents

Table of contents.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Organisation of the Discussion.....	3
Participation.....	5
Summary of the Discussion .....	5
Session One: Welcome and short explanation of how the indicators have been developed .....	5
Session Two: Indicators for data collection on intimate partner violence.....	5
Session Three: Indicators for data collection on rape .....	12
Session Four: Indicators for data collection on femicide .....	13
Session Five: Common questions to all forms of violence and closing remarks.....	15
Conclusions and follow-up .....	18
Annex .....	20
Annex I: Proposed indicators .....	20
Annex II: Transcript of the online discussion on proposed indicators for data collection on intimate partner violence, rape and femicide .....	20
Annex III: List of registered participants .....	20

## Introduction

Since 2010, EIGE has been actively contributing to increasing knowledge of the phenomenon of violence against women (VAW) in the Member States. EIGE has mapped the available data on different forms of violence against women, identified effective practices in combatting violence, and analysed legal and other background information which provides the current framework for EU efforts to combat VAW.

EIGE has analysed and highlighted current gaps in definitions, in interpretation of concepts and in the collection of administrative data across the EU, as well as examining the differences in legislative approaches across the Member States. This work aims to improve both the collection and availability of administrative data on VAW, as well as highlighting the need for comparability across the EU. Current data collection practices must be improved in order to ensure that administrative data are comparable and can be used to enhance the coherence of the framework across the EU.

The online discussion on proposed indicators for data collection on intimate partner violence (IPV), rape and femicide took place on 7 July 2016. It was organised in the context of EIGE's *Study on terminology and indicators used in data collection on rape, femicide and intimate partner violence (the Study)* carried out by Milieu Ltd. The study examines the lack of comparable and reliable EU-wide data on VAW.

The main purpose of the online discussion was to gather feedback on the proposed indicators for data collection on instances of rape, femicide and intimate partner violence. Participants' input will be used to refine the indicators developed to facilitate monitoring and policy evaluation across the EU to combat these forms of VAW. The refined list of indicators will be included in the report on indicators as one of deliverables conducted for the Study.

A group of selected stakeholders were invited to participate in the online discussion, including representatives of international organisations that focus on violence against women (e.g. Council of Europe, OECD, UNESCO), representatives of EU bodies (e.g. the European Commission, Eurostat, FRA), national authorities of the Member States, researchers from national statistical offices, experts from the EuroGender network, senior and national experts involved in the Study and independent experts.

This report summarises the main issues covered during the online discussion. It also gathers together the most relevant quotes and insights, outlines the gaps and challenges identified by the participants, and provides some conclusions and recommendations relevant for EIGE's future work in the area.

## Organisation of the Discussion

The online discussion took the form of five sessions, hosted by EIGE on the EuroGender platform (<http://eurogender.eige.europa.eu/>). The first session provided a short explanation of how the indicators had been developed, with each of the following three sessions dealing specifically with the indicators on intimate partner violence, rape or femicide. The last session dealt with the questions that were common to all three forms of VAW.

## **1. Welcome and short explanation of how the indicators have been developed**

## **2. Indicators for data collection on intimate partner violence**

This session dealt with the following questions:

- Are the indicators on intimate partner violence clear?
- Do the indicators on intimate partner violence cover the most important aspects of their incidence?
- Do you agree with the age group of 18 and over?
- Will the indicators help to achieve a comparable measurement of intimate partner violence across the EU-28?
- In your opinion, which challenges are very likely to arise if these indicators are implemented at national level? How can these be overcome?

## **3. Indicators for data collection on rape**

This session dealt with the following questions:

- Is the indicator on rape clear?
- Does the indicator on rape cover the most important aspects of the incidence of rape of women?
- Do you agree with the age group of 18 and over?
- Will the indicator help to achieve a comparable measurement of rape across the EU-28?
- In your opinion, what challenges are very likely to arise if this indicator is implemented at national level? How can these be overcome?

## **4. Indicators for data collection on femicide**

This session dealt with the following questions:

- Is the indicator on femicide clear?
- Does it cover the most important aspects of the incidence of femicide against women?
- Do you agree with the age group of 18 and over?
- Will the indicator help to achieve a comparable measurement of femicide across the EU-28?
- In your opinion, which challenges are very likely to arise if the indicator is implemented at national level? How can these be overcome?

## **5. Common questions to all forms of violence and closing remarks**

This session dealt with the following questions:

- Do you think that the indicators should be worded to apply to ANY data collection sector (crime, justice, health and social services) or should they be tailored to the sector?
- Do you think that the proposed indicators are sufficient to support policy development?

## Participation

Thirty seven people actively participated in the online discussion, with 62 people registered. In total, there were 347 contributions to the various debates. The participants came from 22 Member States (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the Netherlands and the UK) and were either individual researchers, national experts, representatives of international and European organisations, representatives from academia, or representatives of NGOs, women's organisations or foundations.

In addition, four non-EU countries were represented, Israel, Switzerland, Turkey and the USA.

The discussion took place in English, facilitated by Nathalie Meurens and Elena Friers-Tersch (Milieu Ltd), with EIGE represented by Jurgita Peciuriene.

## Summary of the Discussion

### **Session One: Welcome and short explanation of how the indicators have been developed**

The facilitators and EIGE welcomed the participants to the online discussion and explained the objectives of the discussion, how the indicators were developed, and the means by which participants could input to the development and refinement of the indicators.

The focus of the Study and discussion was on outcome indicators that allow approximations of the prevalence of three forms of violence against women: rape, femicide and intimate partner violence.

In order to develop the proposed indicators, Milieu examined the type of data collected in the Member States and the existing indicators. Their goal was to develop indicators that would better reflect measurability across existing data collection in the EU-28 and allow for harmonised EU-wide data collection. The indicators were developed based on the following criteria: relevance, measurability, specificity, complementarity and validity.

The participants had no specific questions at this point and the facilitators moved on to Session Two.

### **Session Two: Indicators for data collection on intimate partner violence**

The discussion opened with the proposed indicators to measure intimate partner violence. In total, five indicators were proposed, one general and four specifically related to the four types of violence defined as falling within the scope of intimate partner violence (physical, sexual, psychological and economic violence). The indicators on intimate partner violence try to capture the scale of the phenomenon under its different forms and as recorded by administrative sources.

### **Indicator 1: General intimate partner violence**

The proposed general indicator on intimate partner violence is titled '**women victims of intimate partner violence aged 18 and over, as a share of the total population of women of the same age group**'. Within the scope of this indicator, intimate partner violence should be understood as '*any act of physical, sexual, psychological or economic violence that occurs between former or current spouses or partners, whether or not the perpetrator shares or has shared the same residence with the victim*'. The indicator could be measured by cases reported to the police (units: female victims); hospital and healthcare professionals' records (units: female patients) and social services providers (units: women seeking shelter or assistance). A general indicator on intimate partner violence is considered useful for different reasons. For example, in the absence of clear-cut definitions and given the lack of data from the Member States, a general indicator might enable gathering comparable data. However, it also presents particular challenges, such as lack of clarity or being too broad.

#### **Questions:**

1. *Is the indicator clear?*
2. *Does the indicator cover the most important aspects of the incidence of intimate partner violence?*

Most participants stated that the indicator was clear, with Johanna Nelles from the Council of Europe pointing out that each component, such as physical, economic etc., should be clearly defined. Elke Moons and Maria José Carrilho suggested that some of the elements like economic violence should be better defined so that those collecting data are clear about the kind of information to collect.

Participants stated that the indicator title mirrors those measuring prevalence through surveys, while the proposed indicator aims to measure intimate partner violence through administrative data sources. They suggested rewording the title so that it is clearer about what it aims to measure. For example, Maria Guseppina Muratore suggested that the indicator specify the population at risk. Henriette Janssen also suggested 'it should be a clear reference period (in the text it refers to the current year; but should be for example in lifetime or in the past 12 months)'. She proposed that the indicator be re-worded to something like the 'number of women reporting xxx type of violence aged 18 and over to the police in the last year' for example.

Participants also provided feedback on the sources to be used for the indicator. In general, they considered the three data sources listed to be valid but with different levels of usefulness for assessing prevalence. In a discussion of social services, the Council of Europe said that a lot of services are offered by NGOs and other entities, and a greater understanding is needed of how they could collect this data, and the help and resources they would need in order to set up data collection systems. Anu Laas mentioned that 'not all health professionals could report on cases. For emergency doctors it is obligatory to report about cases, where there is a suspected violent act. But for example psychiatric clinics do not give any information'. Marie Valentova pointed out that there are many issues of comparability across the administrative data sources. For example, in some countries social assistance services are very well developed and victims have more

opportunities to report their experiences. In countries with fewer help and assistance institutions, or where such services are not available in all regions, there are fewer reports. 'In this context it would be absolutely necessary to assess the institutional setting and reporting practices in each country to understand what is reported and what is not'.

#### Questions:

1. *Will the indicators help to achieve a comparable measurement of intimate partner violence across the EU-28?*
2. *In your opinion, which challenges are very likely to arise if these indicators are implemented at national level? How can these be overcome?*

Again, a general indicator on intimate partner violence is useful for its broader concept, while also presenting some challenges. Understanding what is reported in each Member State under the umbrella term general intimate partner violence is important, as different components and scopes will create challenges in comparability. For instance, there were some comments about the data availability for each component of the indicator. The Commission of Domestic Violence (Malta) stated that some of the sources do not report on incidences of stalking and neglect, which fall under the category of general intimate partner violence. It is also important to define each of the components within the general intimate partner violence indicator.

#### **Indicator 2: Physical violence**

The proposed specific intimate partner violence indicator on physical violence is '**women victims of physical violence aged 18 and over by an intimate partner or ex-partner, as a share of the total population of women of the same age group.**' Within the scope of this indicator, physical violence in the context of intimate partner violence should be understood as '*any act which causes physical harm to the partner or former partner as a result of unlawful physical force. Physical violence can take the form of, among others, serious and minor assault, deprivation of liberty and manslaughter*'. The indicator could be measured by cases reported to the police (units: number of women victims recorded by the police per calendar year); and hospital and healthcare professionals' records (units: number of women patients per calendar year).

#### Questions:

1. *Is the indicator clear?*
2. *Does the indicator cover the most important aspects of the incidence of physical violence?*

No specific comments were made about the clarity of the indicator. Participants, however, raised some questions about the definition and the scope of the term 'physical violence'. Maria Guseppina Muratore asked about the inclusion of 'deprivation of liberty' within the category of physical violence, with Henriette Jansen agreeing and stating that it could be considered a controlling behaviour rather than physical force.

#### Questions:

1. *Will the indicators help to achieve a comparable measurement of intimate partner violence across the EU-28?*
2. *In your opinion, which challenges are very likely to arise if these indicators are implemented at national level? How can these be overcome?*

Two main issues emerged with respect to the likely challenges. Firstly, the indicator looks at physical violence within the context of intimate partner violence, which encompasses a wide range of acts, the most severe of which is homicide. This could create a possible overlap with the indicator for femicide. Irene Rosales suggested that the different levels of severity covered by the indicator should be made clear, including information on the countries which include homicide and manslaughter within intimate partner violence. It was also suggested that femicide be defined within a broader context than intimate partner violence, in order to differentiate between the two indicators.

The second issue raised was that of under-reporting of physical violence. Some forms of physical violence - being much less severe than homicide or severe bodily harm - might escape detection by administrative sources. Maria Guseppina Muratore and Marta Adiego explained that victims do not report these incidences, as they believe that the specific act does not constitute an offence. Marta Adiego added that there are many offences that should be recorded as an offence related to intimate partner violence but which are not currently recorded as such because of a lack of information on the victim-perpetrator relationship, or because the relationship is hard to classify. While it would be better, therefore, to avoid using data collected by the police as the basis for prevalence indicators, they provide a feasible starting point as an indication of offences reported in their own right.

### **Indicator 3: Sexual violence**

The proposed indicator on sexual violence in an intimate partner violence context is ***'women victims of sexual violence aged 18 and over by an intimate partner or ex-partner, as a share of the total population of women of the same age group'***. Within the scope of this indicator, sexual violence in the context of intimate partner violence should be understood as *'any sexual act performed on the victim without consent'*. Sexual violence can take the form of rape or sexual assault. The indicator could be measured by police records of crimes (units: number of women victims recorded by the police per calendar year) and hospital and healthcare professionals' records (units: number of women patients per calendar year).

#### **Questions:**

1. *Is the indicator clear?*
2. *Does the indicator cover the most important aspects of the incidence of sexual violence?*

Sexual violence within intimate partner violence is another important dimension of VAW. It is important to address this type of violence within the context of intimate partner violence as it is often overlooked and harder to measure.



Participants made few comments specifically concerning the sexual violence indicator. Maria Guseppina Muratore stated that the broad scope of the definition made the indicator insufficiently clear. By contrast, Daniela Cherubini felt that the indicator covered the most important aspects of intimate partner violence, although it should be made clear how each Member State defines the different components that fall within sexual violence between intimate partners. In this respect, it would be important to take into account different typologies, such as date rape or marital rape.

#### **Indicator 4: Psychological violence**

The proposed indicator on psychological violence is ***'women victims of psychological violence aged 18 and over by an intimate partner or ex-partner, as a share of the total population of women of the same age group'***. Within the scope of this indicator, psychological violence in the context of intimate partner violence should be understood as *'any act or behaviour which causes psychological harm to the partner or former partner. Psychological violence can take the form of, among others, coercion, defamation, verbal insult or harassment'*. The indicator could be measured by police records of crimes (units: number of women victims recorded by the police per calendar year) and hospital and healthcare professionals' records (units: number of women patients per calendar year).

#### **Questions:**

1. *Is the indicator clear?*
2. *Does the indicator cover the most important aspects of the incidence of psychological violence?*
3. *In your opinion, which challenges are very likely to arise if these indicators are implemented at national level? How can these be overcome?*

Like other forms of violence, psychological violence encompasses a wide range of behaviors from stalking to harassment. Member States might employ different definitions and include different acts within the broad notion of psychological violence. This has implications for the clarity and comparability of data.

Maria Guseppina Muratore raised the need to clarify the component of harassment as an element of psychological violence. She stated that this notion also forms part of the indicators of Sustainable Development Goals, where it also lacks clarity <sup>(1)</sup>.

Daniela Cherubini stated that psychological violence is more difficult to measure as many of its forms are not criminalised in most Member States. Under-reporting of instances by victims in the belief that it does not constitute a crime, creates additional difficulties. She suggested that social services might be better placed to provide information on these types of violence, with victims more likely to report less serious incidents to social services. These organisations might, therefore, have a better definition of psychological violence.

No other specific comments were made in respect of this particular indicator.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sustainable Development Indicators are accessible at: <http://indicators.report/indicators/> (Indicators referring to violence against women can be found under Filter: Goal 5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls).

### **Indicator 5: Economic violence**

The proposed indicator on economic violence is '**women victims of economic violence aged 18 and over by an intimate partner or ex-partner, as a share of the total population of women of the same age group**'. For this indicator, economic violence in the context of intimate partner violence should be understood as '*any act or behaviour which causes economic harm to the partner. Economic violence can take the form of, among others, property damage, restricting access to financial resources, education or the labour market, or not complying with economic responsibilities, such as alimony*'. The indicator could be measured by police records of crimes (units: women victims).

#### **Questions:**

1. *Is the indicator clear?*
2. *Does the indicator cover the most important aspects of the incidence of economic violence?*
3. *In your opinion, which challenges are very likely to arise if these indicators are implemented at national level? How can these be overcome?*

Some participants highlighted the difficulty of measuring economic violence, given the lack of clear definitions and data availability in most Member States. Henriette Jansen stated that economic violence is an important part of intimate partner violence but one which is difficult to record, even by surveys. It is that much harder, therefore, to capture from administrative data. The German Federal Office of Justice representative held a different view, arguing that despite the challenges associated with reporting this particular type of violence, legal provisions might provide some useful basis for administrative data collection. In Germany, legal provisions for damage to property or failure to meet economic responsibilities might provide useful data about economic violence.

Along with psychological violence, economic violence is considered to be the most complicated to capture. Repeating her comment for psychological violence, Daniela Cherubini said that social services might be better suited for providing data on this type of violence, with police records used as a complementary source of information. The German Federal Office of Justice representative disagreed, believing that definitions used by social service providers are likely to be influenced by their organisational interests, changing considerably from entity to entity. That would result in a proliferation of definitions, further undermining the efforts to harmonise data.

### **General comments on intimate partner violence indicators**

As the indicators on intimate partner violence share some common characteristics and encounter similar challenges in their data collection, some of the questions raised during the discussion were relevant for all of the indicators on intimate partner violence. The following section describes the main points spontaneously raised by the participants throughout the discussion, as well as in response to the questions asked by the facilitators.

### Questions:

- 1) *Do you think it is important to have separate indicators for the specific types of violence in the intimate partner violence context? Or would it be more useful to have only one general indicator on intimate partner violence?*
- 2) *The general intimate partner violence indicator cannot be a composite (aggregate) of the indicators for specific ones because there might be overlaps, so the aggregate would not be the sum of cases. Do you agree?*

Given the challenges of data availability in the Member States and the outlined difficulties in harmonisation of existing data, it was important to discuss the options for simplifying the task at hand. However, simplification in data collection inevitably leads to a lack of precision, which creates a fundamental problem for comparability of data.

Most of the participants agreed it best to have separate indicators for each type of intimate partner violence, along with a general indicator. As stated by Elke Moons, such a general indicator is important because it might provide the only available data from some Member States. Marie Valentova and Daniela Cherubini added that having only one general intimate partner violence indicator with different types of violence from different countries would create imprecision. The Federal Statistical Office of Germany also commented, stating that a composite indicator would not be useful in developing comparable information.

The Observatory on Domestic and Gender Violence of the General Council for the Judiciary (ODGV) highlighted the need for separate indicators for each type of violence, as data are collected in order to guide prevention policies. In the same vein, there was a suggestion to keep the data from different sources separate because of the different nature of the data collected.

### **Challenges for different sectors for all intimate partner violence indicators**

Three types of administrative sources may be useful in providing data on intimate partner violence incidents, i.e. criminal statistics from police and the justice services, health statistics from relevant institutions, and social services providers that encompass a broad spectrum of activities, such as shelters, phone helplines, or NGOs dealing with victims of violence. Even among themselves these sectors present a wide range of differences. The definitions they use, their rationale and *raison d'être*, as well as their institutional priorities, all vary. When it comes to their usefulness for providing data, each of these sources has both advantages and challenges, depending on the type of violence that is being measured.

These differences between the sectors was an issue raised during the discussion. According to some participants, not all of the sources are equally suitable for data collection. The German Federal Office of Justice representative stressed that both health and social service sectors were simply not reliable sources, given their differences in data collection and victims they serve. Siusi Casaccia commented that the health sector would not be an adequate source of information, as women in these situations often hide the real cause of their injuries. She also stated that data collected by NGOs (as part of social

services) are not recognised as official information. A similar comment was made by Anu Laas who pointed out that while some health professionals are bound to report the injuries, e.g. emergency departments, some other bodies within the health sector are not. The Council of Europe representative stated that social services would need help and resources in order to provide the requested information.

Elke Moons stressed that social service providers would be generally less equipped than police sources because there are many different organisations without an established data recording structure. The Commission on Domestic Violence said that data collected by the police and health professionals is not comparable, as they use different definitions and practices. Andrada Filip pointed out that some institutions are simply incapable of providing information, such as helplines that are bound by personal privacy laws. She also made several comments that underlined the challenges associated with data from social services, such as repeat clients being counted as new cases. This has important repercussions for measuring prevalence but such double recording is not always identifiable from the data provided due to confidentiality issues.

On the other hand, the participants agreed that social services are very useful in other ways, for example in reaching and helping more people than the police do. Equally, given their broader definitions, they might be collecting information on types of violence which would go undetected by the police or health sectors. For instance, Daniela Cherubini argued that, in Italy, the social service sector cover more cases of intimate partner violence than the police, and provide a more complete picture. Such services, she stated, have a local base rather than a national base. Inger Lovkrona made a similar suggestion, stating that health and social services come with a number of challenges, but they might be usefully used to complement the data provided by the police and offer additional insight. Maria Guseppina Muratore emphasised the extremely complex nature of the phenomenon, stating that police data run the risk of trivialising the issue. She claimed that social services might provide a better insight, despite the fact that the data is not comparable at this point. Andrada Filip stressed the importance of defining the sources for the social services sector beforehand and coordinating data collection from these pre-selected entities.

### Session Three: Indicators for data collection on rape

The proposed indicator on rape is '**women victims of rape aged 18 and over, as a share of the population of women aged 18 and over.**' Within the scope of this indicator, rape should be understood as '*sexual penetration, whether vaginal, anal or oral, through the use of an object or body parts, without consent, using force or by taking advantage of the vulnerability of the victim*'. The indicator could be measured by police records of crimes (units: women victims).

#### Questions:

- 1) *Is the proposed indicator clear?*
- 2) *Does it cover the most important aspects of the incidence of rape of women?*
- 3) *Do you agree with the age group of 18 and over?*

4) *Will the indicator help to achieve a comparable measurement of rape across the EU-28?*

Participants had few comments about the clarity of this specific indicator. One of the issues discussed was the potential overlap between the indicator on rape and the indicator on sexual violence within the context of intimate partner violence. Daniela Cherubini stressed the importance of including different types of rape within the definition, such as marital rape, client rape or date rape. It was suggested that it is important to remain in line with the International classification of crimes for statistical purposes (ICCS) categories and analyse whether national data sources include or exclude these different types of rape.

Irene Rosales stressed that the components of rape and sexual violence within the context of intimate partner violence should be harmonised among themselves, questioning why the 'use of force' component was included in the former but not the latter. She argued that indicators should follow definitions proposed by the Istanbul Convention, despite some countries' continued reliance on 'use of force' in their definition of rape. Her comment was supported by the Council of Europe representative, who added that the definitions of sexual violence should be consistent across different indicators that use the same components. This representative pointed to the increased use by Member States of the definition of rape proposed by the Istanbul Convention. Germany, Austria, England and Wales have already included the provision of consent, and it is under discussion in France. It is important that these future developments are taken into account.

The issue of inclusion/exclusion of particular incidents and victims was discussed. For instance, Inger Lovkrona argued that the indicator leaves out other important types of sexual violence, such as sexual harassment by unknown perpetrators. Daniela Cherubini agreed, proposing that the indicator on rape should explicitly mention all types of rape that are being included. However, she also stressed that rape and other forms of sexual violence such as sexual assault should be reported separately.

In addressing the comments, Nathalie Meurens reminded participants that the aim of the Study is to provide a synthesis definition based on the strongest aspects of what is available in the Member States and what is put forward by the Istanbul Convention. The Study incorporates the element of 'without consent' and 'use of force', the former stemming from the Istanbul Convention and the latter stemming from the legal provisions in the Member States, in an effort to be as comprehensive as possible. While additional indicators for sexual harassment would be useful, the current study at hand focuses only on rape, intimate partner violence and femicide as the most severe forms of violence.

Shalva Weil raised the issue of age, stating that interpretations of 'young' and statutory rape vary across countries and special attention should be paid to these differences.

#### **Session Four: Indicators for data collection on femicide**

Session Four focused on the indicator on femicide. The indicator is ***'women victims of intimate femicide aged 18 and over committed by an intimate partner as a share of the women victims of homicide aged 18 and over'***. Within the scope of this indicator, femicide should be understood as *'the killing of a woman by an intimate partner and death of a woman as a result of a practice that is harmful to women. Intimate partner is understood*

*as former or current spouses or partners, whether or not the victim shares, or has shared, a residence with the perpetrator’.*

Questions:

- 1) *Is the indicator clear?*
- 2) *Does it cover the most important aspects of the incidence of femicide?*
- 3) *Do you agree with the age group of 18 and over?*
- 4) *Will the indicator help to achieve a comparable measurement of femicide across the EU-28?*
- 5) *In your opinion, what challenges are likely to arise if the indicator is implemented at national level? How can these be overcome?*

The discussion of the indicator on femicide mainly focused on the definition of the concept itself, with the difficulties of providing a clear definition to be adopted by all Member States acknowledged by several participants. Shalva Weil stated that the Working group of Femicide across Europe Cost Action has been dealing with the issue for three years and there is still considerable variation across countries in the definition of femicide <sup>(2)</sup>. She pointed out that femicide is not limited to intimate partners and it can also be a misogynistic act. She suggested that the indicator on femicide should take into account such variations and strive to be absolutely clear. Maria Guseppina Muratore and Andrada Filip also stated that the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crimes (UNODC) meeting held recently revealed the difficulties in providing statistical data on the phenomenon of femicide. Andrada Filip commented that countries have different laws punishing those crimes that can potentially be considered femicide and many countries do not have one single straightforward notion.

Deirdre Brennan underlined the importance of clarity and the criteria of inclusion/exclusion. She stated that the proposed definition includes only practices, making it challenging to address complex cases like ‘mercy killings’. In a similar vein, Inger Lovkrona and Barbora Holubova mentioned that femicide takes place outside the context of intimate partnership and takes different forms, such as ‘honour killings’. Daniela Cherubini suggested that if only intimate partner killings are to be taken into account, then the indicator should be named accordingly.

As mentioned in the session for the physical violence indicator within the context of intimate partner violence, some participants stated that it is important to clarify whether there are any overlaps between these two indicators (see Session Two, Indicator on physical violence).

Several participants argued that femicide, compared to other types of violence, was the indicator with the greatest potential to be measured by administrative sources. This is due to the nature of the crime and the fact that most countries record the victim-perpetrator relationship. For instance, Maria Guseppina Muratore and Henriette Jansen agreed that

---

<sup>2</sup> Femicide across Europe, COST Action IS-1206, more information available at: <http://www.femicide.net/>.

administrative data can be useful to measure femicide, notwithstanding their drawbacks in other respects.

Andrada Filip commented that available data on femicide is currently what is approximated from intimate partner homicide data. In the same vein, Maria Guseppina Muratore said the complex issue of femicide was not fully measurable with the current definitions and data collection systems, unlike a more general notion of female homicide by intimate partners. The relationship between the perpetrator and the victim is, therefore, considered essential. Some challenges are to be expected, for example, the difficulties experienced by the Lithuanian police when registering the exact nature of the victim-perpetrator relationship, as highlighted by Dovile Stoskeviciute.

Participants also discussed the possible disaggregation of data. They stressed the importance of defining an age group for the indicator and consistently applying it in all Member States in order to have comparable information. Age breakdowns were also considered important for capturing other types of femicide. Deirdre Brennan raised the issue of the killing of elderly women, stating that data are needed to raise awareness about this phenomenon. The possibility was also discussed of breaking down data by citizenship or country of birth of the victim. However, several comments, such as the one from the German Federal Office of Justice representative, suggested that this would increase the burden on authorities if they are not already collecting this information. The breakdown of nationality for the offender, although interesting, also runs the risk of overcrowding the indicator. Additionally, the sensitive nature of such information would make such data collection impossible to collect in some Member States.

### Session Five: Common questions to all forms of violence and closing remarks

As described, data collection based on the proposed indicators presents some challenges that are similar for all types of violence. The current session focused on the common challenges raised by the participants. The majority of the discussion focused on the issue of prevalence and the extent to which the administrative sources considered are able to provide suitable information. Two general challenges are believed by the participants to be significant. Firstly, **under-reporting** is a serious obstacle, with some participants stating that it is not possible to use administrative source data to obtain prevalence rates for an entire population. Both Henriette Jansen and Maria Guseppina Muratore said that only a very small number of women who experience violence report it to the authorities. Also, reporting behaviour changes depending on the country, making comparisons difficult. Thus, police records, hospitals and social services capture only a fraction of the real scale of the problem. Elke Moons also stressed that administrative data should be supplemented with survey data if the aim is to measure prevalence.

Secondly, the **nature of administrative data collection** is not oriented towards measuring prevalence but, rather, gathering specific information for the activities of the organisation in question, creating a challenge for comparison. For instance, Henriette Jansen mentioned that definitions used by surveys need to be comparable and operational, while administrative data have no such considerations and reflect only the legal context of the country in question. Multitudes of definitions and practices makes it difficult to compare the data across Member States. Daniela Cherubini questioned the rationale behind giving priority to administrative sources. Some of the participants also

raised the issue of data availability, with Maria Guseppina Muratore drawing attention to the lack of information on the victim-perpetrator relationship in some countries. The differences between the Member States' institutional capacities also represents a challenge; Marie Valentova argued that social services have different levels of outreach in each Member State. This impacts the number of people with whom they are in contact, making comparisons difficult and misleading. A similar point was made by Andrada Filip, who said that differences in rates across countries might indicate anything from a lack of awareness about the services to other factors, such as the working hours of these services.

One suggested improvement was to focus on incidence recorded by the police rather than on prevalence. Daniela Cherubini suggested that the names of the indicators be rephrased to make it clear that they measure reported violence but not prevalence. Marie Valentova and Maria Guseppina Muratore suggested complementing administrative sources data with survey data, even comparing the two in order to gain insight about reporting rates and the performance of different Member States in a bid to increase reporting over time.

Administrative data are not solely problematic, they are also considered useful. The German Federal Office of Justice representative stated that, despite the differences between notions and definitions in the Member States, administrative data are still valuable because they provide insight about the perceptions and attitudes. They also added that administrative data, if supplemented with surveys, can be important indicators. Similarly, Maria José Carrilho stressed that they support the use of administrative statistics for gender violence and although there is a great challenge to overcome in order to have harmonised data, initiatives such as this can be useful to improve data collection.

### **Age groups**

Defining the age group to which the indicator applies is crucial in order to obtain comparable data from the Member States, as this defines who will be included and excluded from the counting. It is also important for certain types of violence, where failing to include a particular age group might result in the complete omission of specific acts of violence. As expected, the age group set at 18+ for the indicators generated much discussion. A number of the participants stated that 18+ was too high a threshold. Given that violence expands beyond the confines of legal marriage, reducing the threshold to 15+ was suggested by Inger Lovkrona, in order to include phenomena such as dating violence. Irene Rosales and Elke Moons also stated that setting the limit to 15 years of age would be in line with the surveys. Kathrin Eckhart stated that they would welcome different age groups such as 14+ and 16+, as different types of violence might necessitate different approaches. Deirdre Brennan argued that a higher age limit-such as 18+ would potentially leave out groups of women who suffer from coercive behaviour.

By contrast, some participants agreed with the 18+ lower age limit. Barbora Holubova said that 18+ would be in line both with legal provisions in Slovakia and also with data collected by different sources, such as the police and helplines.

### **Calculation method and denominator**



The methodology for calculating the indicators and the definition of the total reference population are equally important. As issues pertinent to all indicators, these two aspects formed a core part of the discussion. Maria Guseppina Muratore and Henriette Jensen commented that the denominator should be 'women at risk' rather than all female population. The notion of women at risk was clarified elsewhere in the discussion by Henriette Jansen as 'ever-partnered women'. It is important to note, however, that she also highlighted the impossibility of obtaining such data from administrative resources. She stressed that an indicator based on reported cases should be named accordingly, and should not be compared to the total female population but simply refer to the number of women reporting an incident. Zuzana Ocnasova agreed, stating that it would not be useful to use total population as a basis, as reporting rates can change over time and this might lead to artificial changes. As regards the wording of 'victim', Marie Valentova suggested that a more straightforward word than victim should be used, as the indicator does not provide information on all of the victims but only those reporting an incident to the police.

The suggestion by Henriette Jansen to use the actual numbers from each Member State was criticised on the grounds that it would not be useful for comparisons between the Member States. The German Federal Office of Justice representative stated that it was quite feasible to use a base such as incidences per 1000 women, making it possible to compare data not only between countries but also over time.

### **Definition of partner**

The definition of partner is relevant for indicators on femicide and intimate partner violence. Who constitutes a partner of the victim is important because it has implications for the inclusion or exclusion of certain events from calculations. It is also important to have a standard definition of partner and its components, so that data provided by the Member States can be compared.

This issue was raised by several participants throughout the discussion. Zuzana Ocnasova pointed to the need to clarify whether the police record the victim-perpetrator relationship in cases where they do not share a common residence. Henriette Jansen drew attention to the potential issues related to the use of the term 'partner', stating that this term holds different meanings around the world, and does not even exist in some countries, or excludes legal partnerships, making it very important to specify its parameters in each context. It is also important to make it clear that partnership does not necessarily entail a sexual relationship. The Commission on Domestic Violence also recommended specifying the meaning of the word partner. The Federal Office of Justice representative agreed, stating that unless a common definition is used across the countries it would be hard to make comparisons, particularly because it would have an impact on the numbers.

### **Impact of indicators on policy making**

Another point of discussion was the potential impact of the proposed indicators on the development of policies to gather harmonised data across Member States. Inger Lövkrona stated that proposed indicators could be useful to gain a clearer picture about the incidence and forms of gender-based violence, provided that the aforementioned

clarifications are made. They could also be useful to guide the support of society and organisations in helping the victims. Irene Rosales stressed the usefulness of the study in supporting policy development, given its alignment with other European and international standards.

### **Harmonisation of data**

Several times during the discussion the point was made that Member States all have different legal provisions, practices, cultures and perceptions of each of the types of violence. Comparing and integrating data from Member States is, therefore, a challenge in itself. Several solutions to this particular challenge were suggested.

Participants were asked whether the indicators should be worded in such a way as to fit all sectors or whether they should be tailored to each sector. The German Federal Office of Justice representative commented that, given the existing heterogeneity of definitions and concepts, tailoring the indicators for each sector would simply add to the complexity. On the other hand, the Council of Europe argued that there might be space for variation to accommodate differences between sectors. They also added that some elements, such as age, should be the same for all indicators.

The codes provided by International Classification of Crimes for Statistical Purposes (ICCS) and their potential contribution to efforts to harmonise data across countries were also mentioned. For instance, the German Federal Statistical Office representative stated that ICCS codes are internationally applied coding systems which also have parallels with UN-CTS United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (UN-CTS). This representative also mentioned the work on correspondence tables, which are used to make analogies between the national legal codes and behavioural codes in the ICCS. This suggestion was welcomed by several participants, who expressed an interest in the development of correspondence tables. The German Federal Statistical Office representative clarified that the exercise on correspondence tables was only recently started in Germany and, to-date, extended only to homicide. However, the same logic could be applied to develop correspondence tables for other types of violence, enabling an approximation between the data collected at national level and other international resources.

## **Conclusions and follow-up**

The most important points emerging from the online discussion were:

- ✓ Prevalence of intimate partner violence, rape and femicide are best measured with surveys, with administrative sources giving only a small percentage of the real phenomenon. The indicator names should reflect this and be redefined as incidences recorded by the institution in question.
- ✓ Close attention must be paid to the definitions and counting units used to develop indicators. This is due to the fact that administrative sources in each Member State have varying characteristics, making it challenging to have comparable data. These differences should be taken into account and clearly defined in accompanying documents, such as metadata.

- ✓ Different sectors might be useful for data collection on different types of violence given their varying nature. These differences should be taken into account.
- ✓ Initiatives to develop indicators must align with other parallel processes carried out by the United Nations or the Council of Europe.
- ✓ Despite numerous shortcomings, administrative sources may be improved, and, if complemented by survey data, could provide insightful information about the phenomenon of violence against women.

When defining each indicator, following points require a clear definition:

- ✓ Indicator on prevalence/reported cases
- ✓ Type of violence measured by the indicator
- ✓ Issue of overlapping - avoid or clearly describe possible overlapping
- ✓ Reference population (total, same age, population at risk etc.)
- ✓ Breakdowns (age, country of birth etc.)
- ✓ Age group
- ✓ Reference period
- ✓ Sources to be used (police, justice, health)

## Annex

### Annex I: Proposed indicators

**Background document on proposed indicators for data collection on intimate partner violence, rape and femicide, available at:**

[http://eurogender.eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/events-files/Online%20Discussion%20on%20proposed%20indicators\\_background\\_note.pdf](http://eurogender.eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/events-files/Online%20Discussion%20on%20proposed%20indicators_background_note.pdf)

### Annex II: Transcript of the online discussion on proposed indicators for data collection on intimate partner violence, rape and femicide

[http://eurogender.eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/web-discussions-files/Transcript%20of%20the%20Online%20Discussion%20on%20indicators%20for%20data%20collection%20of%20rape%20femicide%20intimate%20partner%20violence\\_0.pdf](http://eurogender.eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/web-discussions-files/Transcript%20of%20the%20Online%20Discussion%20on%20indicators%20for%20data%20collection%20of%20rape%20femicide%20intimate%20partner%20violence_0.pdf)

### Annex III: List of registered participants

Nr.	Name	Institution	Stakeholder type	Country
1.	Alexandrina Satnoianu	EIGE	EU Entity	Romania
2.	Amelia de Carvalho	Sogeti Luxembourg S.A	Other	Luxembourg
3.	Andrada Filip	WAVE	Civil Society	Austria
4.	Annalisa Casini	Université Catholique de Louvain	Academia	Belgium
5.	Antonella Fazio	Milieu Ltd.	Other	Italy
6.	Anu Laas	University of Tartu; Laas & Laas Ltd.	Other	Estonia
7.	Barbora Holubová	Institute for Labour and Family Research	Other	Slovakia
8.	Cecilia Robustelli	University of Modena	Other	Italy
9.	Central Statistics Office	Central Statistics Office	MS Institution - Other	Ireland
10.	Central Statistics Office	Central Statistics Office	MS Institution - Ministry	Malta
11.	Concetta Carrà		Other	Italy
12.	Court Administration of Latvia - TA	Court Administration of Latvia - TA	MS Institution – Regional & Local	Latvia
13.	Cristina Cabras	Associate Professor, University of Cagliari - UniCA	Academia	Italy
14.	Daniela Cherubini	Università degli Studi di	Other	Italy

		Milano - Bicocca		
15.	Davide Barbieri	EIGE	EU Entity	Italy
16.	Deirdre Brennan	Women's Aid	Civil Society	UK
17.	Dovile Stoskeviciute	Avia Solutions Group AB	Other	Lithuania
18.	Elena Fries-Tersch	Milieu	Other	Austria
19.	Elena Sirvent García del Valle	Government Office against Gender-based Violence	MS Institution - Ministry	Spain
20.	Elke Moons	Statistics Netherlands	MS Institution - Other	The Netherlands
21.	Emerge For Africa Ltd	Emerge For Africa Ltd	Civil Society	UK
22.	Federal Office of Justice - BfJ	Federal Office of Justice - BfJ	MS Institution - Other	Germany
23.	Federal Statistical Office of Germany - Destatis	Federal Statistical Office of Germany - Destatis	Other	Germany
24.	Hana Spanikova	Milieu Ltd	Other	Czech Republic
25.	Henriette Jansen	Violence against women researcher	Other	Switzerland
26.	Inger Lövkrona	Lund University	Academia	Sweden
27.	Irene Rosales	European Women's Lobby	Civil Society	Belgium
28.	Irina Costache	Save the Children	Civil Society	Romania
29.	Ivona Truscan	Women's Human Rights Education Institute	Academia	Romania
30.	Jekaterina Celnova	Independent terminology researcher	Academia	Latvia
31.	Johanna Nelles	Council of Europe	International organisation	France
32.	Julia Habermann	Otto-von-Guericke University Magdeburg	Academia	Germany
33.	Jurgita Pecuriene	EIGE	EU Entity	Lithuania
34.	Kathrin Eckhart	Genderlibrary Luxembourg - Cid	Civil Society	Luxembourg
35.	Ksenia Meshkova	Humboldt University Berlin	Academia	Germany
36.	Maria Guseppina	Istat - Istituto nazionale	MS Institution -	Italy

	Muratore	di Statistica italiano	Other	
37.	Maria José Carrilho	Counsellor for Gender Equality	MS Institution - Other	Portugal
38.	Marie Valentova	Liser Luxembourg	MS Institution - Other	Luxembourg
39.	Marta Adiego	Goverment Office Against Gender-based Violence	MS Institution - Ministry	Spain
40.	Martta October	National Institute for Health and Welfare - THL	MS Institution - Other	Finland
41.	Miina Keski-Petäjä	Statistics Finland	MS Institution - Other	Finland
42.	Milka Njoroge	University of Oulu	Academia	Finland
43.	Miriam Gauer	EIGE	EU Entity	Lithuania
44.	National Agency for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men - ANES	National Agency for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men - ANES	MS Institution - Ministry	Romania
45.	Nathalie Meurens	Milieu Ltd	Other	Belgium
46.	Nikki Ray	EIGE	EU Entity	UK
47.	Nora Helene Stein	EIGE	EU Entity	Germany
48.	Philip McCormack	Cosc - Ireland's National Office for the Prevention of Domestic, Sexual and Gender-based Violence	MS Institution - Ministry	Ireland
49.	Prof. Dr. Els Leye	ICRH - Universiteit Gent	Other	Belgium
50.	Rossitsa Rangelova Pavlova	Institute of Economics Bulgarian Academy of Sciences	EU Entity	Bulgaria
51.		School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol - UoB	Academia	UK
52.	Shalva Weil	Hebrew University	Academia	Israel
53.	Siobán O'Brien Green	Trinity College Dublin	Other	Ireland
54.	Siusi Casaccia	European Women's Lobby	Other	Italy
55.	Stefanie Van Assche	Federal Government Justice	MS Institutio - Ministry	Belgium
56.	Svetlana Negroustoueva	Gender and Evaluation	Other	USA

57.	Therese Murphy	EIGE	EU Entity	Lithuania
58.	Tim de Jong	Atria Institute on Gender Equality and Women's History	Other	The Netherlands
59.	Tugce Tugran	Milieu Ltd	Other	Turkey
60.	Viera Mockeroval	EIGE	EU Entity	Slovakia
61.	Vinko Stojnšek	Criminal Police Directorate	MS Institution - Other	Slovenia
62.	Zuzana Ocenaskova	Coordination and methodological center for gender based and domestic violence	MS Institution - other	Slovakia

### **Contact information**

European Institute for Gender Equality

Gedimino, 16

LT-01103 Vilnius (Lithuania)

Tel +370 5 215 7444

Tel +370 5 215 7400

<http://eige.europa.eu>