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A concern in the EU

**Sweden (2011)**
- 59,409 girls
- 3-19% at risk

**Ireland (2011)**
- 14,577 girls
- 1-11% at risk

**Germany (2015)**
- 25,325 girls
- 3-19% at risk

**Portugal (2011)**
- 5,835 girls
- 5-23% at risk

Estimating the risk of FGM
COMMITMENT TO END FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION
EU framework and actions

Prevention
- 2013 Communication Towards the elimination of FGM
- 2017 year of focused actions GBV
- Learning platform UEFGM.org
- EC funding REC programme

Protection prosecution
- Istanbul Convention
- Victims’ Rights Directive
- FGM is a crime in all MS
- EU Asylum legislation
- Training legal practitioners
- Analysing court cases

Knowledge
- Data collection priority
- EIGE’S risk estimation methodology
- DAPHNE funded prevalence methodology

External action
- International cooperation
- Funding projects in non-EU countries
Increasing knowledge

- EU-wide mapping
- Risk estimations
- Good practices
- Developing methodology
- Country factsheets
Supporting prevention

- Accurate data to estimate FGM risk
- Targeted prevention in the EU
- Repeated estimations over time
- Better informed policy measures
Developing methodology

Extrapolation-of-FGM-practising-countries-prevalence-data-method

Focus group research

Quantitative component

Qualitative component

FGM RISK
Identifying challenges

Allow for trends and comparison

Quantitative - qualitative data

New patterns of migration

Sensitive issue

• Accurately and regularly estimating the risk of female genital mutilation

• Availability of data to estimate the risk of female genital mutilation

• Migrant, refugee and asylum seeking populations

• Interpret results with caution
2017-2018 Study
Preliminary findings
Engaging with communities

Understanding the practice:
in-depth focus groups

Effectice policies:
co-created with communities involved

Advocating for change:
White ribbon ambassadors
Istanbul Convention ratified by 16 Member States and signed by the EU.

Further ratification needed

Common European Asylum System changes entered into force since 2013.

Gender sensitive asylum procedures needed

Legislation in Member States in place and specialising.

Gaps exist and legal differences impact sanctionning ways
Implementing laws

- Implementing the law and prosecute
- Training for people implementing the law
- Awareness raising of the legislation amongst communities involved
The **national strategies on FGM vary across the EU Member States.**

- **18 cover specifically it in recent initiatives**
- Actions most visible in the **health and education sectors**
- Strategies involving men or communities rare

**National guidance for professionals** on how to deal with FGM

- **10 EU Member States developed a framework**
New patterns of migration

Women from FGM-practicing countries continue to seek asylum in the EU

Collect data on migratory flows and how they impact policies
Understanding FGM

Discouraging factors

- Awareness of laws and campaigns
- Stigmatisation
- Health and psychological impact
- Loss of desire

Motivating factors

- Social pressure and fears (promiscuity, infidelity, unwanted pregnancy)
- Purity and aesthetics
- Marriageability

Qualitative results impact quantitative results
Towards a comparable picture in the EU: next steps

Comparable data on the number of girls at risk of female genital mutilation in 10 Member States

Supporting Member States to undertake risk estimations

Increasing knowledge, Informed policy making, targeted actions