

Gender-based violence

Risk assessment and management of intimate partner violence in the EU

Acknowledgements

This overview was developed as part of the study commissioned by the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) on risk assessment by police of intimate partner violence against women. The report was prepared by the Istituto per la Ricerca Sociale (IRS) and the Mediterranean Institute of Gender Studies (MIGS) in close cooperation with colleagues from EIGE, including Diogo Costa, Anke Gittenauer, Sofia Jamal, Carmen Lopez, Jurgita Pecuriene, Cristina Fabre Rosell, Vasiliki Saini, Jennifer Stewart, Erika Toivonen and Katarzyna Wolska-Wrona. EIGE's gender-based violence programme would also like to thank other

colleagues for their intellectual contributions, administrative support and encouragement.

The main authors of this report are Susana Pavlou, senior researcher from MIGS, and Marsha Scott, senior researcher from IRS. Other contributors involved from IRS/MIGS were Flavia Pesce, Elena Ferrari and Daniela Loi.

This overview is accompanied by *A guide to risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence against women for police*.

The European Institute for Gender Equality

The European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) is an autonomous body of the European Union established to strengthen gender equality across the EU. Equality between women and men is a fundamental value of the EU and EIGE's task is to make this a reality in Europe and beyond. This includes becoming a European knowledge centre on gender equality issues, supporting gender mainstreaming in all EU and Member State policies, and fighting discrimination based on sex.

European Institute for Gender Equality, EIGE
Gedimino pr. 16
LT-01103
Vilnius
LITHUANIA

Tel. +370 52157444

Email: eige.sec@eige.europa.eu

 <http://www.eige.europa.eu>

 www.twitter.com/eurogender

 www.facebook.com/eige.europa.eu

 www.youtube.com/eurogender

 <http://eurogender.eige.europa.eu>

 <https://www.linkedin.com/company/eige/>

Neither EIGE nor any person acting on behalf of EIGE is responsible for the use that might be made of the following information.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2019

Print ISBN 978-92-9482-234-5 doi:10.2839/37233 MH-01-19-278-EN-C

PDF ISBN 978-92-9482-233-8 doi:10.2839/39960 MH-01-19-278-EN-N

Cover image: [gerasimov_foto_174/Shutterstock.com](https://www.shutterstock.com/gerasimov_foto_174)

© European Institute for Gender Equality, 2019

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Reuse is authorised provided the source is acknowledged, the original meaning is not distorted and EIGE is not liable for any damage caused by that use. The reuse policy of EIGE is implemented by the Commission Decision of 12 December 2011 on the reuse of Commission documents (2011/833/EU).



Risk assessment and management of intimate partner violence in the EU

Foreword

Police officers play a leading role in reducing violence against women by an intimate partner. They are often the first authority victims turn to for protection, especially in countries where police are trusted. Risk assessment and risk management strategies are two vital steps that ensure the immediate safety of victims and prevent further violence.

Protecting and supporting women who are victims of intimate partner violence is a priority for the European Union. The Victims' Rights Directive (2012/29/EU) sets out a framework for risk assessment by promoting the individual assessment of victims, based on a case-by-case approach. While steps have been taken to improve institutional responses and strengthen prevention measures against intimate partner violence, risk assessment and risk management practices remain fragmented across EU Member States.

EIGE's guidelines and recommendations offer a common EU-wide approach to risk assessment

and risk management. To complement these guidelines, EIGE has also published a report, which maps risk assessment policy measures, legal provisions and research developments across the EU. This research builds upon the institute's previous work supporting Member States in strengthening their responses to intimate partner violence.

On behalf of EIGE, I would like to thank all the institutions and experts who have contributed to this important research. I firmly believe that our guide and recommendations will help the EU and Member States to consolidate their approach, prevent further harm to victims and hold perpetrators accountable. We want victims of intimate partner violence to continue living their lives, without fear, in societies that do not tolerate any kind of gender-based violence.

Virginija Langbakk,
Director
European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE)

Abbreviations

Member State abbreviations

BE	Belgium
BG	Bulgaria
CZ	Czechia
DK	Denmark
DE	Germany
EE	Estonia
IE	Ireland
EL	Greece
ES	Spain
FR	France
HR	Croatia
IT	Italy
CY	Cyprus
LV	Latvia
LT	Lithuania
LU	Luxembourg
HU	Hungary
MT	Malta
NL	Netherlands
AT	Austria
PL	Poland
PT	Portugal
RO	Romania
SI	Slovenia
SK	Slovakia
FI	Finland
SE	Sweden
UK	United Kingdom
EU-28	European Union

Frequently used abbreviations

B-SAFER	brief spousal assault form for the evaluation of risk
DA	danger assessment
DASH	domestic abuse, stalking and harassment, and honour-based violence
DyRiAS	dynamic risk assessment system
EIGE	European Institute for Gender Equality
EU	European Union
EPV-R	severe intimate partner violence risk prediction scale — revised
FJC	family justice centres
FREDA	Feminist Research, Education, Development and Action
IDAP	integrated domestic abuse programme
ISA	increasing self-awareness
MARAC	multiagency risk assessment conference
NGO	non-governmental organisation
ODARA	Ontario domestic assault risk assessment
Patriarch	assessment of risk for honour-based violence
PAVD	programme for aggressors of domestic violence
PPIT	Priority Perpetrator Identification Tool
Salfag	situational analysis of domestic violence
SAM	stalking assessment and management
SARA	spousal assault risk assessment
SARA DN	adapted version of the spousal assault risk assessment for Czechia
VPR	valoración policial de riesgo (police risk assessment)
VPER	valoración policial de evolución de riesgo (police assessment for the evolution of risk)

Contents

Foreword	3
Abbreviations	4
Glossary of terms	7
Introduction	11
1. Legal and policy framework on risk assessment and management of intimate partner violence in the European Union	13
1.1. European Union legal framework	13
1.1.1. Victims' Rights Directive	13
1.1.2. The European protection order directive and Regulation (EU) No 606/2013	14
1.2. International legal framework	14
1.3. Member States' legal and policy framework	16
2. Risk assessment of intimate partner violence	19
2.1. Approaches	19
2.1.1. Unstructured clinical decision-making	19
2.1.2. Actuarial risk assessment	20
2.1.3. Structured approach based on professional judgement	20
2.2. Actors	21
2.3. Specialised instruments	23
2.4. Risk factors on risk assessment	24
2.4.1. Critical issues on risk factors	25
2.4.1.1. Victims' predictions about future violence	25
2.4.1.2. Risks associated with intersectionality	25
2.4.1.3. Risk factors associated with children's exposure to intimate partner violence	26
2.4.1.4. Risk factors associated with coercive control	26
2.4.1.5. Victim reluctance to disclose or report intimate partner violence	26
2.4.1.6. Protective factors	27
3. Risk management of intimate partner violence	28
3.1. Strategies	28
3.1.1. Offender management strategies	29
3.1.1.1. Protection orders	29
3.1.1.2. Perpetrator programmes	29
3.1.2. Protection of the victim	30
3.1.2.1. Victim safety planning	30

3.1.2.2. Victim-centred approach	31
3.1.2.3. Multiagency response	31
4. Challenges during the implementation of risk assessment and risk management procedures for victims of intimate partner violence	32
4.1. Risk assessment challenges	32
4.1.1. Limitations on predictive accuracy of risk assessment tools	32
4.1.2. Insufficient assessment of coercive control in risk assessment tools	33
4.1.3. Need for specialised training on risk assessment and risk management	33
4.1.4. Lack of the gender aspect in risk assessment instruments	33
4.1.5. Limited assessment of risk of children experiencing intimate partner violence	34
4.1.6. Lack of intersectionality aspect in risk assessment instruments	34
4.2. Risk management challenges	34
4.2.1. Limited research evidence on the efficacy of risk management practices	34
4.2.2. The cost of granting a protection order	34
4.2.3. Restrictions in the evaluation of the effectiveness of victims' safety planning	35
Conclusion	36
References	37
Annexes	47
Annex 1. Methodological approach	47
Annex 2. Overview of risk assessment and risk management for intimate partner violence in the EU Member States	48
Annex 3. Tables	67
List of tables	
Table 1 Risk assessment in legal/policy framework in EU Member States by type of document	17
Table 2. Risk assessment/management processes in the EU Member States and main actors involved	21
Table 3. Risk assessment tools used by police and other agencies in EU Member States	23

Glossary of terms

Coercive control

A strategic course of oppressive conduct that is typically characterised by frequent ... physical abuse and sexual coercion in combination with tactics to intimidate, degrade, isolate and control victims ⁽¹⁾.

Gender-based violence

Any form of violence that is directed against a woman because she is a woman or that affects women disproportionately. It includes all acts of violence against women that result in, or are likely to result in, physical, sexual, psychological or economic harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life ⁽²⁾.

Intersectionality

An analytical tool for studying, understanding and responding to the ways in which sex and gender intersect with other personal characteristics/identities, and how these intersections contribute to unique experiences of discrimination ⁽³⁾.

Intimate partner violence

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 a residence with the victim ⁽⁴⁾.

Multiagency cooperation

Effective coordination of actions among relevant actors playing a role in preventing and combat-

ing violence against women, including the judiciary, public prosecutors, law-enforcement agencies, and local and regional authorities, as well as non-governmental organisations and other relevant organisations and entities.

Perpetrator

A person who deliberately uses violent and abusive behaviour to control their partner or former partner, whether or not they have been charged, prosecuted or convicted ⁽⁵⁾.

Predictive validity

In evaluating the accuracy of risk assessment, studies typically assess the predictive validity of a risk assessment tool. Predictive validity (or accuracy) refers to the ability of an instrument to correctly assess the likelihood of violence or recidivism ⁽⁶⁾.

Probation

Period of supervision over a perpetrator, ordered by the court, instead of the perpetrator serving time in prison ⁽⁷⁾.

Protection order

A fast legal remedy to protect people at risk of any form of violence by prohibiting, restraining or prescribing certain behaviour by the perpetrator. Any order should take effect immediately after it has been issued and must be available without lengthy court proceedings. National protection measures can be of civil, criminal or administrative law in nature and their duration, scope and

⁽¹⁾ Stark, E., 'The dangerousness of danger assessment', *Domestic Violence Report*, Vol. 17, No 5, 2012, pp. 65-69.

⁽²⁾ Council of Europe (CoE) (2011), *Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, and its explanatory memorandum*, Council of Europe Treaty Series No 210.

⁽³⁾ European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE), <https://eige.europa.eu/thesaurus/terms/1263>

⁽⁴⁾ European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) (2017), *Glossary of definitions of rape, femicide and intimate partner violence*. Available at: <https://eige.europa.eu/publications/glossary-definitions-rape-femicide-and-intimate-partner-violence>

⁽⁵⁾ Council of Europe (CoE) (2017), Emergency barring orders in situations of domestic violence: Article 52 of the Istanbul Convention. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/convention-istanbul-article-52/168073e0e7>

⁽⁶⁾ Geraghty, K. A. and Woodhams, J. (2015), 'The predictive validity of risk assessment tools for female offenders: A systematic review', in *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Volume 21, March-April 2015, pp. 25-38. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1359178915000038>

⁽⁷⁾ The free dictionary by Farlex. Available at: <https://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/probation>

procedures of adoption vary among Member States ⁽⁸⁾.

Protective measures

Legislative and other measures aimed at protecting victims as well as their families and witnesses from any further form of violence and revictimisation or secondary victimisation, at all stages of investigations and judicial proceedings ⁽⁹⁾.

Psychological violence

Any act or behaviour that causes psychological harm to the partner or former partner. Psychological violence can take the form of, among other things, coercion, defamation, a verbal insult or harassment ⁽¹⁰⁾.

Offender management

Offender management involves a range of strategies aimed at holding perpetrators accountable and reducing violent behaviour. Such strategies include enforcing the law and pursuing criminal justice sanctions against the perpetrator. Offender management can include arrest/investigation, referrals to behaviour change programmes or programmes for alcohol and/or substance abuse, as well as indirect work to manage risk such as more intensive probation, police surveillance and information sharing between agencies.

Reassault

A repeated act of assault, in this case a repeated act of intimate partner violence ⁽¹¹⁾.

Recidivism

The tendency of someone convicted of intimate partner violence to reoffend ⁽¹²⁾.

Repeat victimisation

Repeat victimisation refers to a situation in which the same person suffers from more than one criminal incident over a specific period of time ⁽¹³⁾.

Risk

A situation involving exposure to danger of intimate partner violence ⁽¹⁴⁾.

Risk assessment

The assessment of the safety risks a particular victim faces on a case-by-case basis, according to standardised procedures and within a multiagency framework. Risk assessment includes an assessment of the lethality risk, the seriousness of the situation and the risk of repeated violence ⁽¹⁵⁾.

Risk factors

A characteristic at any level (individual, relational, community or societal) whose presence increases the possibility of intimate partner violence occurring or recurring ⁽¹⁶⁾.

Risk management

The process by which all relevant authorities manage the safety risks identified in a risk assessment. These activities may be directed towards victims (e.g. safety planning), towards perpetrators (e.g. using police powers to pursue, detect and disrupt offending behaviour) or towards victims and perpetrators in combination. The scope and type of activities undertaken should be informed by risk assessment, implemented within a multiagency framework and monitored for effectiveness. The aim of these activities is to try to reduce the threat posed by the perpetrator and protect the victim from further violence and abuse ⁽¹⁷⁾.

⁽⁸⁾ https://e-justice.europa.eu/content_mutual_recognition_of_protection_measures-358-en.do

⁽⁹⁾ Council of Europe (CoE) (2011), *Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence and its explanatory memorandum*, Council of Europe Treaty Series No 210. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/168046031c>

⁽¹⁰⁾ European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) (2017), *Glossary of definitions of rape, femicide and intimate partner violence*. Available at: <https://eige.europa.eu/rdc/eige-publications/glossary-definitions-rape-femicide-and-intimate-partner-violence>

⁽¹¹⁾ Oxford Dictionary. <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/reassault>

⁽¹²⁾ Oxford Dictionary. <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/recidivism>

⁽¹³⁾ Council of Europe (CoE) (2006), *Recommendation Rec(2006)8 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on assistance to crime victims*. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/16805afa5c>

⁽¹⁴⁾ Oxford Dictionary, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/risk>

⁽¹⁵⁾ Council of Europe (CoE) (2011), 'Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence' in *Istanbul Convention*, Article 51.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Council of Europe (CoE) (2016), *Improving the effectiveness of law-enforcement and justice officers in combating violence against women and domestic violence: Training of trainers manual*. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/16807016f3>

⁽¹⁷⁾ Robinson, A. L., Myhill, A., Wire, J., Roberts, J. and Tilley, N. (2016), *Risk-led policing of domestic abuse and the DASH risk model*, What Works: Crime Reduction Research. Cardiff & London: Cardiff University, College of Policing and UCL Department of Security and Crime Science. Available at: http://www.college.police.uk/News/College-news/Documents/Risk-led_policing_of_domestic_abuse_and_the_DASH_risk_model.pdf

Risk prediction

The process of assessing the likelihood of violence or recidivism.

Risk prevention

The process of avoiding risk or reducing the probability and impact of risk.

Safety planning

Safety planning is a process by which the victim may consult appropriate agencies to discuss increasing personal safety and the safety of any children. It should form part of a partnership approach between professionals, victims and children and should include an assessment of the level of risk and the development of a crisis plan and a plan for the future, both in the short term and in the longer term. The police have a role in helping to develop and support safety plans as part of their risk management processes. In general, the victim, with assistance from an independent domestic violence adviser or other independent advocacy service, should carry out the safety planning, with officers being able to contribute to the process by implementing safety measures as part of a risk management plan or action plan. It should be carried out in consultation with other agencies, for example the fire service, housing services and children's services (18).

Secondary victimisation

Secondary victimisation occurs when the victim suffers further harm not as a direct result of the criminal act but owing to the manner in which institutions and other individuals deal with the victim. Secondary victimisation may be caused,

for instance, by repeated exposure of the victim to the perpetrator, repeated interrogation about the same facts, the use of inappropriate language or insensitive comments made by anyone who comes into contact with the victim (19).

Victim

A natural person who has suffered harm, including physical, mental or emotional harm, or economic loss directly caused by a criminal offence, and family members of a person whose death was directly caused by a criminal offence and who have suffered harm as a result of that person's death (20).

Victim-centred approach

Placing the rights, needs and concerns of victims at the centre of interventions. This requires consideration of the multiple needs of victims, their risks and vulnerabilities, and the impact on them of decisions and actions taken.

Victimisation

Any adverse treatment (including dismissal in cases of unequal treatment at work) in reaction to a complaint (21).

Violence against women

A violation of human rights and a form of discrimination against women. This includes all acts of gender-based violence that result in, or are likely to result in, physical, sexual, psychological or economic harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life (22).

(18) College of Policing, Authorised Professional Practice. Available at: <https://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/major-investigation-and-public-protection/domestic-abuse/victim-safety-and-support/#safety-planning>

(19) Council of Europe (CoE) (2006), *Recommendation Rec(2006)8 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on assistance to crime victims*. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/16805afa5c>

(20) Article 2(1)(a), Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1421925131614&uri=CELEX:32012L0029>

(21) European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). <https://eige.europa.eu/rdc/thesaurus/terms/1425>

(22) Council of Europe (CoE) (2011), 'Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence' in *Istanbul Convention*, Article 3. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/168046031c>

Introduction

Intimate partner violence is the most widespread form of violence against women, and rarely consists of a single event but rather repeated acts of abuse. It has been characterised as a severe and escalating form of violence consisting of multiple forms of abuse, terrorisation and threats, and increasingly possessive and controlling behaviour on the part of the abuser⁽²³⁾. As a result, female victims of violence have multiple and diverse needs that have to be tackled. One of their top three needs is to be protected from further victimisation⁽²⁴⁾.

Risk assessment procedures and risk management strategies are considered parts of a system-wide response to prevent revictimisation. On national level, the development and/or the improvement of risk assessment procedures and risk management interventions is crucial in designing tailor-made strategies targeted at the needs of victims of intimate partner violence and their children.

In the context of intimate partner violence, risk assessment can be defined as evaluating the level of risk of harm a victim may be facing, including the likelihood of repeated and/or lethal violence. A range of agencies may be involved in carrying out risk assessment, including victim protection centres and women's shelters, social services and health professionals, as well as probation and prison services. However, the police,

as the agency often tasked with the front-line management of intimate partner violence, have the lead role in formal risk assessment processes. For the police, the goal is to identify high risk cases that can be selected to receive violence prevention interventions⁽²⁵⁾. The development of risk management interventions depends greatly on the purpose and outcome of risk assessment instruments and whether the system focuses on victim safety planning or managing perpetrators' behaviour, or both.

In order to provide a legal and policy framework to risk assessment and risk management, the European Union has introduced a number of legislative and policy initiatives to protect victims from further victimisation. Directive 2012/29/EU (Victims' Rights Directive) provides that victims' needs should be dealt with in an individual manner, based on an individual assessment⁽²⁶⁾. Directive 2011/99/EU⁽²⁷⁾ on the European protection order and Regulation (EU) No 606/2013⁽²⁸⁾ on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters should also be applied in risk assessment and risk management. At international level, the Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (Istanbul Convention) in Article 51 establishes the obligation of risk assessment and risk management to ensure that all relevant authorities effectively assess and devise a plan to manage the

⁽²³⁾ See Johnson, M. P., (1995), 'Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: two forms of violence against women', *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 57, pp. 283-294; Johnson M. P. and Ferraro, K. J., (2000), 'Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: making distinctions', *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 62, pp. 948-963. Johnson, M. P., (2008), *A typology of domestic violence*, Northeastern University Press, Lebanon, NH; and Johnson M. P., Leone J. M. and Xu Y., (2014), 'Intimate terrorism and situational couple violence in general surveys: ex-spouses required', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 20, No 2, pp. 186-207.

⁽²⁴⁾ European Agency of Fundamental Rights (FRA) (2014), *Violence against women: An EU-wide survey: Main results*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, pp. 64-67.

⁽²⁵⁾ Hoyle, C., (2008), 'Will she be safe? A critical analysis of risk assessment in domestic violence cases', *Children and Youth Services Review*, Vol. 30, No 3, pp. 323-337.

⁽²⁶⁾ DG Justice guidance document related to the transposition and implementation of Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA.

⁽²⁷⁾ Regulation (EU) No 606/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 June 2013 on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters. Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/%20TXT/?uri=celex%3A32013R0606>

⁽²⁸⁾ Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1563809966533&uri=CELEX:32012L0029>

safety risks a particular victim faces on a case-by-case basis ⁽²⁹⁾.

Supporting the implementation of EU legal provisions by Member States in risk assessment and risk management, the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) publishes this report focused on mapping relevant procedures, instruments and strategies applying to risk assessment and risk management in EU Member States. This overview describes the situation on national level, identifies existing gaps and challenges, and proposes a way to improve the accuracy and effectiveness of the existing policies through the development of *A guide to risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence against women for police*.

Chapter 1 of this overview provides an overview of the existing policy measures and legal provisions on risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence in the EU and its Member States. Chapter 2 presents the approaches and tools for risk assessment, as well as the risk factors involved during the risk assessment procedure, whilst Chapter 3 refers to risk management strategies implemented at EU level. Chapter 4 highlights challenges that can impact the implementation of risk assessment and risk management practices.

Lastly, for the purpose of this report, the term ‘victims of intimate partner violence’ will refer to women and girls, in acknowledgement of the disproportionate number of female victims and the gendered dimension of violence.

⁽²⁹⁾ Explanatory Report to the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. <https://rm.coe.int/16800d383a>

1. Legal and policy framework on risk assessment and management of intimate partner violence in the European Union

In this chapter, political initiatives and legal provisions of risk assessment and risk management are presented at EU, international and national levels.

Key point

The first step to protecting victims of intimate partner violence from further victimisation and to providing them with better support is the development of a robust legal and political framework on national, EU and international levels.

1.1. European Union legal framework

Protecting and supporting victims of intimate partner violence is a continued priority at EU level and many legislative and policy steps have been taken to improve system responses, to prevent violence against women and to support victims.

In particular, the Victims' Rights Directive⁽³⁰⁾ constitutes the major legal instrument which establishes the minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime. It aims to strengthen the rights of victims across the EU, ensuring that they are able to receive a minimum level of protection, support, access to justice, restoration and compensation. This is regardless of

where the crime takes place within the EU or of the victim's nationality. The other two EU legal instruments that could be applied in the risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence are the European protection order directive and Regulation (EU) No 606/2013.

1.1.1. Victims' Rights Directive

The core objective of the Victims' Rights Directive is to meet victims' and their family members' needs in an individual manner, based on an individual assessment, and apply a targeted and participatory approach towards the provision of information, support, protection and procedural rights⁽³¹⁾.

Article 22 of the directive is relevant both to risk assessment and risk management. Primarily, it calls specifically for individual assessment of the victim by the relevant services, and promotes a case-by-case approach towards victims. The purpose of the individual assessment of victims is to determine whether a victim has specific protection needs, and thus if special protection measures should be applied, and what these measures should be.

Importantly, the individual approach of the directive 'does not create priority categories or a hierarchy of victims' but specifies that special attention should be paid to victims of gender-based

⁽³⁰⁾ Directive 2011/99/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the European protection order. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32011L0099&qid=1563808386845&from=EN>

⁽³¹⁾ DG Justice and Consumers, Guidance document related to the transposition and implementation of Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime.

violence and violence in a close relationship, among others ⁽³²⁾.

Another key element of the Victims' Rights Directive is stressing the importance of a coordinated **multiagency approach** to the implementation of the directive itself. This should involve all relevant stakeholders for targeted and integrated support for victims with specific needs ⁽³³⁾.

Although the Victims' Rights Directive constitutes a considerable step in victims' protection in the EU and its Member States, EIGE's *An analysis of the Victims' Rights Directive from a gender perspective* report ⁽³⁴⁾ found certain weaknesses in the operational dimension of the individual assessment. Firstly, the majority of provisions are too general or do not provide any reference to instruments such as codes of conduct, in the absence of which the application of legal solutions can prove limited ⁽³⁵⁾. Secondly, the directive is not specific as to when the individual assessment is to be performed (and by whom).

As to children's experiences of intimate partner violence when assessing risk, the Victims' Rights Directive, in its **recital 17**, states that 'women victims of gender-based violence and their children often require special support and protection because of the high risk of secondary and repeat victimisation, of intimidation and of retaliation connected with such violence.' The directive also promotes a **child-sensitive approach**, whereby the best interests of a child victim is a primary consideration.

1.1.2. The European protection order directive and Regulation (EU) No 606/2013

Directive 2011/99/EU ⁽³⁶⁾ on the European protection order and Regulation (EU) No 606/2013 ⁽³⁷⁾ on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters ensure that civil and criminal protection orders issued in one EU Member State are recognised across the EU. This is linked to paragraph 1(c) of Article 4 of the Victims' Rights Directive on the right to receive information from the first contact with a competent authority, which explicitly mentions available protection measures. Furthermore, both Directive 2011/99/EU and Regulation (EU) No 606/2013 oblige EU Member States to recognise civil and criminal protection orders issued in other EU Member States, thereby enabling cross-border enforcement of such orders across the EU.

1.2. International legal framework

The Istanbul Convention is the first legal instrument on preventing and combating violence against women and girls at international level. It establishes a comprehensive framework of legal and policy measures for preventing such violence, supporting victims and punishing perpetrators. The convention came into force on 1 August 2014. As of March 2019, it has been signed by all EU Member States, and ratified by 21 ⁽³⁸⁾ ⁽³⁹⁾. The EU signed the Istanbul Convention

⁽³²⁾ DG Justice and Consumers, Guidance document related to the transposition and implementation of Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA.

⁽³³⁾ Directive 2011/99/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the European protection order. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32011L0099&qid=1563808386845&from=EN>

⁽³⁴⁾ European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) (2016), *An analysis of the Victims' Rights Directive from a gender perspective*. Available at: <https://eige.europa.eu/rdc/eige-publications/analysis-victims-rights-directive-gender-perspective>.

⁽³⁵⁾ European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) (2016), *An analysis of the Victims' Rights Directive from a gender perspective*. Available at: <https://eige.europa.eu/rdc/eige-publications/analysis-victims-rights-directive-gender-perspective>.

⁽³⁶⁾ Regulation (EU) No 606/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 June 2013 on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters. Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/%20TXT/?uri=celex%3A32013R0606>

⁽³⁷⁾ Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1421925131614&uri=CELEX:32012L0029>

⁽³⁸⁾ BE, DK, DE, EE, IE, EL, ES, FR, HR, IT, CY, LU, MT, NL, AT, PL, PT, RO, SI, FI, SE.

⁽³⁹⁾ <https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/210/signatures>

on 13 June 2017 and is in the process of concluding the convention. The accession of the EU to the convention will reinforce its commitment to combating violence against women within the EU, and will strengthen the EU legal framework in this area. In relation to risk assessment and risk management, Article 51 provides the following.

Article 51 of the Istanbul Convention established the obligation of all relevant authorities, not limited to the police, to effectively assess and devise a plan to manage the safety risks a particular victim faces on a case-by-case basis, according to standardised procedure and in cooperation and coordination with each other. Risk assessment in the convention is outlined as an ‘assessment of the lethality risk, the seriousness of the situation and the risk of repeated violence’, including access to firearms.

As to risk management implementation, the Istanbul Convention provides a number of articles on risk management strategies. More specifically, **Article 16** refers to **preventive intervention and treatment programmes**. In paragraph 1, it states that ‘parties shall take the necessary legislative or other measures to set up or support programmes aimed at teaching perpetrators of domestic violence to adopt non-violent behaviour in interpersonal relationships with a view to preventing further violence and changing violent behavioural patterns’⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Article 50 on immediate response, prevention and protection provides that ‘parties shall take the necessary legislative or other measures to ensure that the responsible law-enforcement agencies respond to all forms of violence covered by the scope of this Convention promptly and appropriately by offering adequate and immediate protection to victims’⁽⁴¹⁾.

Article 52 on emergency barring orders provides that ‘parties shall take the necessary legislative or other measures to ensure that the competent authorities are granted the power to order, in situations of immediate danger, a perpetrator of domestic violence to vacate the residence of the victim or person at risk for a sufficient period of time and to prohibit the perpetrator from entering the residence of or contacting the victim or person at risk. Measures taken pursuant to this article shall give priority to the safety of victims or persons at risk’⁽⁴²⁾.

Article 53 on restraining or protection orders calls parties to ‘take the necessary legislative or other measures to ensure that appropriate restraining or protection orders are available to victims of all forms of violence covered by the scope of this Convention’⁽⁴³⁾.

Article 56 on measures of protection states that ‘parties shall take the necessary legislative or other measures to protect the rights and interests of victims, including their special needs as witnesses, at all stages of investigations and judicial proceedings’⁽⁴⁴⁾.

With regard to children, the Istanbul Convention makes specific reference to children’s experiences, recognising that ‘children are victims of domestic violence, including as witnesses of violence in the family’⁽⁴⁵⁾. **Article 26** obligates state parties to ‘ensure that in the provision of protection and support services to victims, due account is taken of the rights and needs of **child witnesses**’. Furthermore, **Article 56** obligates states to ensure that special protection measures are made available to child victims and child witnesses of violence against women and domestic violence, taking into account the best interests of the child.

⁽⁴⁰⁾-⁽⁴⁵⁾ Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. Available at: <https://www.coe.int/fr/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/rms/090000168008482e>

1.3. Member States' legal and policy framework

The majority of EU Member States have risk assessment and/or risk management embedded in some form of policy document and/or national legislation on intimate partner violence ⁽⁴⁶⁾, such

as national action plans and strategies ⁽⁴⁷⁾, policies other than national action plans or strategies ⁽⁴⁸⁾ and in some cases risk assessment/risk management is not referred in legislation ⁽⁴⁹⁾ (Table 1). For analytical information on the policy and legal framework of each EU Member State please see Annex 2.

Table 1. Risk assessment in legal/policy framework in EU Member States by type of document

Risk assessment in legal and policy framework ⁽⁵⁰⁾	
Member State	Type of document
Belgium	National action plan 2015-2019
Bulgaria	No legal provision
Czechia	Methodological guide No 1/2010, director of the police service of the police presidium of Czechia to implement the mandatory instruction of the police president No 166/2009 on the execution of eviction
Denmark	National action plan to combat violence in the family and in intimate relations
Germany	Segmented implementation in federal states
Estonia	Strategy for preventing violence for 2015-2020 Action plan of the Ministry of the Interior
Ireland	Second national strategy on domestic, sexual and gender-based violence 2016-2021 Joint strategy on the management of offenders 2016-2018 Health service executive policy on domestic, sexual and gender-based violence 2010
Greece	Law No 4531/2018, Official Gazette 62/A/5-4-2018 (ratification of the Istanbul Convention), Law No 4478/2017, part IV, Official Gazette A91/23-6-2017, pp. 1 460-1 470 (Directive 2012/29/EU transposed into Greek law)
Spain	Organic Act 1/2004 of protection measures against gender violence Instruction (10/2007, from 10 July) organising the police risk assessment protocol for intimate partner violence Protocol for national law enforcement and security agency action and coordination with the courts for protection against gender and domestic violence — updated for police Direction 7/2016
France	No legal provision

⁽⁴⁶⁾ BE, CZ, DK, EE, IE, EL, ES, HR, IT, CY, LU, MT, NL, AT, PT, RO, SK, FI, UK.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ BE, DK, EE, IE, HR, IT, MT, FI, SE, UK.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ BE, CZ, IE, ES, IT, AT, PT, UK.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ BG, DE, EL, FR, LT, HU, PL, SI.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Information provided as of April 2019.

Risk assessment in legal and policy framework ⁽⁵⁰⁾	
Member State	Type of document
Croatia	National strategy for the development of support systems for victims and witnesses in the Republic of Croatia (2016-2020)
Italy	National strategic plan on male violence against women 2017-2020 National guidelines for hospitals for the relief and social/health assistance to women who suffer violence ('Pathway for female victims of violence') State-Regions agreement on minimum requirements for anti-violence centres and shelters (2014) Directive of the Ministry of Interior, Central Operational Service, 20 January 2017, No 77, establishing that all state police headquarters (Questure) adopt the EVA protocol
Cyprus	Ratification Law 14(III)/2017 Council of Europe Convention on the prevention and combating of violence against women and domestic violence Law No 51(I)/2007 (rights, support and protection of victims of crime) National action plan for the prevention and combating of violence in the family (2017-2019)
Latvia	Rules of the Cabinet of Ministers (23.3.2014) on prevention of danger of violence
Lithuania	Order on regulations of police interventions into the cases of domestic violence, operation and control of temporal protection measures issued by a court (No 5-V-611)
Luxembourg	Law of 8 September 2003 (as amended by the law of 30 July 2013) on domestic violence
Hungary	No legal provision
Malta	Criminal Code Gender-based violence and domestic violence national strategy and action plan, vision 2020
Netherlands	'Meldcode' (reporting code) Law 2013
Austria	Ministry of the Interior, internal police regulations
Poland	Ministry of the Interior, decision for the development of a risk assessment tool in the police (2013)
Portugal	National strategy for equality and non-discrimination (2018-2030) National plan to prevent and combat violence against women and domestic violence (2018-2021) Article 4-A, Law No 112/2009, 16 September, amended and republished by Law No 129/2015, 3 September (retrospective analysis in domestic violence homicide situations) Regulatory decree No 2/2018, 24 January Law No 112/2009, 16 September, amended and republished by Law No 129/2015, 3 September Regulatory decree No 2/2018, 24 January Ordinance 63/2011, 3 February
Romania	Law 174/2018 regarding the amendment and supplement of Law No 217/2003 on the prevention and fighting of domestic violence National strategy on promoting equal opportunities and treatment for women and men and the prevention and combating of domestic violence 2018-2021 Operational plan for the period 2018-2021
Slovenia	No legal provision

Risk assessment in legal and policy framework ⁽⁵⁰⁾	
Member State	Type of document
Slovakia	National action plan on the prevention and elimination of violence against women 2014-2019 Victims crime Law No 274/2017
Finland	National action plan to combat violence against women (2010-2015) and plan for implementation of the Istanbul Convention (2018-2021)
Sweden	National strategy to prevent and combat men's violence against women 2017-2027 National guidelines for relevant actors on how to use the specific risk assessment tools
United Kingdom	Strategy to end violence against women and girls 2016-2020 Police guidance

2. Risk assessment of intimate partner violence

This chapter provides an overview of risk assessment approaches, those involved, and specialised instruments implemented in the field. It also highlights the critical issues that might arise during the procedures of risk assessment.

Key point

In order to design a better response to victims' safety, and to reduce harm, it is essential that the drafters of risk assessment procedures become familiar with theoretical approaches and the way risk assessment is implemented, so as to be able to proceed towards the development of more accurate ways of estimating risk.

Risk assessment is a 'decision-making process through which we determine the best course of action by estimating, identifying, qualifying or quantifying risk'⁽⁵¹⁾ and its purpose is to reduce harm to female victims of intimate partner violence and their children. The importance of implementing it lays in the identification of all levels of risk, namely standard, medium and high, as well as victims' specific needs, which in turn will facilitate the gathering of detailed and relevant information about the victim and the perpetrator in intimate partner violence cases. Through this, better responses to victim safety tailored to a woman's specific needs could be designed. Equally important is the fact that risk assessment provides an enhanced 'paper trail' of evidence should the victim choose not to go forward with the case, allowing prosecutors to make more informed decisions about whether to proceed with cases when victims retract their original state-

ment. It also helps prosecutors to ensure stakeholder accountability for decisions on victim safety and offender management.

2.1. Approaches

Risk assessment of intimate partner violence is implemented within EU Member States according to different approaches and, in some cases, a combination of approaches is used. The main approaches to risk assessment are unstructured clinical decision-making, the actuarial approach and the structured professional judgement approach.

2.1.1. Unstructured clinical decision-making

Unstructured clinical decision-making is an informal approach to risk assessment used by professionals and practitioners in the field of intimate partner violence, including the police, social workers, health professionals and victim support services. It is perhaps the most widely used approach to risk assessment of violence as it does not involve any constraints or guidelines in performing the assessment and can be carried out by professionals across sectors⁽⁵²⁾. In this approach, the professional collects information and renders a risk assessment based on their own subjective judgement and discretion; these are justified by the professional's qualifications and experience⁽⁵³⁾. Some have argued that one strength of this approach is that it allows for flexibility and for the professional to consider the offender's specific behaviours and circumstances in the development of specific violence

⁽⁵¹⁾ Nicholls, T. L., Desmarais, S. L., Douglas, K. L. and Kropp, P. R. (2006), 'Violence risk assessments with perpetrators of intimate partner abuse', in *Family Interventions in domestic violence: A handbook of gender-inclusive theory and treatment*, J. Hamel and T. Nicholls, (eds.), Springer: New York, pp. 275-301.

⁽⁵²⁾ Dutton, D. G. and Kropp, P. R. (2008), 'A review of domestic violence risk instruments', *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, Vol. 1, No 2, pp. 171-181.

⁽⁵³⁾ Guo, B. and Harstall, C. (2008), *Spousal violence against women: Preventing recurrence*. Institute of Health Economics. Alberta, Canada. Available at: <https://www.ihe.ca/advanced-search/spousal-violence-against-women-preventing-recurrence>

prevention strategies⁽⁵⁴⁾. However, the approach has also been criticised as too heavily dependent on the opinion of the assessor, and therefore suffers from low reliability and is less accurate than structured risk assessments.

2.1.2. Actuarial risk assessment

The actuarial approach is a method used to predict specific violent behaviours based on the use of evidence-based risk factors. It uses statistical analysis conducted within a limited time frame in order to predict violence by providing an accurate estimate of the probability of a repeat attack⁽⁵⁵⁾. The actuarial approach involves the use of a tool with a checklist of static risk factors (such as criminal history) that have been shown to be statistically related to a specific outcome (recidivism/lethality). Risk factors are assessed as to whether they are present or not present, or are assigned a specific value according to guidelines. The values are then added up to get a total score that corresponds to a specific level of risk for future violence over a given period of time.

The main advantage of this approach is that it improves credibility and validity compared to an unstructured clinical approach. Another advantage of the actuarial approach is that because actuarial tools use the same criteria, findings can be replicated easily⁽⁵⁶⁾. In addition, the actuarial approach could be used by professionals who do not have specific training in the area of intimate partner violence, as professional judgement is not required.

The limitations to this approach include a dependence on static risk factors that do not capture how risk may fluctuate over time, and a focus

on risk prediction rather than risk management and violence prevention.

The most commonly used validated actuarial risk assessment tools for intimate partner violence are the Ontario domestic assault risk assessment (ODARA) and the danger assessment (DA).

2.1.3. Structured approach based on professional judgement

Structured professional judgement is an approach that attempts to bridge the gap between actuarial and unstructured clinical approaches to risk assessment and address the limitations associated with both⁽⁵⁷⁾. Emphasis is placed on developing guidelines and tools for risk assessment that are sufficiently flexible to take into account the specificities of each occurrence of violence. The method has also been termed the 'guided clinical approach'⁽⁵⁸⁾. Here, the practitioner must conduct the assessment according to specific risk assessment guidelines that reflect current theoretical, professional and empirical knowledge about violence. Such guidelines provide the minimum set of risk factors to be considered in every case as well as recommendations for information gathering (e.g. the use of multiple sources and multiple methods), communicating risk assessment results to other agencies where relevant and implementing violence prevention strategies⁽⁵⁹⁾. In structured approaches, evidence-based static and dynamic risk factors are used, which allows risk assessment processes to be used by a wide range of professionals such as police officers, lawyers, correctional staff, mental health professionals and victim support services. Additionally, risk assessment tools following this approach allow practitioners to integrate their own judgement when making the final risk de-

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Kropp, P.R. (2008), Intimate partner violence risk assessment and management. *Violence and Victims*, Vol. 23, No 2, p. 202.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Hilton, N. Z. and Harris, G. T. (2005), 'Predicting wife assault: a critical review and implications for policy and practice', *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* Vol. 6, No 1, p. 9. Available at: <http://tva.sagepub.com/content/6/1/3.abstract>

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Hilton, N. Z., Harris, G. T. and Rice, M., (2010), 'Risk assessment for domestically violent men: tools for criminal justice, offender intervention, and victim services', American Psychological Association, Washington, DC and Kropp, P. R., (2008), 'Intimate partner violence risk assessment and management', *Violence and Victims* Vol. 23, No 2, p. 202.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Douglas, K. and Kropp, P. R., (2002), 'A prevention-based paradigm for violence risk assessment: clinical and research applications', *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 2, pp. 617-658.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Hanson, R. K., (1998), 'What do we know about sex offender risk assessment?' *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, Vol. 4, pp. 50-72.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Department of Justice, Canada, *The development of the brief spousal assault form for the evaluation of risk (B-SAFER): A tool for criminal justice professionals*. Available at: http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/fl-lf/famil/rr05_fv1-rr05_vf1/p4.html

cision. Most importantly, this approach changes the emphasis from one of risk prediction to one of risk management ⁽⁶⁰⁾.

Three of the most commonly used tools that follow this approach are the spousal assault risk assessment (SARA), the brief spousal assault form for the evaluation of risk (B-SAFER), and the domestic violence screening inventory.

2.2. Actors

In the majority of countries, it is the police and other law-enforcement agencies (such as prosecutors and the courts) that have the lead role

in formal risk assessment processes, although in many EU Member States victim protection centres and women's shelters routinely carry out risk assessments with victims of intimate partner violence. Social workers also have a prominent role in risk assessment in EU Member States such as Belgium (Flanders), Croatia, Malta and Slovenia. Health professionals play a lesser role in risk assessment overall, however in Member States such as Italy, Belgium and Sweden there is evidence of increased involvement with the use of risk assessment tools and/or guidelines. Probation and/or prison services also play a role in risk assessment in order to inform criminal justice measures and decisions in certain Member States ⁽⁶¹⁾ (Annex 3, Table 2 ⁽⁶²⁾

Table 2. Risk assessment/management processes in the EU Member States and main actors involved

Member State	Main actors of risk assessment and risk management	Regulated and/or standardised at national level	Multiagency framework
Belgium	Police, social workers, health professionals, public prosecutors	No	Yes (not uniform)
Bulgaria	Non-governmental organisations (NGOs), social services	No	No
Czechia	Police, victim support centres	Yes	No
Denmark	Police, social services	No	Yes
Germany ⁽⁶²⁾	Police, specialised counselling services, victim support centres, perpetrator programmes, women's shelters, youth welfare agency, social workers, law-enforcement agencies	No	Yes (not uniform)
Estonia	Police, probation services, victim support services, social services (child protection, social workers), NGOs	Yes	Yes
Ireland	Police, probation services, health professionals, social services	Yes	No
Greece	Victim support centres, NGOs, police	No	No
Spain	Police, victim support centres, forensic assessment units inside institutes of legal medicine and forensic sciences, prison and probation services	Yes	Yes
France	Victim support centres, health services	No	No

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Doyle & Dolan (2008), Understanding and managing risk. In K. Soothill, P. Rogers, & M. Dolan (Eds.), Handbook of Forensic Mental Health. Uffculme, Devon, UK, Willan Publishing. In Bowen, E., (2011), 'An overview of partner violence risk assessment and the potential role of female victim risk appraisals', *Erica Bowen Aggression and Violent Behavior* 16, pp. 214-226.

⁽⁶¹⁾ ES,IR,ES,HR,MT,PT,SE.

⁽⁶²⁾ Rhineland-Palatinate and Lower Saxony.

Member State	Main actors of risk assessment and risk management	Regulated and/or standardised at national level	Multiagency framework
Croatia	Police, probation services, state attorney, social welfare centre, courts, victim support centres and shelters, perpetrator programmes	No	Yes (not uniform)
Italy	Police, law-enforcement agencies, victim support centres, perpetrator programmes, emergency departments, judiciary	No	Yes (not uniform)
Cyprus	Police, social welfare services, NGOs, health professionals	Yes	Yes
Latvia	Police, social departments, victim support centres	No	No
Lithuania	Police	Yes	No
Luxembourg	Police, public prosecutor, victim support centres, service in charge of perpetrators	No	Yes
Hungary	Women's rights NGOs working in the field, national crisis management and information telephone service, victim support centres	No	No
Malta	Malta Police Force, social workers	Yes	Yes (not uniform)
Netherlands	Victim support centres, health professionals, law-enforcement, child protection, social workers	Yes	Yes
Austria	Police, intervention/violence protection centres, justice system, health professionals in hospitals, men's counselling centres	Yes for police and intervention/violence protection centres	Yes (not uniform)
Poland	Police, social services, health professionals, education professionals, victim support centres	Yes	Yes
Romania	Police, Public Service of Social Assistance, probation services	Yes	Yes
Slovenia	Police, social workers, victim support centres, NGOs working with perpetrators	Yes	Yes
Slovakia	Police, victim support centres	Yes	No
Finland	Police, social services, health services, victim support centres	Yes	Yes
Sweden	Police, social services, prison and probation services, victim support centres	Yes	Yes
United Kingdom	Police, victim support centres	Yes	Yes

2.3. Specialised instruments

A variety of specialised instruments on risk assessment of intimate partner violence provide information ‘regarding the nature, form and degree of the danger’ of violence, while others allow the evaluator to make a probability statement regarding the likelihood of recidivism — some provide both ⁽⁶³⁾. Risk assessment tools are also used in different capacities and in a variety of settings, like in offender management, and to inform criminal justice processes, including decisions on perpetrators’ detention, sentencing and treatment ⁽⁶⁴⁾. They can also be used in civil matters when determining child custody and access, and to help set the conditions of civil or criminal restraining/protective orders ⁽⁶⁵⁾. Victim advocates and the police use them in safety planning with victims, includ-

ing referrals to other victim support agencies ⁽⁶⁶⁾. They are also used in fatality reviews when assessing gaps in services and communication that led to the death of a victim ⁽⁶⁷⁾.

In a number of EU Member States, various adaptations of validated risk assessment tools are used by various governmental and non-governmental actors, mainly the SARA (DK, IE, ES, IT, AT, PT, SK) and the B-SAFER (IT, SE), as well as the ODARA (DE, SK) and the DA (DE, IT, AT, PT). Most Member States in the EU have developed their own risk assessment tools reflecting their own specific context, which are widely used by the police and other sectors ⁽⁶⁸⁾. Nationally developed tools are often applied in addition to internationally validated tools (Table 1 and Table 3 in Annex 3).

Table 3. Risk assessment tools used by police and other agencies in EU Member States

Type of tools	No	EU Member States
Only internationally validated tools	2	Denmark, Luxembourg
Only risk assessment tools developed specifically for national use	11	Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Finland, United Kingdom
Both risk assessment tools developed specifically for national use and internationally validated tools	12	Belgium, Czechia, Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Spain, Italy, Hungary, Austria, Portugal, Slovakia, Sweden
Projects/procedures on risk assessment with or without the use of risk assessment tools	4	Bulgaria, Greece, France, Slovenia

⁽⁶³⁾ Northcot, M. (2012), *Intimate partner violence risk assessment tools: A review*, Research and Statistics Division Department of Justice Canada. Available at: http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/cj-jp/fv-vf/rr12_8/rr12_8.pdf

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Kropp, P. R. (2004), ‘Some questions regarding spousal assault risk assessment’, *Violence against women*, Vol. 10, No 6, pp. 676-697.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Kropp, P. R. (2004), ‘Some questions regarding spousal assault risk assessment’, *Violence against women*, Vol. 10, No 6, pp. 676-697.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ Braff, R. and Sneddon, C. (2007), ‘Family law act reform: The potential for screening and risk assessment for family violence’, *Australian domestic and family violence clearinghouse*, Sydney, Australia. Available at: <https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2007/02/apo-nid2705-1135811.pdf>

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Kropp, P. R. (2004), ‘Some questions regarding spousal assault risk assessment’, *Violence against women*, Vol. 10, No 6, pp. 676-697.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ BE, CZ, EE, IE, ES, HR, IT, CY, LT, HU, NL, AT, PL, PT, SK, SE, UK.

2.4. Risk factors on risk assessment

Risk factor is defined as a characteristic at any level (individual, relational, community or societal) whose presence increases the possibility of intimate partner violence occurring or reoccurring⁽⁶⁹⁾.

Risk factors may be related to:

- the **victim** (such as pregnancy/new birth, depression/mental health issue, isolation);
- the **perpetrator** (such as history of violence, access to weapons, previous or current breach of protection order);
- the **relationship** (such as separation, escalation of violence, financial difficulties);
- the **community** (poverty, lack of institutional support).

Thus, risk factors must take into account how an individual's exposure to violence is influenced by factors at the **individual, relational, community and societal** levels. Victims' own level of fear and views about the likelihood of future violence is also a critical determinant of the level of risk experienced by the individual. It is also important when assessing risk to take into account any protective factors that may serve to mitigate the risk (such as having a well-developed social network and having access to resources and social services)⁽⁷⁰⁾.

It is also important to consider risk factors, within a dynamic developmental systems perspective, in (a) **contextual characteristics of partners**, (b) **developmental characteristics and behaviours of the partners**, and (c) **relationship influences** and interactional patterns⁽⁷¹⁾.

Risk factors in (a), contextual characteristics of the partners, include **demographic factors** (age, gender, socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, acculturation among ethnic minority groups, and work- and financial-related stress), **neighbourhood- and community-level factors** and **school context factors**.

For the level of (b), developmental characteristics and behaviours that male and female partners bring to the relationship, the following risk factors are discussed:

- **family factors** (exposure to intimate partner violence in family or origin, experience of child abuse and parenting);
- **peer associations and influences** (association with deviant peers, social and emotional support);
- **psychological and behavioural factors** (behavioural problems/antisocial behaviour, personality disorders, depression, suicide attempts, alcohol and drug use, self-esteem issues);
- **cognitive factors** (hostile attributes, attitudes and beliefs).

The risk factors discussed at the level of (c), **couples' relationship and interaction patterns**, include relationship status, relationship satisfaction, and negative emotionality and jealousy.

A different classification of risk factors is between dynamic and static risk factors. Dynamic risk factors are factors that can change, which may be associated with changes in risk level, and include unemployment and financial issues (of both perpetrator and victim), current substance abuse, unsafe living situation of the victim, etc.⁽⁷²⁾. Risk assessment tools that incorporate dynamic factors are slightly more effective at predicting risk of violence in the community compared to those

⁽⁶⁹⁾ Council of Europe (2016), *Improving the effectiveness of law-enforcement and justice officers in combating violence against women and domestic violence, Training of trainers manual*. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/16807016f3>

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Department of Justice, Canada, *The development of the brief spousal assault form for the evaluation of risk (B-SAFER): a tool for criminal justice professionals*. Available at: http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/fl-lf/famil/rr05_fv1-rr05_vf1/p4.html

⁽⁷¹⁾ Capaldi, D. M., Knoble, N. B., Shortt, J. W. and Kim, H. K. (2012), 'A systematic review of risk factors for intimate partner violence', *Partner Abuse*, Vol. 3, No 2, pp. 231-280. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3384540/>

⁽⁷²⁾ Campbell, M. A., French, S. and Gendreau, P., (2009), 'The prediction of violence in adult offenders: a meta-analytic comparison of instruments and methods of assessment', *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 36, No 6, pp. 567-590.

that rely primarily on static factors ⁽⁷³⁾. Dynamic risk factors are also known as ‘criminogenic needs’ ⁽⁷⁴⁾. Conversely, static risk factors are risk factors that are fixed and unchangeable, such as demographic factors (e.g. age, gender, childhood history and criminal history) ⁽⁷⁵⁾. In intimate partner violence risk assessment, static risk factors are statistically tied to the current and past behaviour of the individual, such as criminal history, history of substance abuse, past violent behaviour towards the victim and general violent behaviour. Risk assessment tools that take both dynamic and static factors into account are those that take a structured approach based on professional judgement, such as the B-SAFER, the DA and the domestic abuse, stalking and harassment, and honour-based violence (DASH) checklist. Other risk assessment tools, such as the ODARA, are not sensitive to changes in risk because of the dominance of static risk items ⁽⁷⁶⁾.

2.4.1. Critical issues on risk factors

2.4.1.1. Victims’ predictions about future violence

One approach to assessing risk of intimate partner violence is asking the victim to determine the risk that the perpetrator will reoffend. Research has demonstrated that female victims of intimate partner violence are able to predict their risk of revictimisation with moderate accuracy ⁽⁷⁷⁾, as they are in a better position to provide relevant information on dynamic risk factors pertaining to

the perpetrator, such as mental health and violent behaviour ⁽⁷⁸⁾. An assessment was made of whether women’s perceptions can improve predictability of reassault above and beyond other risk factors present in three of the most popular risk assessment instruments — the Kingston Screening Instrument for Domestic Violence, the SARA and the DA. It was found that women’s perceptions of risk by themselves were much better predictors than the simulated Kingston Screening Instrument for Domestic Violence, similar to the SARA, and not quite as accurate as the DA. Following this, it was recommended that risk assessment instruments be used in combination with a variety of other sources of information, including women’s characteristics and perceptions of risk ⁽⁷⁹⁾.

However, risk assessment should not solely depend on a victim’s judgement, as they may over- or underestimate the risk and be reluctant to share information for a number of reasons, including fear for their safety. More specifically, some studies highlighted that victims may downplay or underestimate the risk of violence ⁽⁸⁰⁾.

2.4.1.2. Risks associated with intersectionality

Gender intersects and interacts with other protected characteristics ⁽⁸¹⁾; when these intersections reflect societal discrimination (e.g. race, immigration status), women and children often experience additional barriers to accessing and

⁽⁷³⁾ Campbell, M. A., French, S. and Gendreau, P., (2009), ‘The prediction of violence in adult offenders: a meta-analytic comparison of instruments and methods of assessment’, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 36, No 6, pp. 567-590.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ Canales, D., Macaulay, A., McDougall, A., Wei, R. and Campbell, M. A., (2013), *A brief synopsis of risk assessment screening tools for frontline professionals responding to intimate partner violence*, Centre for Criminal Justice Studies, University of New Brunswick. Available at: https://www.unb.ca/saintjohn/ccjs/_resources/pdf/ipvrisktoolsynopsis2013.pdf

⁽⁷⁵⁾ Hanson and Morton-Bourgon (2009) and Guo and Harstall (2008) cited in Northcot, M., *Intimate partner violence risk assessment tools: A review*, Research and Statistics Division, Department of Justice, Canada.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ Canales, D., Macaulay, A., McDougall, A., Wei, R., Campbell and M. A., (2013), *A brief synopsis of risk assessment screening tools for frontline professionals responding to intimate partner violence*, Centre for Criminal Justice Studies, University of New Brunswick. Available at: https://www.unb.ca/saintjohn/ccjs/_resources/pdf/ipvrisktoolsynopsis2013.pdf

⁽⁷⁷⁾ Cattaneo, L., Bell, M., Goodman, L. and Dutton, M., (2007), ‘Intimate partner violence victims’ accuracy in assessing their risk of re-abuse’, *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 22, pp. 429-440, doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9097-8; Heckert, D. A. and Gondolf, E. W., (2004), ‘Battered women’s perceptions of risk versus risk factors and instruments in predicting repeat reassault’, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 19, No 7, pp. 778-800, doi:10.1177/0886260504265619.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ Connor-Smith, J. K., Henning, K., Moore, S. and Holdford, R., (2010), ‘Risk assessments by female victims of intimate partner violence: predictors of risk perceptions and comparison to an actuarial measure’, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 26, No 12, pp. 2 517-2 550. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510383024>

⁽⁷⁹⁾ Heckert, D. A. and Gondolf, E. W. (2004), ‘Battered women’s perceptions of risk versus risk factors and instruments in predicting repeat reassault’, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 19, No 7, pp. 778-800, doi:10.1177/0886260504265619.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ cf. Weisz, Tolman, and Saunders (2000) and Campbell et al. (2001) cited in Australian Attorney-General’s Department, *AVERT Family violence: collaborative responses in the family law system* (2010). Weisz, Tolman, and Saunders (2000) found that women’s perception of danger was the single best predictor of reassault, a stronger predictor than any of the 10 items from the danger assessment available in criminal justice records. Similarly, Goodman, Dutton and Bennett (2001) in a sample of 92 women found that women’s prediction of reassault was the strongest single predictor of reassault. Campbell et al. (2001) concurred, noting that victims underestimated the risk in 47 % and 53 % of actual and attempted femicides respectively.

⁽⁸¹⁾ Sex, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, membership of a national minority, property, birth, disability, age or sexual orientation (Article 21 — Non discrimination, EU Charter of Fundamental Rights).

obtaining support and protection. Addressing the needs of these victims requires both recognition and inclusion in the development of risk assessment procedures and risk management strategies. Therefore, risk assessment tools must be sufficiently flexible and dynamic to take into account unique risks that may be associated with specific groups of women such as migrant women, refugee women, older women, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex individuals and disabled women.

2.4.1.3. Risk factors associated with children's exposure to intimate partner violence

Children's exposure to intimate partner violence includes being exposed at home, directly or indirectly, to violent or threatening behaviour between caregivers. This includes physical and emotional abuse through behaviours such as humiliation, intimidation and controlling actions, and is associated with increased risk of psychological, social, emotional and behavioural problems⁽⁸²⁾. However, in most of the EU Member States children's experiences of intimate partner violence are not reflected, since a separate risk assessment focused on them is not usually carried out.

The Barnardo's Domestic Violence Risk Identification Matrix is a domestic violence risk assessment instrument focusing on the child, and is used in parts of the United Kingdom. The Matrix uses risk factors associated with child and adult victims of domestic violence as identified in the literature and from child death reviews. Domestic violence, risk/vulnerability factors and protective measures are assessed to determine if the children and mother are in need of support or an immediate protection plan⁽⁸³⁾.

2.4.1.4. Risk factors associated with coercive control

Risk factors should include items that may represent an underlying pattern of abusive behaviour consistent with coercive control. Factors associated with a course of coercive and controlling conduct include perpetrators' threats, controlling behaviour and sexual coercion, and victims' isolation and fear — factors that feature less frequently in standardised risk assessment tools⁽⁸⁴⁾. In addition, it can often be observed that even where risk factors associated with coercive control are included in risk assessment, practitioners often lack a clear understanding of the importance of coercive control when making judgements about victims and perpetrators⁽⁸⁵⁾. This can have serious implications for the efficacy of current approaches to domestic abuse⁽⁸⁶⁾.

2.4.1.5. Victim reluctance to disclose or report intimate partner violence

The fear of the abuser (physical and emotional) is a crucial element in the mental/psychological dimension of reluctance to disclose/report intimate partner violence. It is also intrinsically linked with the systemic response to victims' safety. Attempting to leave the domestic situation increases the danger for the woman and is likely to precipitate an escalation of the violence against her⁽⁸⁷⁾. Research has clearly demonstrated that for many victims the disclosure of the abuse (even in the form of sharing with friends and family members) results in retribution by the perpetrator and increased 'punishment'⁽⁸⁸⁾. Therefore, the risk of reassault presents a serious factor that will always have a decisive value for a victim, and a victim may take any possible precautions to avoid further escalation of abuse. Such self-protection measures may take the form of not reporting, or

⁽⁸²⁾ Wathen C. D. and MacMillan H. L., (2013), 'Children's exposure to intimate partner violence: impacts and interventions', *Paediatric Child Health*, Vol. 18, No 8, pp. 419-422.

⁽⁸³⁾ Healy, J. and Bell, M., (2005), *Assessing the risks to children from domestic violence: findings from two pilot studies using the Barnardo's Domestic Violence Risk Assessment Model*, Barnardo's, Ireland. Retrieved 9 August 2016 from: http://www.barnardos.org.uk/pp_no_7_assessing_the_risks_to_children_from_domestic_violence.pdf.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ Myhill, A. and Hohl, K., (2016), 'The "golden thread": coercive control and risk assessment for domestic violence', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, pp. 1-21.

⁽⁸⁵⁾ Robinson, R., Myhill, A. and Wire, J., (2018), 'Practitioner (mis)understandings of coercive control in England and Wales', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, Vol. 18, No 1, pp. 29-49.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ Robinson, R., Myhill, A. and Wire, J., (2018), 'Practitioner (mis)understandings of coercive control in England and Wales', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, Vol. 18, No 1, pp. 29-49.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ Domestic Violence, Council Report CR102, (2002), London: Royal College of Psychiatrists, viewed on 6 November 2011.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ Marshall, L., (1992), 'Development of the severity of violence against women scales', *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 7, pp. 103-121; Carlson, R. G. and Jones, K. D., (2010), 'Continuum of conflict and control: a conceptualization of intimate partner violence typologies', *The Family Journal*, Vol. 18, No 3, pp. 248-254.

retracting at a certain stage of criminal investigation.

2.4.1.6. Protective factors

Potential protective factors are noticeably absent from standard risk assessment instruments for intimate partner violence ⁽⁸⁹⁾. Furthermore, a relatively limited number of studies have examined the role of protective factors in assessing risk of intimate partner violence. It might be that the inclusion of protective factors may increase the predictive validity of risk assessment tools and provide useful insights for risk management and intimate partner violence prevention strategies. A factor that has been hypothesised as an important protective factor for intimate partner violence victimisation in particular is social support, because social isolation is considered a risk factor ⁽⁹⁰⁾. Studies that compare the protective value

of different aspects of support within populations with differing characteristics are also needed. In a meta-analysis of published and unpublished studies where any risk or protective factor(s) for self-reported intimate partner violence victimisation among women were analysed, it showed that unplanned pregnancy and having parents with less than high school education, which may indicate lower socioeconomic status, are risk factors, whereas being older or married were protective ⁽⁹¹⁾. A bigger number of studies focused on risk factors related to women rather than to their partners (or the perpetrators). Other protective factors that may be useful for risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence include emotional support, financial or social resources to reduce dependence, connection with support services, capacity to emotionally separate from perpetrators and personal coping strategies ⁽⁹²⁾.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ Rogers, R. (2000), 'The uncritical acceptance of risk assessment in forensic practice. *Law and human behavior*', 24(5), pp. 595-605.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ Goodman, L., Dutton, M. A., Vankos, N. and Weinfurt, K., (2005), 'Women's resources and use of strategies as risk and protective factors for reabuse over time', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 11, No 3, pp. 311-336.

⁽⁹¹⁾ Yakubovich, A. R., Stöckl, H., Murray, J., Melendez-Torres, G. J., Steinert, J. I., Glavin, C. E. Y and Humphreys, D. K., (2018), 'Risk and protective factors for intimate partner violence against women: systematic review and meta-analyses of prospective-longitudinal studies', *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 108, No 7, p. e1-e11.

⁽⁹²⁾ Centers for Diseases Control and Prevention, *Risk and protective factors for perpetration*, <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/riskprotectivefactors.html>

3. Risk management of intimate partner violence

In this chapter, the strategies of risk management are presented. The strategies are focused on victims' protection, and on perpetrators' accountability.

Key point

Broader knowledge of the developments on risk management needs to be acquired by policymakers so as to develop strategies that are tailor made to victims of intimate partner violence needs.

Risk management aims to prevent violence against victims of intimate partner violence by influencing risk and protective factors⁽⁹³⁾. It involves different strategies designed both to protect the victim and to work with the perpetrators to make them more accountable and to reduce their violent behaviour. The development of risk management strategies is linked to risk assessment procedures and depends heavily on the purpose and outcome of risk assessment tools, whether the system focuses exclusively on victims or on managing perpetrator behaviour (or both). Thus, risk management strategies adopted by the police and other services, as will be analysed further on in this chapter, largely depend on the level of risk assessed.

3.1. Strategies

Risk management by the police involves enforcing the law and pursuing criminal justice sanctions

against the perpetrator, as well as undertaking safety planning with the victim. These actions are influenced by risk assessment, to reduce the threat posed by the perpetrator and protect the victim from further violence and abuse.

Risk management strategies can include, but are not limited to, the following types⁽⁹⁴⁾.

- **Monitoring**, which refers to strategies that involve surveillance or repeated assessment. The goal of monitoring is to evaluate changes in risk factors over time so that risk management strategies can be revised as appropriate.
- **Supervision**, which involves imposition of controls or restrictions of freedoms. The goal of supervision is to make it (more) difficult for the perpetrator to engage in further violence.
- **Intervention**, involving measures that focus on the perpetrator's behaviour or mental health, including referral to a perpetrator programme, a substance use treatment programme, or other rehabilitation strategies, etc.
- **Victim/survivor safety planning**, which is the process of supporting or empowering victims/survivors in developing strategies and implementing measures to increase their safety.

Ways of implementing risk management strategies are described on the following page.

⁽⁹³⁾ Hart, S. D., (2008), 'Preventing violence: the role of risk assessment and management', in A. C. Baldry and F. W. Winkel (eds.), *Intimate partner violence prevention and intervention*, Nova Science, New York, pp. 7-18.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ Centre for Research and Education on Violence against Women and Children, (2012), *Domestic violence risk assessment and management curriculum*. Available at: http://onlinetraining.learningtoendabuse.ca/sites/default/files/lessons/DVRAM%20full-text%20December%202012_1.pdf

3.1.1. Offender management strategies

3.1.1.1. Protection orders

A protection order is a fast legal remedy to protect persons at risk of any form of violence by prohibiting, restraining or prescribing certain behaviour of the perpetrator⁽⁹⁵⁾. Civil protective orders are an important additional legal remedy available to victims of domestic violence. Research indicates that women typically seek orders of protection after serious levels of victimisation and after repeated abuse over a significant length of time⁽⁹⁶⁾. Protection orders have been introduced in many countries and are largely similar, although they vary in name⁽⁹⁷⁾. Despite differences in name, the core purpose of protection orders is the same: to try to protect those who are being harassed and stalked by an intimate or former intimate partner⁽⁹⁸⁾.

In general, protection orders are not sufficient if used alone without any additional protective actions from police or social services⁽⁹⁹⁾. For instance, in a study carried out in Sweden⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ on examining the effectiveness of the restraining order as a protective risk management strategy to prevent intimate partner violence, it was found that, in 44 % of cases, perpetrators had breached the restriction orders. This was most clearly the case in situations where the risk of violence remained high, meaning that the majority of perpetrators who had a restraining order and recidivated were assessed as high risk. This suggests that the restraining order, while of limited protective use, may be most effective against perpetrators

assessed to present a low or medium risk of future violence.

3.1.1.2. Perpetrator programmes

Perpetrator programmes for intimate partner violence constitute an offender management strategy focused on perpetrators. They emerged in the 1980s and the rationale behind them was to provide a holistic and victim-centred approach as an important part of the coordinated community response to gender-based violence⁽¹⁰¹⁾. It is important to stress that these programmes should not be set up in isolation, but in close cooperation with women's support services, law-enforcement agencies, the judiciary, probation services and child protection or child welfare offices⁽¹⁰²⁾ in order to contribute to women's safety. Across the EU there are different types of perpetrator programmes being implemented⁽¹⁰³⁾:

- **treatment programmes delivered within prison (for both sexually violent men and domestic violence perpetrators);**
- **probation-led behavioural change programmes for convicted perpetrators (mainly for domestic violence perpetrators and implemented by voluntary associations);**
- **community-based behavioural and attitude-change programmes delivered by NGOs and other agencies that have links to the criminal justice system (mainly for domestic violence perpetrators, for example where referral from the criminal justice sys-**

⁽⁹⁵⁾ Council of Europe, (2011), *Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence explanatory report* CM(2011)49-addfinal. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/16800d383a>

⁽⁹⁶⁾ Jordan, C. E., (2004), 'Intimate partner violence and the justice system: an examination of the interface', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 19, pp. 1 412-1 434.

⁽⁹⁷⁾ They are also known as a restraining order, barring order, domestic violence restraining order, intervention order, civil harassment restraining order or an anti-harassment order.

⁽⁹⁸⁾ Benitez, C. T., McNeil, D. E. and Binder, R. L., (2010), 'Do protection orders protect?', *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, Vol. 38, No 3, p. 376.

⁽⁹⁹⁾ Strand, S., (2012), 'Using a restraining order as a protective risk management strategy to prevent intimate partner violence', *Police Practice and Research*, Vol. 13, No 3, pp. 254-266, doi:10.1080/15614263.2011.607649.

⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Strand, S., (2012), 'Using a restraining order as a protective risk management strategy to prevent intimate partner violence', *Police Practice and Research*, Vol. 13, No 3, pp. 254-266, doi:10.1080/15614263.2011.607649.

⁽¹⁰¹⁾ European Network for the Work with Perpetrators of Domestic Violence, *Perpetrators programmes: Starting a conversation*. Available at: https://www.work-with-perpetrators.eu/fileadmin/WWP_Network/redakteure/Campaign/WWP_flyer_EN_FINAL.pdf

⁽¹⁰²⁾ Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, (2014), *Domestic and sexual violence perpetrator programmes: Article 16 of the Istanbul Convention*, A collection of papers on the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, p. 7. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/168046e1f2>.

⁽¹⁰³⁾ Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (2014), *Domestic and sexual violence perpetrator programmes: Article 16 of the Istanbul Convention*, A collection of papers on the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/168046e1f2>

tem may then be a condition for dropping criminal charges);

- community-based behavioural and attitude-change programmes delivered by NGOs and other agencies that have no link to the criminal justice system (mainly for domestic violence perpetrators).

Despite the variety and differentiation in approaches and implementation of these programmes there is limited evidence about their effectiveness in treating perpetrators. In a study on a Duluth model⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ batterers intervention programme, it was found that over one third of batterers assigned to it eventually reoffended; there was no difference between those who finished and dropouts on official arrest reports⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. A Swedish study was not able to identify a difference in recidivism rates in groups of men participating in the integrated domestic abuse programme (IDAP)⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. However, a more recent study carried out in Spain showed positive outcomes for recidivism among offenders participating in a court-mandated batterer intervention programme⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. These results highlight the necessity of studying and evaluating perpetrator programmes in a specific socioeconomic and cultural context in due time. Evidence suggests that in order to increase the effectiveness of batterer intervention programmes, batterers' different needs and risk profiles should be taken into account⁽¹⁰⁸⁾. It was found that risk management

recommendations were associated with decreased recidivism in high risk perpetrators but with increased recidivism in low-risk perpetrators⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. This provides evidence that, while high risk offenders are best handled with high levels of intervention, the same high levels of intervention can be counterproductive when working with low-risk offenders⁽¹¹⁰⁾. In an overview of risk management tactics, monitoring and supervision appear to be of particular importance for high risk perpetrators⁽¹¹¹⁾. More specifically, frequent contact with perpetrators, victims and their families by social services or healthcare or criminal justice professionals were said to be an excellent form of monitoring when high risk perpetrators have access to the community⁽¹¹²⁾.

3.1.2. Protection of the victim

3.1.2.1. Victim safety planning

Safety planning is facilitated by the screening and risk assessment process. It is a strategic process enabling the victim, with the support of professionals and services, to make use of the existing and available resources. This helps her to be aware of the risk she faces and increases her, as well as her children's, safety⁽¹¹³⁾. The safety plan is composed of a set of measures designed together with the victim and can cover the victim's specific needs at different times in the cycle of the abusive relationship.

⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ Developed in Minnesota in the 1980s, the Duluth model (part of the domestic abuse intervention programmes) advocates a coordinated community approach to tackling domestic abuse, putting the safety of women and children at the centre and requiring agencies to work together to protect victims whilst consistently holding perpetrators accountable for their abuse or violence through intervention that offers them an opportunity to change (see <http://theduluthmodel.org/about>) (<https://rm.coe.int/168046e1f2>).

⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Herman et al. (2014), Outcomes from a Duluth model batterer intervention program at completion and long-term follow-up, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 53:1, pp. 1-18, doi:10.1080/10509674.2013.861316.

⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ Haggård, U., Freij, I., Danielsson, M., Wenander, D. and Långström, N., (2017), 'Effectiveness of the IDAP treatment program for male perpetrators of intimate partner violence', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 32, No 7, pp. 1 027-1 043. doi:10.1177/0886260515586377.

⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ Lila, M., Oliver, A., Catalá-Miñana, A. and Conchell, R., (2014), 'Recidivism risk reduction assessment in batterer intervention programs: a key indicator for program efficacy evaluation', *Psychosocial Intervention*, Vol. 23, pp. 217-223. 10.1016/j.psi.2014.11.001.

⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ Carbajosa, P., Catalá-Miñana, A., Marisol, L. and Gracia, E., (2017), 'Differences in treatment adherence, program completion, and recidivism among batterer subtypes', *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, Vol. 9, No 2, pp. 93-101.

⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ Belfrage, H. and Strand, S., (2012), 'Measuring the outcome of structured spousal violence risk assessments using the B-SAFER: risk in relation to recidivism and intervention', *Behavioural Sciences & the Law*, Vol. 30, No 4, pp. 420-30. doi: 10.1002/bsl.2019.

Storey, J. E., Kropp, P. R., Hart, S. D., Belfrage, H. and Strand, S., (2013), 'Assessment and management of risk for intimate partner violence by police officers using the brief spousal assault form for the evaluation of risk', *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 256-271.

⁽¹¹⁰⁾ Belfrage, H., Strand, S., Storey, J. E., Gibas, A. L., Kropp, P. R., Hart and S. D., (2011), 'Assessment and management of risk for intimate partner violence by police officers using the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide', *Law and Human Behavior*, Vol. 36 No 1, pp. 60-67; Storey, J. E., Kropp, P. R., Hart, S. D., Belfrage, H. and Strand, S., (2013), 'Assessment and management of risk for intimate partner violence by police officers using the brief spousal assault form for the evaluation of risk', *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 41, No 2, pp. 256-271.

⁽¹¹¹⁾ Hart, S. D., (2008), 'Preventing violence: the role of risk assessment and management', in A. C. Baldry and F. W. Winkel (eds.), *Intimate partner violence prevention and intervention*, Nova Science, New York, pp. 7-18.

⁽¹¹²⁾ Hart, S. D., (2008), 'Preventing violence: the role of risk assessment and management', in A. C. Baldry and F. W. Winkel (eds.), *Intimate partner violence prevention and intervention*, Nova Science, New York, pp. 7-18.

⁽¹¹³⁾ Centre for Research and Education on Violence against Women and Children, (2012), *Domestic violence risk assessment and management curriculum*. Available at: http://onlinetraining.learningtoendabuse.ca/sites/default/files/lessons/DVRAM%20full-text%20December%202012_1.pdf

As mentioned before, a victim leaving a relationship may actually increase the risk of reassault and this is considered a risk factor for intimate partner violence.

Beyond the personal safety plan developed between the victim and the professional managing her case, interagency plans can also be developed, whereby multiple agencies work in collaboration to manage the risk⁽¹¹⁴⁾.

3.1.2.2. Victim-centred approach

The role of the victim is crucial for risk management. A victim-centred approach aims to achieve a shared safety management strategy where responsibilities, actions and commitments are clearly identified and agreed upon. Given that the greatest source of information on the specific situation is the victim herself, she should be at the centre of all interventions. All efforts should aim to provide her with the opportunity to engage actively with supporting agencies/services and to be informed at every stage of the process. Children's needs should also be taken into account since they could be an important consideration to victims whether they seek safety or not, as well as how victims retrospectively evaluate the safety strategies they used⁽¹¹⁵⁾.

When drafting risk management strategies with the collaboration of the victim, the personal characteristics of the victim of intimate partner violence should be taken into consideration. For instance, migrant and refugee women often fall out of the system and, at times, are barred from

seeking legal remedies altogether, particularly in the case of undocumented migrants. For many migrant women, the choice is essentially limited to either 'safety in their home' (safety from a violent partner) or 'state intervention in their life'⁽¹¹⁶⁾.

3.1.2.3. Multiagency response

Multiagency mechanisms, whether formal or informal, could provide a prominent response to intimate partner violence. A multiagency framework provides a coordinated response to intimate partner violence by bringing together statutory and volunteer agencies which, in collaboration with the victim, design tailored, individualised safety strategies. Such agencies could be the police, public safety organisations, social services, health professionals, emergency shelters and consultation centres, as well as experts in intervention programmes for perpetrators.

An example of multiagency response is the multi-agency risk assessment conference (MARAC). The MARAC is a formal conference to facilitate the risk assessment and management process for high risk victims of domestic violence. The purpose is for agencies to share information in order to identify those at high risk and very-high risk and thereafter jointly constructing a management plan to provide professional bespoke support to all those at risk⁽¹¹⁷⁾. The MARAC model could be implemented with some alterations in cases of intimate partner violence.

For more details, consult EIGE's *A guide on risk assessment of intimate partner violence by the police*.

⁽¹¹⁴⁾ Department for Child Protection, (2011), The Western Australian Family and Domestic Violence, *Common risk assessment and risk management framework*, Western Australian Government, Perth.

⁽¹¹⁵⁾ Thomas, K. A., Goodman, L. and Putnins, S., (2005) 'I have lost everything: trade-offs of seeking safety from intimate partner violence', *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Vol. 85, pp. 170-180.

⁽¹¹⁶⁾ Coker, D., (2004) 'Race, poverty, and the crime-centered response to domestic violence: a comment on Linda Mills's "Insult to injury: rethinking our responses to intimate abuse"', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 10, No 11, 2004, pp. 1 331-1 353.

⁽¹¹⁷⁾ Richards L., Letchford S. and Stratton S. (2013), *Policing domestic violence*, OXFORD University Press, p. 301.

4. Challenges during the implementation of risk assessment and risk management procedures for victims of intimate partner violence

This chapter highlights the challenges that are usually encountered during the implementation of risk assessment and risk management, and underlines the necessity of introducing solutions.

Key point

Managing the limitations of risk assessment procedures and risk management strategies is crucial in order to provide more effective protection to victims of intimate partner violence and their children.

4.1. Risk assessment challenges

4.1.1. Limitations on predictive accuracy of risk assessment tools

There is a relatively small body of empirical evidence to evaluate tools that assess the risk of intimate partner violence. Studies focused on this theme have found that risk assessment tools have moderate predictive accuracy: on one hand,

they showed a weak to moderate association between risk assessment and recidivism⁽¹¹⁸⁾ and on the other hand, although lethal assault is of greatest concern, the necessary evidentiary basis for recommending a measure to assess for risk of lethal intimate partner violence is highly limited⁽¹¹⁹⁾.

Another consequence of limited predictive accuracy is the possibility of inaccurate predictions, which may result in false positives or false negatives. A false negative, that labels an accused as low risk for reoffending, may lead to difficulties for the criminal justice system if the offender does reoffend, as well as victim harm, should measures not be taken to ensure the victim's safety. A false positive, which labels an offender as high risk for reoffending when in fact they are not, may lead to undue harm to the abuser and may heighten the fear experienced by the victim⁽¹²⁰⁾.

The literature review revealed a small number of large-scale validation studies available⁽¹²¹⁾, and a restricted number of countries which carried out the studies. This lack of empirical research has also made the determination of more accurate tools and the best-suited approaches diffi-

⁽¹¹⁸⁾ Belfrage, H. and Strand, S., (2012), 'Measuring the outcome of structured spousal violence risk assessments using the B-SAFER: risk in relation to recidivism and intervention', *Behavioural Sciences & the Law*, Vol. 30, No 4, pp. 420-30. doi:10.1002/bsl.2019; Belfrage H. et al., (2012), 'Assessment and management of risk for intimate partner violence by police officers using the spousal assault risk assessment guide', *Behavioural Sciences & the Law*, Vol. 30, No 4, pp. 420-430. doi:10.1002/bsl.2019; Storey, J. E. et al., (2013), 'Assessment and management of risk for intimate partner violence by police officers using the brief spousal assault form for the evaluation of risk', *Criminal Justice and Behavior* Vol. 41, No 2.

⁽¹¹⁹⁾ Nicholls, T. L. et al., (2013), 'Risk assessment in intimate partner violence: a systematic review of contemporary approaches', *Partner Abuse*, Vol. 4, No 1; Bowen, E., (2011), *The rehabilitation of partner-violent men*, Wiley, Chichester; Guo, B. and Harstall, C. (2008), 'Spousal violence against women: preventing recurrence' (Report), *Institute of Health Economics*, Alberta, Canada. Retrieved from: <https://www.ihe.ca/advanced-search/spousal-violence-against-women-preventing-recurrence>

⁽¹²⁰⁾ Messing, J. T. and Thaller, J. (2013), 'The average predictive validity of intimate partner violence risk assessment instruments', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 28, No 7, pp. 1 537-1 558, doi:10.1177/0886260512468250.

⁽¹²¹⁾ Some of the studies that focus on predictive validity are the following Cattaneo, L., Bell, M., Goodman, L. and Dutton, M., (2007), 'Intimate partner violence victims' accuracy in assessing their risk of re-abuse Connor-Smith, J. K., Henning, K., Moore, S. and Holdford, R., (2010), 'Risk assessments by female victims of intimate partner violence: predictors of risk perceptions and comparison to an actuarial measure'.

Gondolf, E. W. and Heckert, D. A., (2003), 'Determinants of women's perceptions of risk in battering relationships'.

Heckert, D. A. and Gondolf, E. W., (2004), 'Battered women's perceptions of risk versus risk factors and instruments in predicting repeat reassault'.

cult. The theory of coercive control further complicates research on risk assessment that focuses primarily on the statistical precision with which specific tools can predict future physical assaults.

4.1.2. Insufficient assessment of coercive control in risk assessment tools

Risk assessment and research on risk assessment have, to date, focused primarily on the 'violence incident model' of reoffending and revictimisation that reflects physical assault and risk of physical injury⁽¹²²⁾, underestimating the impacts of psychological violence.

Coercive control theory challenged notions similar to those mentioned above, suggesting that frequency of coercive behaviours was a better predictor of lethal violence than severity of previous assaults, even though the study and practice of risk assessment have been slow to adjust to the new paradigm. 'A failure to recognise coercive and controlling patterns of abusive behaviour can lead to practitioners excluding eligible cases from processes designed to respond to domestic abuse, and it can exacerbate a tendency for underappreciating the inherent risk in some situations'⁽¹²³⁾. Thus, the absence of a clear understanding of patterns of abuse associated with coercive control can have serious implications for the efficacy of current approaches to domestic abuse.

4.1.3. Need for specialised training on risk assessment and risk management

There is a gap in experience, specialised training and/or guidelines to support front-line professionals in conducting risk assessment processes for intimate partner violence. Assessing the level of risk in cases of intimate partner violence is often a complicated process. It requires specific training for front-line professionals in order to provide them with skills and knowledge, enabling them to understand and properly assess the level of intimate partner violence risk. This is particu-

larly important in view of the fact that the predictive accuracy of risk assessment tools depends largely on the training of professionals, their level of experience with intimate partner violence and the existence of specific guidelines or monitoring of standardised risk assessment tools. In addition, some standardised risk assessment tools (e.g. SARA and DASH) require the practitioner to receive adequate training to be able to identify, assess and manage risk.

4.1.4. Lack of the gender aspect in risk assessment instruments

Gender perspective is not integrated in policy, law, and practice on risk assessment procedures. More specifically, the applied instruments and tools are gender blind. In Slovakia, for example, police are required to pose the same questions to each victim, regardless of gender (or other characteristics). In other cases, risk assessment was focused exclusively on victim behaviour (risk to rather than risk from), and therefore management processes centred on victim behaviours and actions only rather than on controlling abusive behaviours of perpetrators. In Ireland, where the law is gender neutral, risk management activity requires police to invite the victim to make a statement; provide information on victim services, protection orders and additional information as appropriate; and record information on the police information management system. Strategies for controlling abusive behaviour of the perpetrator are noticeably absent.

Another challenge identified was the absence of the gendered elements in predicting lethality, such as coercive and controlling behaviours. Austria, for instance, has no specific law on intimate partner violence, does not use a gendered approach, and does not include psychological violence in its risk assessments. In the United Kingdom, an evaluation of police risk assessment in England identified that a failure to apply the principles of gender that underpin coercive control resulted in assessments that failed to iden-

⁽¹²²⁾ Stark, E., (2012), 'The dangerousness of danger assessment', *Domestic Violence Report*, Vol. 17, No 5, pp. 65-69.

⁽¹²³⁾ Robinson, R., Myhill, A. and Wire, J., (2018), 'Practitioner (mis)understandings of coercive control in England and Wales', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, Vol. 18, No 1, pp. 29-49.

tify 'the dangerous patterns of behaviour that precede domestic homicide' (¹²⁴).

4.1.5. Limited assessment of risk of children experiencing intimate partner violence

In most EU Member States, there is no separate risk assessment tool for children experiencing intimate partner violence. Only in some tools, there is, at least, one risk factor associated with the presence of children in the relationship and/or their exposure to violence. However, it is not clear how risk factors associated with worse outcomes for children are taken into account in risk management strategies and responses (¹²⁵).

As a result, children's experiences of intimate partner violence are either reflected only to a limited extent or not reflected at all (Table 3 in Annex 3).

Another critical issue is the way different services interpret risk, which depends in part on their role in the system. These differences in perspective may not only impede the processes of risk assessment and risk management, but also the effective protection of children experiencing intimate partner violence (¹²⁶).

4.1.6. Lack of intersectionality aspect in risk assessment instruments

Gender intersects and interacts with other multiple vulnerabilities that may increase susceptibility to violence by increasing the number of risk factors related to intimate partner violence and reducing possible protective factors. However, research on the development and use of culturally competent risk assessment tools is limited. More comparable research is needed to determine whether generic risk assessment tools can be applied with the same predictive validity to specific population groups.

In EU Member States, at least two standardised risk assessment tools take into account specific forms of violence that may affect specific population groups, such as those which are motivated by 'honour', including forced marriage and female genital mutilation, namely the DASH in the United Kingdom and the assessment of risk for honour-based violence (Patriarch) in Sweden.

4.2. Risk management challenges

4.2.1. Limited research evidence on the efficacy of risk management practices

Risk management is under-researched, undervalued, and hard to link with risk assessment outcomes. There is a common — and significant — gap in data regarding the practice and efficacy of risk management strategies linked with risk assessment in the EU Member States. Proactive interventions are for the most part limited to protection orders linked to risk assessment (¹²⁷), and in many countries those require victim initiation, especially in civil settings. Moreover, data on the efficacy of victim safety planning and links to risk factors identified in risk assessment is lacking in the EU Member States.

4.2.2. The cost of granting a protection order

Numerous difficulties could introduce barriers to a victim of intimate partner violence seeking to gain a protection order, such as the cost in the absence of legal aid, the level of evidence required and the period of time within which emergency orders have to be issued. As a result, research reveals that in many countries women seeking protection orders fail to receive them. For example, an evaluation in Sweden indicated that only half of the applications by women seeking protection

(¹²⁴) Robinson, R., Myhill, A. and Wire, J., 'Practitioner (mis)understandings of coercive control in England and Wales', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, Vol.18, No 1, 2018, pp. 29-49. See also, Stark, E., (2012), 'The dangerousness of danger assessment', *Domestic Violence Report*, Vol. 17, No 5, pp. 65-69.

(¹²⁵) Stanley, N., (2011), *Children experiencing domestic violence: A research review*, Research in Practice, Dartington.

(¹²⁶) Stanley, N., (2011), *Children experiencing domestic violence: A research review*, Research in Practice, Dartington.

(¹²⁷) BE, BG, CZ, DE, EE, IE, ES, HR, CY, LT, LU, MT, AT, PL, PT, SI, SK, and parts of the UK.

from a violent husband were granted. In Germany, many protection order cases are closed with a settlement or withdrawal of the victim's application, and only a minority with a decision of the court ⁽¹²⁸⁾.

4.2.3. Restrictions in the evaluation of the effectiveness of victims' safety planning

Safety planning strategies for women experiencing intimate partner violence is an under-re-

searched topic and literature on evidence-based practices and their outcomes is scarce. Currently, the term 'safety plan' typically refers to plans with an almost exclusive focus on physical violence. These plans mostly rely on physical separation and a victim leaving a relationship to increase her own safety. These types of plans are important tools for many victims, but their narrow focus offers limited safety and, for some victims, it increases risk ⁽¹²⁹⁾.

⁽¹²⁸⁾ Hagemann-White, C., (2006), *Combating violence against women*, Directorate-General of Human Rights, Strasbourg, p. 16.

⁽¹²⁹⁾ Davies, J., (2017), *Victim-defined safety planning: A summary*, Greater Hartford Legal Aid, Hartford, CT. Available at: <https://vawnet.org/sites/default/files/assets/files/2018-07/Victim-Defined-Safety-Planning.1-17.pdf>

Conclusion

Effective implementation of risk assessment and management procedures contribute to better protection of the victim of intimate partner violence and her children from further victimisation.

The development of a more specialised legal and policy framework on all levels — national, EU and international — should introduce a more systematic and effective system for a better protection of victims of intimate partner violence. In recent years, the EU has enacted a number of legal acts, which contribute to the protection of victims of violence in general, and that of victims of gender-based violence in particular. An example of this is the introduction of provisions focused on assessing the risk of intimate partner violence. As a result, there is an obligation for the Member States to further develop more specialised and tailor-made mechanisms on risk assessment and risk management at national level.

Risk assessment tools and instruments, and risk assessment strategies, need to be regularly evaluated. As it has been indicated, research on the accuracy of risk assessment instruments and on the effectiveness of risk management strategies is scarce. An evaluation of both of them would highlight their advantages and limitations, and would aid policymakers in the police sector in se-

lecting the most adequate instrument or developing a relevant one, tailor made to the needs of each Member State.

It is imperative that new elements, such as the victim-centred approach, inclusion of gender and intersectionality aspects, as well as the estimation of coercive control, are embedded in risk assessment instruments, to enable the improvement of their predictive validity and effectiveness. It is also important that police officers who are going to apply and develop more accurate procedures receive the relevant training.

It is equally crucial to include aspects of intersectionality in the training of police officers, to enable the understanding of interconnection between individual characteristics such as race, disability, age, religion, immigration status, ethnicity and sexual orientation. This helps more targeted and holistic interventions that would meet victims' needs to be drafted, and to be implemented through multiagency mechanisms.

A more detailed proposal of how to develop gender-sensitive and individualised risk assessment procedures and holistic risk management strategies can be found in EIGE's *A guide to risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence against women for police*.

References

- Abrams, M. L., Belknap, J. and Melton, H. C. (2001), *When domestic violence kills: the formation and findings of the Denver metro domestic violence fatality review committee*, Project Safeguard, Denver.
- Albuquerque, M. et al. (2013), *E-MARIA: European manual for risk assessment*, Bupnet, Göttingen.
- Amor, P. J., Bohórquez, I. A., Corral, P. and Oria, J. C. (2012), 'Variables psicosociales y riesgo de violencia grave en parejas con abuso de sustancias tóxicas y maltrato previo' [Psychosocial variables and risk of severe violence in couples with substance abuse and previous maltreatment], *Acción Psicológica*, Vol. 9, No 1, Faculty of Psychology of the Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, pp. 3-18. Available at: <http://revistas.uned.es/index.php/accionpsicologica/article/view/204>
- An Garda Síochána (2017), *Policy of An Garda Síochána on domestic abuse intervention*, An Garda Síochána, Dublin. Available at: <https://www.garda.ie/en/Crime/Domestic-abuse/Domestic-Abuse-Intervention-Policy-2017.pdf>
- Artz, L. and Jefthas, D. (2011), *Reluctance, retaliation and repudiation: the attrition of domestic violence cases in eight magisterial districts*, GHJRU, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
- Baldry, A. C. and Duban, E. (2016), *Improving the effectiveness of law-enforcement and justice of-ficers in combating violence against women and domestic violence: training of trainers manual*, Council of Europe. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/16807016f3>
- Belfrage, H. et al. (2012), 'Assessment and management of risk for intimate partner violence by police officers using the spousal assault risk assessment guide', *Law and Human Behavior*, Vol. 36, No 1, American Psychological Association, pp. 60-67. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22471386>
- Belfrage, H. and Strand, S. (2012), 'Measuring the outcome of structured spousal violence risk assessments using the B-SAFER: risk in relation to recidivism and intervention', *Behavioural Sciences & the Law*, Vol. 30, No 4, Wiley, pp. 420-430. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22782915>
- Belfrage H., Strand, S., Ekman L. and Hasselborg A. (2011), 'Assessing risk of patriarchal violence with honour as a motive: six years, experience using the Patriarch checklist', *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, Vol. 14, No 1, Sage Publications, pp. 20-29.
- Belfrage, H. and Strand, S. (2009), 'Validation of the stalking assessment and management checklist (SAM) in law-enforcement: a prospective study of 153 cases of stalking in two Swedish police counties', *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, Vol. 11, No 1, Sage Publications, pp. 67-76.
- Benitez, C. T., McNiel, D. E. and Binder, R. L. (2010), 'Do protection orders protect?', *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, Vol. 38, No 3, American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, pp. 376-385.
- Besluit verplichte meldcode huiselijk geweld en kindermishandeling, (2018). Available at: <http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0033723/2018-07-28>
- Blavier, A. and Nederlandt, P. (2016), 'Conception d'un code de signalement à l'usage des professionnels liés au secret professionnel (voir art. 458Bis du Code Pénal) et confrontés à des situations de violences entre partenaires' (research report), IGVM, Brussels.

- Bowen, E. (2011), 'An overview of partner violence risk assessment and the potential role of female victim risk appraisals', *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Vol. 16, No 3, Elsevier, pp. 214-226.
- Bowen, E. (2011), *The rehabilitation of partner-violent men*, Wiley, Chichester.
- Braff, R. and Sneddon, C. (2007), 'Family law act reform: the potential for screening and risk assessment for family violence', Australian Domestic & Family Violence Clearinghouse, Sydney, Australia.
- Buzawa, E. S. (2012), 'The evolving police response to domestic violence', *Journal of Police Crisis Negotiations*, Vol. 12, No 2, Taylor & Francis, pp. 82-86.
- Campbell, J. C., Webster, D., Koziol-McLain, J., Block, C., Campbell, D., Curry, M. A. and Laughon, K. (2003), 'Risk factors for femicide in abusive relationships: results from a multisite case control study', *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 93, No 7, American Public Health Association, pp. 1 089-1 097.
- Campbell, J. et al. (2007), 'Intimate partner homicide: review and implications of research and policy', *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, Vol. 8, No 3, Sage Publications, pp. 246-269.
- Campbell, J. C., Webster, D. W. and Glass, N. (2008), 'The danger assessment: validation of a lethality risk assessment instrument for intimate partner femicide', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 24, No 4, Sage Publications, pp. 653-674.
- Campbell, M. A., French, S. and Gendreau, P. (2009), 'The prediction of violence in adult offenders: a meta-analytic comparison of instruments and methods of assessment', *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 36, No 6, Sage Publications, pp. 567-590.
- Campbell, M., Hilton, N. Z., Kropp, P. R., Dawson, M., Jaffe, P. (2016), *Domestic violence risk assessment: informing safety planning & risk management: domestic homicide brief (2)*, Canadian Domestic Homicide Prevention Initiative, London, Ontario.
- Canales, D., Macaulay, A., McDougall, A., Wei, R., Campbell, M. A. (2013), *A brief synopsis of risk assessment screening tools for frontline professionals responding to intimate partner violence*, Centre for Criminal Justice Studies, University of New Brunswick. Available at: https://www.unb.ca/saintjohn/ccjs/_resources/pdf/ipvrisktoolsynopsis2013.pdf
- Capaldi, D. M., Knoble, N. B., Shortt, J. W. and Kim, H. K. (2012), 'A systematic review of risk factors for intimate partner violence', *Partner Abuse*, Vol. 3, No 2, Springer Publishing, pp. 231-280. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3384540/>
- Carbajosa, P., Catalá-Miñana, A., Lila, M. and Gracia, E. (2017), 'Differences in treatment adherence, program completion, and recidivism among batterer subtypes', *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, Vol. 9, No 2, Elsevier España, pp. 93-101.
- Cattaneo, L. B. and Goodman, L. A. (2005), 'Risk factors for reabuse in intimate partner violence: a cross-disciplinary critical review', *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, Vol. 6, No 2, Sage Publications, pp. 141-175.
- Cattaneo, L. B., Bell, M. E., Goodman, L. A. and Dutton, M. A. (2007), 'Intimate partner violence victims' accuracy in assessing their risk of reabuse', *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 22, No 6, Springer Publishing, pp. 429-440.
- Centers for Diseases Control and Prevention, *Risk and protective factors for perpetration*. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/riskprotectivefactors.html>
- Centre for Research and Education on Violence against Women and Children, *Domestic violence risk assessment and management curriculum*. Available at: http://onlinetraining.learningtoendabuse.ca/sites/default/files/lessons/DVRAM_%20full-text_%20December_%202012_1.pdf
- Cesvis, Centro Studi Vittime SARA, *ISA increasing self awareness: Daphne Project N° 2006-1_300_W*. Available at: <http://www.sara-cesvis.org/index.php?op->

tion=com_content&task=view&id=115&Item-id=136

Circuit Barcelona contra la violència vers les dones (2011), THE RVD-BCN: Risk assessment guide for violence against women perpetrated by their partner or former partner. Available at: [http://ajuntament.barcelona.cat/dretssocials/sites/default/files/arxiu-documents/RVD-BCN %20Publicacio %20ANGLES %20novembre %202012.pdf](http://ajuntament.barcelona.cat/dretssocials/sites/default/files/arxiu-documents/RVD-BCN%20Publicacio%20ANGLES%20novembre%202012.pdf)

Ajuntament de Barcelona, *Barcelona circuit against gender violence*. Available at: <http://ajuntament.barcelona.cat/bcnantimasclista/en/preventing-and-acting/barcelona-circuit-against-gender-violence>

Coker, D. (2004), 'Race, poverty, and the crime-centered response to domestic violence: a comment on Linda Mills's *Insult to injury: rethinking our responses to intimate abuse*', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 10, No 11, Sage Publications, pp. 1 331-1 353.

COM(2016) 109 final, Proposal for a Council Decision on the conclusion, by the European Union, of the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence.

COM(2016) 111 final, Proposal for a Council Decision on the signing, on behalf of the European Union, of the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence.

Council of Europe (2011), *Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence*, Council of Europe Treaty Series No 210. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/168046031c>

Council of Europe (2011), *Explanatory report to the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence*. Available at <https://rm.coe.int/16800d383a>

Council of Europe (2014), *Domestic and sexual violence perpetrator programmes: Article 16*

of the Istanbul Convention: A collection of papers on the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/168046e1f2>

DASH risk model. Available at: <https://www.dashriskchecklist.co.uk/>

Davies, J. (2017), *Victim-defined safety planning: a summary*, Greater Hartford Legal Aid, Hartford, Connecticut. Available at: <https://vawnet.org/sites/default/files/assets/files/2018-07/Victim-Defined-Safety-Planning.1-17.pdf>

De Deken, L., Pas, L., Hillemans, K., Cornelis, E. and Van Royen, P. (2010), 'Detectie van partnergeweld: een aanbeveling voor de huisarts' [Detection of partner violence: a recommendation for the general practitioner], *Huisarts Nu*, Vol. 39, No 3, pp. 57-63.

Western Australian Family and Domestic Violence (2011), *Common risk assessment and risk management framework*, Government of Western Australia Department for Child Protection and Family Support, Perth.

Department of Justice, Canada, *The development of the brief spousal assault form for the evaluation of risk (B-SAFER): a tool for criminal justice professionals*. Available at: http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/fl-lf/famil/rr05_fv1-rr05_vf1/p4.html.

Royal College of Psychiatrists (2003), *Domestic Violence Council Report CR102*, Cambridge University Press.

Douglas, K. S. and Kropp, P. R. (2002), 'A prevention-based paradigm for violence risk assessment: clinical and research applications', *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 2, No 5, Sage Publications, pp. 617-658.

Doyle, M. and Dolan, M. (2008), 'Understanding and managing risk', *Handbook of Forensic Mental Health*, Willan Publishing, Devon, United Kingdom.

- Dutton, D. G. and Kropp, P. R. (2008), 'A review of domestic violence risk instruments', *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, Vol. 1, No 2, Sage Publications, pp. 171-181.
- Echeburúa, E., Amor, P. J., Loinaz, I. and de Corral, P. (2010), 'Escala de predicción del riesgo de violencia grave contra la pareja —revisada—(EPV-R)' [Severe intimate partner violence risk prediction scale — revised], *Psicothema*, Vol. 22, No 4, Colegio Oficial de Psicólogos del Principado de Asturias, pp. 1 054-1 060. Available at: www.psicothema.es/pdf/3840.pdf
- Ελληνική Αστυνομία (2005), Αρχηγείο Ελληνικής Αστυνομίας, Κλάδος Διοικητικού, Διευθυσση Οργάνωσης-Νομοθεσίας, Η αντιμετώπιση της ενδοοικογενειακής βίας. Available at: http://www.astynomia.gr/images/stories/Attachment13518_egxeiridio.pdf
- European Institute for Gender Equality (2016), *An analysis of the Victims' Rights Directive from a gender perspective*. Available at: <https://eige.europa.eu/publications/analysis-victims-rights-directive-gender-perspective>
- European Institute for Gender Equality (2014), *Estimating the costs of gender-based violence in the European Union: Report*. Available at: <http://eige.europa.eu/rdc/eige-publications/estimating-costs-gender-based-violence-european-union-report>
- European Network for the Work with Perpetrators of Domestic Violence, *Perpetrator programmes: Starting a conversation*. Available at: https://www.work-with-perpetrators.eu/fileadmin/WWP_Network/redakteure/Campaign/WWP_flyer_EN_FINAL.pdf
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union (2011), *Directive 2011/99/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the European protection order*. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32011L0099&from=EN>
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union (2012), *Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA*. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32012L0029&from=EN>
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union (2013), *Regulation (EU) No 606/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 June 2013 on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters*. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32013R0606&from=EN>
- European Parliament (2010), *The issue of violence against women in the European Union*
- 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*. Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/eplive/expert/multimedia/20110405MLT17038/media_20110405MLT17038.pdf
- European Union (2013), *DG Justice guidance document related to the transposition and implementation of Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA*.
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2012), *Annual report 2011: Fundamental rights: challenges and achievements in 2011*, p. 225. Available at: http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/2211-FRA-2012_Annual-Report-2011_EN.pdf
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2014), *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey: Main results*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. Available at: http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2014-vaw-survey-main-results-apr14_en.pdf

- Ficha RVD — 1L: Avaliação de risco para situações de violência doméstica* [RVD — 1L: risk assessment report on domestic violence situations]. Available at: http://www.ministeriopublico.pt/sites/default/files/documentos/pdf/ficha_rvd_1l.pdf
- Ficha RVD — 2L: Avaliação de risco para situações de violência doméstica* [RVD — 2L: risk assessment report on domestic violence situations]. Available at: http://www.ministeriopublico.pt/sites/default/files/documentos/pdf/ficha_rvd_2l.pdf
- FJC Limburg (2018), *Triage instrument FJC Limburg*, Flemish Government — Department of Well-being, Public Health and Family, Department of Houses of Justice (document not published).
- Gillis, J. R. et al. (2006), 'Systemic obstacles to battered women's participation in the judicial system: when will the status quo change?', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 12, No 12, Sage Publications, pp. 1 150-1 168.
- Gondolf, E. W. and Heckert, D. A. (2003), 'Determinants of women's perceptions of risk in battering relationships', *Violence and Victims*, Vol. 18, No 4, Springer Publishing, pp. 371-386.
- GonzálezÁlvarez, J.L., López Ossorio, J.J. and Muñoz Rivas, M. (2018), *La valoración policial del riesgo de violencia contra la mujer pareja en España*, Ministerio del Interior, Madrid. Available at: <http://www.interior.gob.es/documents/642012/8791743/Libro+Violencia+de+G%C3%A9nero/19523de8-df2b-45f8-80c0-59e3614a9bef>
- Goodman, L., Dutton, M. A., Vankos, N. and Weinfurt, K. (2005), 'Women's resources and use of strategies as risk and protective factors for re-abuse over time', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 11, No 3, Sage Publications, pp. 311-336.
- Groenen, A., Van Vossolle, A. and Matkoski, S. (2015), 'Risicoscreening en risicotaxatie inzake partnergeweld in België' [Risk screening and risk assessment concerning partner violence in Belgium], *Handboek Familiaal Geweld*, Politeia, Brussels, pp. 1-18.
- Gruppo di lavoro inter-disciplinare finalizzato alla realizzazione di un modello provinciale innovativo di presa in carico delle donne che hanno subito violenza, Province of Trento, 27 October 2017, Delibera 1776/2017.
- Guo, B. and Harstall, C. (2008), *Spousal violence against women: preventing recurrence*, Institute of Health Economics, Alberta, Canada. Available at: <https://www.ihe.ca/advanced-search/spousal-violence-against-women-preventing-recurrence>
- Hagemann-White, C. (2006), *Combating violence against women*, Directorate-General of Human Rights, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, p. 16.
- Haggård, U., Freij, I., Danielsson, M., Wenander, D. and Långström, N. (2017), 'Effectiveness of the IDAP treatment program for male perpetrators of intimate partner violence: a controlled study of recidivism', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 32, No 7, pp. 1 027-1 043.
- Haller, B., Pelikan, C. and Smutny, P. (2004), 'The Austrian Protection against Domestic Violence Act 1996', *Crime Policy in Europe*, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, pp 37-46.
- Haller, B. (2005), 'Gewalt in der Familie: Evaluierungen des österreichischen Gewaltschutzgesetzes', *Das österreichische Gewaltschutzgesetz*, Verlag Österreich, Vienna, pp. 269-388.
- Hanson, R. K., Helmus, L. and Bourgon, G. (2007), *The validity of risk assessments for intimate partner violence: a meta-analysis*, Public Safety Canada, Ottawa.
- Hanson, R. K. (1998), 'What do we know about sex offender risk assessment?' *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, Vol. 4, Nos 1-2, American Psychological Association, pp. 50-72.
- Hart, S. D. (1998), 'The role of psychopathy in assessing risk for violence: Conceptual and methodological issues', *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, Vol. 3, No 1, British Psychological Society, pp. 121-137. Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.2044-8333.1998.tb00354.x/abstract>

- Hart, S. D. (2008), 'Preventing violence: the role of risk assessment and management', *Intimate partner violence prevention and intervention*, Nova Science, New York, pp. 7-18.
- Healy, J. and Bell, M. (2005), *Assessing the risks to children from domestic violence: Findings from two pilot studies using the Barnardo's Domestic Violence Risk Assessment Model*, Barnardo's, Northern Ireland. Available at: http://www.barnardos.org.uk/pp_no_7_assessing_the_risks_to_children_from_domestic_violence.pdf
- Heckert, D. A. and Gondolf, E. W. (2004), 'Battered women's perceptions of risk versus risk factors and instruments in predicting repeat reassault', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 19, No 7, Sage Publications, pp. 778-800.
- Heckert, D. A. and Gondolf, E. W. (2004), 'Predicting abuse and reassault among batterer program participants'. Available at: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/199730.pdf>
- Heilbrun, K., Yasuhara, K. and Shah, S. (2010), 'Violence risk assessment tools: overview and critical analysis', *Handbook of violence risk assessment*, Routledge, New York, pp. 1-17.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Court Administration (2005), *Domestic violence, safety and family proceedings: Thematic review of the handling of domestic violence issues by the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (CAFCASS) and the administration of family courts in Her Majesty's Courts Service (HMCS)*. Available at: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.hmica.gov.uk/files/HMICA_Domestic_violence_linked1.pdf
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of the Constabulary (2014), 'Everyone's business: improving the police response to domestic abuse', HMIC, London, p. 70.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of the Constabulary (2014), Merseyside Police's approach to tackling domestic abuse, HMIC, London. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmicfrs/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/merseyside-approach-to-tackling-domestic-abuse.pdf>
- Herman K., Rotunda R., Williamson G. & Vodanovich S. (2014), 'Outcomes from a Duluth model batterer intervention program at completion and long-term follow-up', *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, Vol. 53, No 1, Taylor & Francis, pp. 1-18.
- Hester, M. (2004), 'Future trends and developments: violence against women in Europe and East Asia', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 10, No 12, Sage Publications, pp. 1 431-1 448.
- Hester, M. (2005), 'Making it through the criminal justice system: attrition and domestic violence', *Social Policy & Society*, Vol. 5, No 1, Cambridge University Press, pp. 79-90.
- Hilton, N. Z., Harris, G. T., Popham, S. and Lang, C. (2010), 'Risk assessment among incarcerated male domestic violence offenders', *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 37, No 8, Sage Publications, pp. 815-832.
- Hilton, N. Z. and Harris, G. T. (2005), 'Predicting wife assault: a critical review and implications for policy and practice', *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, Vol. 6, No 1, Sage Publications, pp. 3-23.
- Horwitz, S. H., Mitchell, D., LaRussa-Trott, M., Santiago, L., Pearson, J., Skiff, D. M. and Cerulli, C. (2011), 'An inside view of police officers' experience with domestic violence', *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 26, No 8, Springer Publishing, pp. 617-625.
- Hoyle, C. (2008), 'Will she be safe? A critical analysis of risk assessment in domestic violence cases', *Children and Youth Services Review*, Vol. 30, No 3, Elsevier, pp. 323-337.
- Jaaber, R. A. and Das Dasgupta, S. (2010), 'Assessing social risks of battered women', *Praxis International*, Vol. 1, p. 5. Available at: <http://praxisinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/AssessingSocialRisk.pdf>
- Johnson M. P. and Ferraro, K. J. (2004), 'Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: making dis-

- tinctions', *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 62, No 4, Wiley, pp. 948-963.
- Johnson M. P., Leone J. M. and Xu, Y. (2014), 'Intimate terrorism and situational couple violence in general surveys: ex-spouses required', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 20, No 2, Sage Publications, pp. 186-207.
- Johnson, M. P. (1995), 'Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: two forms of violence against women', *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 57, No 2, Wiley, pp. 283-294.
- Johnson, M. P. (2008), *A typology of domestic violence: intimate terrorism, violent resistance, and situational couple violence*, Northeastern University Press, Lebanon, New Hampshire.
- Jordan, C. E. (2004), 'Intimate partner violence and the justice system: an examination of the interface', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 19, No 12, Sage Publications, pp. 1 412-1 434.
- Juodis, M., Starzomski, A., Porter, S. and Woodworth, M. (2014), 'What can be done about high risk perpetrators of domestic violence?', *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 29, No 4, Springer Publishing, pp. 381-390.
- Kelly, L. and Westmarland, N. (2015), *Domestic violence perpetrator programmes: steps toward change*. Available at: <https://www.dur.ac.uk/resources/criva/ProjectMirabalfinalreport.pdf>.
- Kropp, P. R. and Hart, S. D. (2000), 'The spousal assault risk assessment (SARA) guide: reliability and validity in adult male offenders', *Law and Human Behavior*, Vol. 24, No 1, American Psychological Association, pp. 101-118.
- Kropp, P. R. (2004), 'Some questions regarding spousal assault risk assessment', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 10, No 6, Sage Publications, pp. 676-697.
- Kropp, P. R. (2008), 'Intimate partner violence risk assessment and management', *Violence and Victims* Vol. 23, No 2, Springer Publishing, pp. 202-220.
- Irekia (2013), La Ertzaintza da protección activa a casi cinco mil mujeres amenazadas por violencia de género o doméstica. Available at: <https://www.irekia.euskadi.eus/es/news/16911-ertzaintza-proteccion-activa-casi-cinco-mil-mujeres-amenazadas-por-violencia-genero-domestica>
- La séjournelle inc. (2008), *Le processus de domination conjugale: un modèle interactif et évolutif*. Available at: <http://csvc.ca/>
- Laing, L. (2004), 'Risk assessment in domestic violence', *Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse*, topic paper, University of Sydney.
- Law: 'Meldcode' [Reporting Code], 16 July 2013. Available at: <http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0033723/2018-07-28>
- Lietuvos respublikos generalinis prokuroras. Rekomendacijos dėl nukentėjusiųjų specialių apsaugos poreikių vertinimo, 29 February 2016, No I-63. Available at: <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/86bc22f0dfa611e58a92afc65dd68e97>
- Lila, M., Oliver, A., Catalá-Miñana, A. and Conchell, R. (2014), 'Recidivism risk reduction assessment in batterer intervention programs: a key indicator for program efficacy evaluation', *Psychosocial Intervention*, Vol. 23, No 3, pp. 217-223.
- López-Ossorio, J. J., González-Álvarez, J. L. and Andrés-Pueyo, A. (2016), 'Predictive effectiveness of the police risk assessment in intimate partner violence', *Psychosocial Intervention*, Vol. 25, No 1, Colegio Oficial de Psicólogos de Madrid, pp. 1-7.
- LR Generalinis prokuroras (2016), Usakymas dėl rekomendacijų dėl nukentėjusiųjų specialių apsaugos poreikių vertinimo patvirtinimo [Lithuanian Republic, Prosecutor General, Order on recommendations on victims' special protection needs], 29 February 2016, pp. 1-63.
- Marshall, L. L. (1992), 'Development of the severity of violence against women scales', *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 7, No 2, Springer Publishing, pp. 103-121; Carlson, R. G. and Jones, K. D. (2010),

- 'Continuum of conflict and control: a conceptualization of intimate partner violence typologies', *The Family Journal*, Vol. 18, No 3, Sage Publications, pp. 248-254.
- Matkoski, S., Groenen, A., Van Vossole, A. and Coteur, K. (2016), *Risicotaxatie Instrument Partnergeweld & Risicomangement*, UC Leuven-Limburg, Diepenbeek. Available at: www.risicotaxatie.be or www.évaluation-des-risques.be
- Messing, J. T., Amanor-Boadu, Y., Cavanaugh, C. E., Glass, N. E. and Campbell, J. C. (2013), 'Culturally competent intimate partner violence risk assessment: adapting the danger assessment for immigrant women', *Social Work Research*, Vol. 37, No 3, Oxford Academic, pp. 263-275.
- Messing, J. T., Campbell, J., Sullivan Wilson, J., Brown, S. and Patchell, B. (2015), 'The lethality screen: the predictive validity of an intimate partner violence risk assessment for use by first responders', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 32, No 2, Sage Publications, pp. 205-226.
- Messing, J. T. and Thaller, J. (2012), 'The average predictive validity of intimate partner violence risk assessment instruments', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 28, No 7, Sage Publications, pp. 1 537-1 558.
- Messing, J. T. and Thaller, J. (2015), 'Intimate partner violence risk assessment: a primer for social workers', *The British Journal of Social Work*, Vol. 45, No 6, Oxford Journals, pp. 1 804-1 820.
- Ministry of Interior Italy (2017), Directive No 77, establishing that all state police headquarters (Questure) adopt the EVA protocol of the Ministry of Interior, Central Operational Service.
- Moser, A. E. and Campbell, M. A. (2012), *Validation and expansion of the Ontario domestic assault risk assessment (ODARA) instrument: an early warning system*, Centre for Criminal Justice Studies & Psychology Department, University of New Brunswick.
- Myhill, A. and Hohl, K. (2016), "The golden thread": coercive control and risk assessment for domestic violence', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Sage Publications, pp. 1-21.
- National Audit Office (2015), *Performance audit: tackling domestic violence*. National Audit Office, Malta. Available at: <https://www.um.edu.mt/library/oar/bitstream/123456789/11762/1/Domestic%20Violence%20July%202015.pdf>
- Nicholls, T. L., Desmarais, S. L., Douglas, K. S. and Kropp, P. R. (2006), 'Violence risk assessments with perpetrators of intimate partner abuse', *Family interventions in domestic violence: a handbook of gender-inclusive theory and treatment*, Springer, New York, pp. 275-301.
- Nicholls, T. L. et al. (2013), 'Risk assessment in intimate partner violence: a systematic review of contemporary approaches', *Partner Abuse*, Vol. 4, No 1, Springer Publishing, pp. 76-168.
- Northcott, M. (2012), *Intimate partner violence risk assessment tools: a review*, Department of Justice Canada, Ottawa. Available at: http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/cj-jp/fv-vf/rr12_8/rr12_8.pdf.
- Novick, S., Yoshihama, M., Runner, M. and Family Violence Prevention Fund (2009), *Intimate partner violence in immigrant and refugee communities: challenges, promising practices and recommendations*, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Available at: <https://www.policyarchive.org/handle/10207/21315>.
- Police Presidium, Ministry of Interior Slovak Republic (2017), Order of the Police President no. PPZ — KP — OVYS — 153-008/2017 from 19 December 2016 to use danger risk assessment questionnaire in cases of reporting suspicion of domestic violence. Available at: <http://www.pravnelisty.sk/clanky/a536-o-dotaznikoch-a-zadrzani-podozriveho-na-zaklade-poctuziskanych-bodov>
- Ertzaintza, *Proceso de actuaciones en casos de violencia doméstica y/o de género*. Available at: <https://www.ertzaintza.eus/wps/wcm/connect/ertzaintza/7931f500458116cb9258be5f7523df72/Diagrama+VDVG+CAST.jpg?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=mfl2u4c>

- Original MARAC model (from United Kingdom). Available at: <http://www.safelives.org.uk/practice-support/resources-marac-meetings>
- Richards, L., Letchford, S. and Stratton, S. (2013), *Policing Domestic Violence*, Oxford University Press, p. 301.
- Robinson, A. L. and Clancy, A. (2015), *Development of the Priority Perpetrator Identification Tool (PPIT) for domestic abuse*, Cardiff University, Cardiff. Available at: <http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/people/view/38078-robinson-amanda>, [http://orca.cf.ac.uk/75006/1/Robinson %20 %26 %20Clancy %20 %282015 %29 %20Development %20 of %20the %20Priority %20Perpetrator %20 Identification %20Tool %20 %28PPIT %29 %20fo r %20Domestic %20Abuse.pdf](http://orca.cf.ac.uk/75006/1/Robinson%20%26%20Clancy%20%282015%29%20Development%20of%20the%20Priority%20Perpetrator%20Identification%20Tool%20%28PPIT%29%20for%20Domestic%20Abuse.pdf)
- Robinson, A. L. and Clancy, A. (2017), 'New initiatives to tackle domestic violence using the Priority Perpetrator Identification Tool (PPIT)', Cardiff University, Cardiff. Available at: <http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/people/view/38078-robinson-amanda>
- Robinson, A., Myhill, A. and Wire, J. (2017), 'Practitioner (mis)understandings of coercive control in England and Wales', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, Vol. 18, No 1, Sage Publications, pp. 29-49.
- Robinson, A. L., Pinchevsky, G. M. and Guthrie, J. A. 'A small constellation: risk factors informing police perceptions of domestic abuse', *Policing and Society*, 28:2, Taylor & Francis, 2016, pp. 189-204.
- Robinson, A. (2004), *Domestic Violence MARACs (multi-agency risk assessment conferences) for very high risk victims in Cardiff, Wales: a process and outcome evaluation*, Cardiff University.
- Rogers, R. (2000), 'The uncritical acceptance of risk assessment in forensic practice', *Law And Human Behavior*, Vol. 24, No 5, American Psychological Association, pp. 595-605.
- Rosa-Centrum pro Zeny. Available at: www.rosa-os.cz
- Signalenkaart: Huiselijk geweld en kindermishandeling. Available at: <https://signalenkaart.nl/>
- Connor-Smith, J. K., Henning, K., Moore, S. and Holdford, R. (2010), 'Risk assessments by female victims of intimate partner violence: predictors of risk perceptions and comparison to an actuarial measure', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 26, No 12, Sage Publications, pp. 2 517-2 550.
- Sponsler-Garcia, C. (2015), *Accounting for risk and danger practice checklists: coordinating risk assessment in domestic violence cases*, The Battered Women's Justice Project, Minneapolis.
- Stanley, N. (2011), *Children experiencing domestic violence: a research review*, Research in Practice, Totnes.
- Stark, E. (2013), 'The dangers of dangerousness assessment', *Family & Intimate Partner Violence Quarterly*, Vol. 6, No 2, Civic Research Institute, pp. 13-22. Available at: [https://www.fcadv.org/sites/default/files/Stark %2020132.pdf](https://www.fcadv.org/sites/default/files/Stark%2020132.pdf)
- Stöckl, H., Devries, K., Rotstein, A., Abrahams, N., Campbell, J., Walls, C. and Garcia Moreno, C. (2013), 'The global prevalence of intimate partner homicide: a systematic review', *The Lancet*, Vol. 382, No 9895, Elsevier, pp. 859-865.
- Storey, J. E. et al., (2013) 'Assessment and management of risk for intimate partner violence by police officers using the brief spousal assault form for the evaluation of risk', *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 41, No 2, Sage Publications, pp. 256-271.
- Strand, S. (2011), 'Using a restraining order as a protective risk management strategy to prevent intimate partner violence', *Police Practice and Research*, Vol. 13, No 3, Taylor & Francis, pp. 254-266.
- Tamm, G. and Espenberg, S. (2016), 'Lähisuhetvõigivalla juhtumikorralduse MARAC-mudeli rakendamise mõju hindamise metoodika väljatöötamine Eestis' [Methodology for measuring the effects of the multiagency risk assessment conference (MARAC) in Estonia], Lõpparuanne, Tartu Ülikooli sotsiaalteaduslike rakendusuuringute keskus (RAKE) ja Siseministeerium. Available

in Estonian at: https://skytte.ut.ee/sites/default/files/skytte/maraci_uuringu_lopparuanne.pdf

Tanha, M., Beck, C. J. A., Figueredo, A. J. and Raghavan, C. (2009), 'Sex differences in intimate partner violence and the use of coercive control as a motivational factor for intimate partner violence', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 25, No 10, Sage Publications, pp. 1 836-1 854.

The National Help Assistance for Victims of Domestic Violence 'Blue Line', Kwestionariusz oceny ryzyka oraz algorytm postępowania w przypadku podejrzenia przemocy w rodzinie wobec dorosłego [Risk assessment questionnaire and the algorithm of conduct in case of suspicion of domestic violence against an adult] (tested 2014-2015).

Thomas, K. A., Goodman, L. and Putnins, S. (2015), 'I have lost everything: trade-offs of seeking safety from intimate partner violence', *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Vol. 85, No 2, pp. 170-180.

United Nations (2006), *In-depth study on all forms of violence against women: report of the Secretary-General*.

Valstybės auditas (2015), 'Apsaugos nuo smurto artimoje aplinkoje organizavimas. Tyrimo ataskaita' [State audit: organisation of protection from violence, research report], Vilnius. Available at: <http://www.vkontrolė.lt/>

Wathen, C. N. and MacMillan, H. L. (2013), 'Children's exposure to intimate partner violence: impacts and interventions', *Paediatrics & Child Health*, Vol. 18, No 8, Oxford University Press, pp. 419-422.

WAVE Network (2012), *Protect II: capacity building in risk assessment and safety management to pro-*

tect high risk victims, Vienna. Available at: http://files.wave-network.org/trainingmanuals/PROTECTII_Risk_Assessment_and_Safety_2012_English.pdf

WAVE, Protect II, (2012), *Capacity building in risk assessment and safety management to protect high risk victims — a learning resource*, second, revised edition, Vienna.

World Health Organisation and Pan American Health Organisation (2012), 'Understanding and addressing violence against women: intimate partner violence', WHO series of information sheets on violence against women. Available at: http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/violence/rhr12_36/en/

Wright C. V. and Johnson, D. M. (2009), 'Correlates for legal help-seeking: contextual factors for battered women in shelter', *Violence and Victims*, Vol. 24, No 6, Springer Publishing, pp. 771-785. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2819311/>

Yakubovich, A. R., Stöckl, H., Murray, J., Melendez-Torres, G. J., Steinert, J. I., Glavin, C. E. Y. and Humphreys, D. K. (2018), 'Risk and protective factors for intimate partner violence against women: systematic review and meta-analyses of prospective longitudinal studies', *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 108, No 7, American Public Health Association, e1-e11.

Zentrum für Methoden (2016), *Diagnostik und Evaluation Universität Koblenz: Risikomanagement bei Fällen von Gewalt in engen sozialen Beziehungen: Evaluation des Pilotprojekts 'High Risk' Abschlussbericht*, Landau.

Annexes

Annex 1. Methodological approach

The methodology adopted for the purposes of this study was a combination of different methods and techniques. The methods used were desk research and analysis, fieldwork, and consultation meetings with key stakeholders and experts on risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence.

Desk research and analysis

The purpose of the desk research and analysis was to collect and present recent policy and legal and research developments on risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence, as well as identifying possible common approaches, differences and challenges in the EU and the EU Member States.

The desk research was conducted through literature review in the field of risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence. The literature review was from 2010 onwards and was drawn from different sources, encompassing academic literature and other published reports; academic journal articles, studies, papers, etc.; grey literature, including online publications, media articles, relevant websites, etc.; and publications and information from both European and international organisations, on risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence, as well as on risk factors.

Fieldwork

The purpose of the fieldwork was to contribute to filling in gaps within data and information and to obtain richer insights into policy measures and practices under analysis, as well as to collect feedback on the main challenges identified. A total of 147 national experts were selected to be interviewed, with at least three per Member State. A semi-structured interview topic guide was used for carrying out the interviews in order to detect crucial inputs on main challenges and success factors. Interviews were conducted face to face, via telephone or Skype, through written replies or in groups.

Consultation meetings

Two consultation meetings with experts took place. The aims of the meetings were to get relevant information on risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence, to validate key findings and to contribute to the finalisation of the *A guide to risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence against women for police*. In each consultation meeting 16 participants were invited, ensuring equal representation from both areas of risk assessment and risk management, so as to enable a crossover of experiences and expertise. A geographical balance among participants in each group was also considered.

Annex 2. Overview of risk assessment and risk management for intimate partner violence in the EU Member States

In **Belgium**, risk assessment for intimate partner violence is one of the key points in the national action plan to combat gender-based violence; implementation is fragmented and procedures have not been regulated on a national level. Risk assessment processes are implemented by a wide range of actors, including medical practitioners, social workers and the police.

The federal government for public health published guidelines for medical practitioners in 2010. The same assessment procedure must be carried out for each medical consultation, namely the subjective objective evaluation planning system. Information on history of violence, the list of injuries and their impact, as well as diagnosis and care plans is collected. Based on their clinical assessment, medical practitioners can break professional confidentiality regulations and report the situation to the public prosecutor if severe danger is presumed. Systematic screening for intimate partner violence with pregnant patients is also recommended. Besides detection and screening, attention is given to the management of risk, although no details are provided.

A working model for the approach to intimate partner violence by general medical practitioners has been developed and published⁽¹³⁰⁾. Recently, a reporting code to be used by professionals tied to professional confidentiality and confronted with situations of intimate partner violence was developed, commissioned by the Institute for the Equality of Women and Men in 2016. However, the authors insist the code be tested by professionals before implementation⁽¹³¹⁾.

For social workers in Belgium, risk assessment for intimate partner violence is a clinical assessment (professional judgement), based on information

obtained during counselling sessions with victims. In the methods and guidelines developed for social workers on the involvement of children, some structured screening and risk assessment processes are presented to evaluate the risk of child abuse.

Police officers make use of checklists and draft specific reports on cases of intimate partner violence. Practices differ considerably between police zones and specific services within the zones⁽¹³²⁾. However, in 2015 a control list with questions to be asked during interrogation was added to the police circular 4/2006. These questions should be asked after the victim and perpetrator have told their versions of events in order to ensure that all aspects relevant in a situation of intimate partner violence are recorded.

Being aware of the gap in the practice of risk assessment in Belgium, the research centre APART developed a scientifically based risk assessment and risk management tool for intimate partner violence⁽¹³³⁾. This was developed in cooperation with the National Institute for Criminalistics and Criminology and the Institute for the Equality of Women and Men. This tool is available as a paper version in three languages, namely Dutch, French and German, and online in Dutch and French. Use of the online tool is free of charge and professionals from various sectors and organisations have registered, from both Flanders and Wallonia. However, use of the tool is not mandatory and registration with the online system does not mean that it is being applied. The tool adopts the structured approach based on professional judgement and is currently being validated by researchers of the expert group APART at University College Leuven-Limburg.

⁽¹³⁰⁾ De Deken, L., Pas, L., Hillemans, K., Cornelis, E. and Van Royen, P. (2010), 'Detectie van partnergeweld: een aanbeveling voor de huisarts' [Detection of partner violence: a recommendation for the general practitioner] *Huisarts Nu*, Vol. 39, pp. S57-S63.

⁽¹³¹⁾ Blavier, A. and Nederlandt, P., (2016), 'Conception d'un code de signalement à l'usage des professionnels liés au secret professionnel (voir art. 458Bis du Code Pénal) et confrontés à des situations de violences entre partenaires' (research report), IGVM, Brussels.

⁽¹³²⁾ Groenen, A., Van Vossolle, A. and Matkoski, S. (2015), 'Risicoscreening en risicotaxatie inzake partnergeweld in België' [Risk screening and risk assessment concerning partner violence in Belgium] In *Handboek Familiaal Geweld*, pp. 1-18, Politeia, Brussels.

⁽¹³³⁾ Matkoski, S., Groenen, A., Van Vossolle, A. and Coteur, K. (2016), *Risicotaxatie Instrument Partnergeweld & Risicomanagement*, UC Leuven-Limburg, Diepenbeek. Available at: www.risicotaxatie.be or www.évaluation-des-risques.be

In the northern region of Belgium (Flanders), a multidisciplinary approach for complex cases of domestic violence has been initiated in the past year, stimulated by policy developments. Before this, only two provinces worked in this way to handle situations of domestic violence. In both family justice centres (FJCs) in the country there is close cooperation between actors from different sectors, mainly police, prosecution, social workers and general practitioners. They used a self-developed risk-screening tool to evaluate risk and protective factors in different domains of life. The multidisciplinary approach in these two provinces evolved into FJCs and a new instrument for risk assessment has been developed, called the 'triage instrument'. The outcome of the triage guides the professionals towards support actions for the family (different degrees of intensity in support). The triage instrument is being evaluated in a European research project, called 'stopping violence against women and children through an integral and fast trajectory' (JUST/2015/RDAP/AG/MULT: 9763). Recent developments in policy have obliged the multidisciplinary approach in each province of Flanders to work with the same registration system to structure the process of information gathering and dossier building. Part of the registration is completing the Dutch 'triage' instrument.

In **Bulgaria**, risk assessment is reportedly carried out mainly by NGOs and social services but there are no unified procedures or coordination around risk assessment practices.

By order issued on 30 April 2018, the prosecutor general adopted guidelines for the work of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria. This concerns files and pre-trial proceedings initiated by reports of committed domestic violence, threats of murder and violated orders for protection against domestic violence. The purpose of the guidelines is to create a unified mechanism for timely reaction of prosecutors in such cases, as well as to effectively protect the rights of injured parties. Immediate action by prosecutors on duty is expected as soon as the alert is re-

ceived. When appearing in person in the district prosecutor's office, the victim provides written statements before the prosecutor on duty and fills out a form containing information about his/her rights. It is envisaged that when the prosecutor finds evidence of imminent danger to the life and health of the victim, they immediately notify the police authorities, which must take measures in accordance with the Ministry of Interior Act and the law on protection from domestic violence. The guidelines also contain specific provisions on timely investigation during pre-trial proceedings and the need for measures to protect the victim under the Penal Procedure Code ⁽¹³⁴⁾.

The Ministry of Interior has drafted a proposal to improve the efficiency of police work in the field of domestic violence and gender-based violence, including the development of a risk assessment algorithm for cases of domestic violence and gender-based violence, and training of police officers on risk assessment ⁽¹³⁵⁾.

In **Czechia**, implementation is fragmented and not standardised. Risk assessment is conducted primarily by NGOs providing services to victims and by police. Risk assessment processes mainly focus on the risk of repeated violence and its prevention. Women's NGOs were the first to apply risk assessment in their practices.

The police as well as NGOs in Czechia use an adapted version of the SARA method (SARA DN). The SARA DN consists of 15 questions and the licence for the Czech version of SARA is owned by the organisation Bílý kruh bezpečí (white circle of safety). Police use SARA DN as a basis to make decisions on perpetrator eviction orders that need to be justified. However, it is not mandatory and its use depends on the professional discretion of the police officer. Domestic violence intervention centres are also trained in using the SARA DN method.

Risk assessment is not part of a multiagency framework and there are no clear and mandatory procedures and processes about sharing in-

⁽¹³⁴⁾ <https://dnes.dir.bg/obshtestvo/tsatsarov-dade-ukazaniya-na-podchinenite-si-kak-da-deystvat-pri-domashno-nasilie>

⁽¹³⁵⁾ <https://www.dnes.bg/obshtestvo/2018/05/03/biesh-jenata-zakonno-domashnoto-nasilie-ne-e-prestyplenie.375379>

formation drawn from risk assessment. Although the national action plan for preventing domestic and gender-based violence for 2014-2015 included a proposed evaluation study of the SARA DN method in 2015, no such evaluation has taken place.

The women's NGO ROSA has developed a specialised risk assessment questionnaire, 'questionnaire for identification of risk of repeated violence in relationship and risk assessment of serious violence', which is completed together with each victim. The questions are based on risk factors identified in the Protect I and Protect II⁽¹³⁶⁾ manuals, the DA and the DASH risk checklist. The questionnaire covers forms of psychological, physical, sexual and economic violence, as well as coercive control and violence against children.

In **Denmark**, the national action plan to combat violence in the family and in intimate relations acknowledges the need for early identification of victimisation and early prevention, including a focus on risk factors for exposure to violence. Consequently, at police academies and in the training of social workers and other relevant professionals, education includes providing knowledge on risk factors of violence exposure, and physical and psychological consequences of violence exposure.

The police started to use the risk assessment tool SARA:SV in 2016. The model requires that risk assessment be carried out only in cases of physical violence. Police are also trained in employing the stalking assessment and management (SAM) tool for assessing stalking, and the Patriarch tool for assessing honour-based violence. In 2015-2016, 74 individual law-enforcement officers were trained in the use of these risk assessment tools.

No initiatives exist at present to further systematic implementation of risk assessment for intimate partner violence, and no comprehensive evaluation of any implementation of risk assessment of

intimate partner violence in Denmark has been conducted.

No information is available on the measures taken to manage risk once a risk assessment is carried out and risk assessment is not part of a multiagency framework.

Germany has a differentiated support system for domestic violence cases including police bans, civil protection orders, safe houses and an emergency hotline. Risk assessment processes for intimate partner violence are not in place in all states, as all of the 16 federal states have separate police laws. Rhineland-Palatinate was the first federal state to test and implement a risk assessment process with the tools ODARA and DA in two regions. In Rhineland-Palatinate every agency that comes into contact with a victim carries out the risk assessment, but this is done mainly by police at the first point of contact. One region in Lower Saxony conducts risk assessment with an adapted DA tool. In both Lower Saxony and Rhineland-Palatinate, multiagency case conferences are implemented for cases considered high risk.

It is not clear which police agencies use which standardised tool and they can choose and switch at any time as both tools were rated, tested and validated. It is of no importance to the case conference which of the two tools is used to assess the status of a case of 'high risk'. One agency does not use the DA because it contains an issue which would trigger immediate criminal prosecution regardless of the wishes of the victim. In Lower Saxony the DA is used, but with a second sheet which asks additional questions: if the sheet was filled in together with the victim, if a ban was issued, if a migration background is present, among others.

A project called 'High risk' was implemented in 2014-2015⁽¹³⁷⁾ in three police districts in Rhineland-Palatinate to evaluate the implementation of risk assessment procedures using the DA and

⁽¹³⁶⁾ WAVE Network, (2012), Protect II: 'Capacity building in risk assessment and safety management to protect high risk victims', Vienna. Available at: http://files.wave-network.org/trainingmanuals/PROTECTII_Risk_Assessment_and_Safety_2012_English.pdf

⁽¹³⁷⁾ Zentrum für Methoden, (2016), Diagnostik und Evaluation Universität Koblenz: Risikomanagement bei Fällen von Gewalt in engen sozialen Beziehungen: Evaluation des Pilotprojekts 'High Risk' Abschlussbericht. Landau.

the ODARA, as well as the case conferences in the style of the MARAC. The evaluation found that the ODARA is best used in front-line assessment and is completed based on police data, but the DA instrument should be used to work with victims to increase their awareness of the risk they are facing. When evaluating case conferences, researchers found that professionals praised the improved information sharing and trust among professionals, as well as shared understanding and access to the expertise of colleagues. The two instruments ODARA and DA could not be compared in respect of their effect, because both tools work differently and aim to predict different things (recidivism by the ODARA, lethality by the DA). For the DA, the translated version has yet to be validated.

In **Estonia**, risk assessment is implemented by the police in three districts (Põlvamaa, Haapsalu, Rakvere), but plans are in place for implementation on a national level. Estonia started a pilot project to apply the MARAC model for multiagency cooperation in cases of repeated domestic violence⁽¹³⁸⁾. Part of this model is the DASH checklist. By the year 2020, the model will be adopted and applied all over Estonia. The pilot project on the MARAC started on 1 September 2015, will end on 31 December 2020, and is coordinated by the Social Insurance Board. MARAC project partners from different agencies use the DASH checklist translated into Estonian. Specialists from different agencies — police officers, social workers, victim support officers, healthcare specialists, specialists from shelters, and others — use the DASH.

Police outside the framework of the MARAC project use an information sheet ('Lähisuhtevägivalla infoleht'). Police officers will carry out an initial risk assessment and, based on emerging risk factors, may make referrals to other agencies such as women's support centres. Police officers may also make several home visits without notice. Probationary officers deal with offender management after a court judgment or order, and

are responsible for the supervision of offenders in the community. They also carry out risk assessment using an electronic checklist that calculates the level of risk.

'Individualised assessment of needs' is now explicitly included in legislation as an obligation of the criminal justice system, although there are no guidelines for implementation. If a victim support officer feels that a victim needs psychological support and the victim agrees, there is a special questionnaire to assess this need and to check eligibility for these measures.

In **Ireland**, as a consequence of the new national strategy and action plan, An Garda Síochána (the police) have developed a new risk assessment screening tool — the risk assessment matrix — that is currently being piloted in one rural and one urban area. The assessment undertaken by the Gardaí (police) is based on a very loosely structured approach — mostly the judgement of the responding officer — and is based on seeking information on four to six key issues that are related to an increased risk of lethality and serious physical harm as identified within research literature (e.g. whether the victim is pregnant). The assessment is designed to capture some information to inform the attending officer of any immediate protective action that is required, and to assist officers in the Police Protective Services Bureau in assessing whether any follow-up assessment is required.

It is still very early in the process of implementing risk assessment and risk management of domestic violence perpetrators in Ireland. At present, the focus is mostly on the risk to victims, rather than the risk from perpetrators. Additionally, the degree to which risk assessment and risk management is embedded in routine practice is still to be assessed.

Women's Aid has worked with the Gardaí since 2012 on the development and piloting of a high risk support project in the Dublin Metropolitan

⁽¹³⁸⁾ Tamm, G. and Espenberg, S. (2016), 'Lähisuhtevägivalla juhtumikorralduse MARAC-mudeli rakendamise mõju hindamise meetoodika väljatöötamine Eestis' [Methodology for measuring the effects of multiagency risk assessment conference (MARAC) in Estonia], Lõpparuanne, Tartu Ülikooli sotsiaalteaduslike rakendusuuringute keskus (RAKE) ja Siseministeerium. Available in Estonian at: https://skytte.ut.ee/sites/default/files/skytte/maraci_uuringu_lopparuanne.pdf

Area, which gives women at high risk of domestic violence enhanced access to the Gardaí and a higher priority rating for emergency response. As part of this project Women's Aid undertakes risk assessment as well as providing support for domestic violence victims. The project has been evaluated positively and provides a good model for collaborative work in high risk cases. The project aims to ensure that women identified as being at medium-to-high risk of violence from their former intimate partner have a special mobile phone that makes a secret call to the police whenever the woman feels she is in danger. The practice focuses specifically on the risk that the victim and their children face and follows the unstructured clinical decision-making approach. Women can self-refer to the project, or are referred by either a local victim support group or the Gardaí. The assessment that is undertaken by the high-risk support project is designed to ensure that women will feel safer as a result of having the mobile phone, and that the police treat the call as a high priority given the heightened risk to the woman.

In addition, some victim support centres use the DASH checklist as a means of identifying women who are at high risk of experiencing domestic violence, stalking and/or honour-based violence.

In **Greece**, there is no formal process of risk assessment in place for intimate partner violence or domestic violence.

There are two police orders (15 September 2013 and 31 May 2018) entitled 'Handling domestic violence cases and strict implementation of the provisions of Law 3500/2006'; in both, reference is made to a handbook entitled *Addressing domestic violence* ⁽¹³⁹⁾ that was published in 2005 by the headquarters of the Hellenic Police. It includes an informal risk assessment (a list of 18 items that should be considered as risk factors). There are no guidelines on how to assess the extent of risk and how to respond to risk.

The European Anti-Violence Network has developed a risk assessment form that is mainly based on the risk factors included in Campbell's DA tool. The tool was developed and pilot tested during training with healthcare and welfare professionals but as there is no policy for conducting risk assessment in the organisation where they work, they do not use it in practice.

The Institute for the Prevention and Treatment of Violence and the Promotion of Gender Equality, an NGO specialising in victim support and perpetrator management, implements a risk assessment protocol based on the SARA and the DASH risk checklist. Although these tools have not been standardised in Greece, they have been adapted to the Greek context. The risk assessment is carried out at first point of contact and there is a close collaboration between the NGO and local police (of Kavala city). There are also referrals from police to the NGO and vice versa.

The National Centre for Social Solidarity, of the Hellenic Ministry of Labour, Social Insurance and Social Solidarity, has also adopted a risk assessment/needs assessment protocol. The approach followed is a structured professional judgement using a risk assessment tool. The immediate risk is assessed during the first contact with the women's emergency helpline 197 or during intake. The level of risk is neither assessed nor characterised but actions are taken to minimise risk or escalation of risk. Risk management depends on the victim's requests.

There are no studies or data regarding risk assessment of intimate partner violence, nor examining risk factors for intimate partner violence in Greece.

In **Spain**, the police are the main actor carrying out risk assessment and risk management (through victim protection) according to the risk level assessed with different tools. There are specific risk assessment tools such as the valoración policial de riesgo [police risk assessment] (VPR)/ valoración policial de evolución de riesgo [police

⁽¹³⁹⁾ Ελληνική Αστυνομία (2005), Αρχηγείο Ελληνικής Αστυνομίας, Κλάδος Διοικητικού, Διευθυνση Οργάνωσης-Νομοθεσίας, Η αντιμετώπιση της ενδοοικογενειακής βίας. Available at: http://www.astynomia.gr/images/stories/Attachment13518_egxeiridio.pdf

assessment for the evolution of risk] (VPER) or the severe intimate partner violence risk prediction scale — revised (EPV-R), and the victim can be protected regardless of legal actions (i.e. decisions taken by the judge)⁽¹⁴⁰⁾. The tools adopt the actuarial approach (based on statistical analysis on the basis of a fixed set of factors), with the possibility of modifying the risk level according to the opinion of the professional. The purpose of the tools is mainly victim protection (including children), but taking into account the perpetrators' characteristics and other family members at risk. The VPR is applied after the first contact with the case (i.e. after a complaint). A first provisional VPR can be conducted until more information is available to complete the final VPR. The system will assign one of the following risk levels: undetected, low, medium, high or extreme. The follow-up assessment is done automatically after the first judicial decision with the VPER. If there are no new incidents, reassessment is done: in fewer than 72 hours for cases of extreme risk; fewer than 7 days for high risk; fewer than 30 days for medium risk; and fewer than 60 days for low-level risk. In case of new incidents or new information, a VPER must be applied immediately.

Periodic training is provided for users and high-level officers, and this year the first advanced course on functionalities of the 'Comprehensive monitoring system in cases of gender violence' (VioGén system) was developed in Madrid. Police cooperate with other law-enforcement agencies, including the courts, the prisons and social services. These collaborators can consult the VioGén system to find out about specific situations or risk levels of the victims.

There have been several assessments of the usefulness of the systems as well as updates of the tool, with the aim of reaching a higher predictive validity and utility for risk management. There is a specific research team from the Home Office of

Spain, with the collaboration of experts from different universities. The predictive effectiveness of the VPR risk assessment tool was evaluated in a longitudinal study showing good predictive ability⁽¹⁴¹⁾.

In the Basque Country, the EPV-R⁽¹⁴²⁾ is used by the Basque Country Police (Ertzaintza), the local police in the Basque Country, and some legal, medical and forensic science institutes. The tool adopts the actuarial approach, but can be adjusted (agents can change the result according to their perception of the case, but only by increasing the risk). The Ertzaintza are responsible for the management of risk in these cases (in the Basque Country only) and they establish victim protection (with four different levels according to the risk) independently of the judicial process and without acting on the suspect (offender). The risk assessment is conducted at the time of receiving a report or complaint, at the site of the incident or after judicial action. The risk assessment is applied in a dynamic way, being updated every time that new information is available (e.g. during the first days there may be different assessments while new data is made available for the agents). Regarding the four possible risk levels, the assessment must be updated at least every 2 months in the basic and medium levels, every month in the high level, and every 15 days in the special level. All members of the Ertzaintza receive training at the beginning of their association with the police body at the academy, regarding domestic violence and intimate partner violence, the application of the EPV-R tool, risk management and so on. The training is also updated over the years. The Ertzaintza conduct their own quality assessment (according to ISO norms) every year or every 2 years⁽¹⁴³⁾.

The Catalonia police (Policia de la Generalitat — Mossos d'Esquadra) has a different risk assessment tool, the RVD-BCN (Risc Violència Dona [risk

⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ Amor, P. J., Bohórquez, I. A., Corral, P. and Oria, J. C., (2012), 'Variables psicosociales y riesgo de violencia grave en parejas con abuso de sustancias tóxicas y maltrato previo' [Psychosocial variables and risk of severe violence in couples with substance abuse and previous maltreatment], *Acción Psicológica*, Vol. 9, No 1, pp. 3-18, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5944/ap.9.1.204>.

⁽¹⁴¹⁾ López-Ossorio, J. J., González-Álvarez, J. L. and Andrés-Pueyo, A. (2016), 'Predictive effectiveness of the police risk assessment in intimate partner violence', *Psychosocial Intervention*, Vol. 25, No 1, pp. 1-7.

⁽¹⁴²⁾ La Ertzaintza da protección activa a casi cinco mil mujeres amenazadas por violencia de género o doméstica (2013). Available at: <https://www.irekia.euskadi.eus/es/news/16911-ertzaintza-proteccion-activa-casi-cinco-mil-mujeres-amenazadas-por-violencia-genero-domestica>

⁽¹⁴³⁾ Proceso de actuaciones en casos de violencia doméstica y/o de género. available at: <https://www.ertzaintza.eus/wps/wcm/connect/ertzaintza/7931f500458116cb9258be5f7523df72/Diagrama+VDVG+CAST.jpg?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=mfl2u4c>

of violence against women] — Barcelona) ⁽¹⁴⁴⁾. The tool is used more widely as it is also routinely used by other front-line services that form the Barcelona network to fight violence against women, which includes social services, information points for women, recovery and reception of victims, and health services. It is used to inform victim safety and victim protection measures (protection order, emergency barring order, etc.), and adopts the structured approach based on professional judgement, but providing cut-off scores.

There are no assessments on the efficiency of the tool except a study evaluating knowledge of the tool and prevalence of users ⁽¹⁴⁵⁾.

The SARA tool is also widely used by comprehensive forensic assessment units inside institutes of legal medicine and forensic science departments of the central government (i.e. Murcia, Castilla y León, Castilla-La Mancha, the Balearic Islands, Extremadura, Ceuta and Melilla), although they exist in other regions of Spain. The purpose of the tool is offender management and victim safety, and specifically to adopt judicial measures related to risk, such as restraining orders. The risk assessment is carried out after a complaint with legal action, mainly through a judge's request for risk assessment. The forensic doctor can also initiate it after the assessment of a victim.

The SARA is also used by penitentiary centres and alternative measures for offender management and rehabilitation, and is used to prevent recidivism by violent offenders. It is a procedure that is part of the assessment and treatment of offenders in prisons and in the community, but can have a lot of variability according to the region analysed or even according to the professional who applies the instruments, since the level of training is different.

In **France**, risk assessment is not embedded in the national policy framework, nor implemented

systematically across sectors on a national level. Risk assessment of intimate partner violence with standardised tools is not a priority and implementation of risk assessment is not regulated or uniform. The only tools available are empirical lists of risk criteria that are mainly the results of local initiatives of NGOs and health services (such as the Accident and Emergency department of Cochin Hospital, Paris; Port-Royal Maternity, Paris, etc.).

As a partner in European projects of the Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers' rights, equality and citizenship programme (project Implement and project Response), the telephone-based therapy organisation Psytel has contributed to the development of lists of risk factors used to train front-line health professionals ⁽¹⁴⁶⁾. These tools, available online, adopt the structured approach to risk assessment. Other professionals rely on their professional experience and judgement when making assessments on risk.

No literature has been identified evaluating risk assessment processes for intimate partner violence in France.

In **Croatia**, risk assessment is implemented in practice by all institutions and organisations that come into contact with victims and perpetrators of intimate partner violence, although the practice is fragmented and not standardised. It is conducted by diverse institutions, according to their internal codes of practice, including the police, the state attorney, social welfare centres, courts, shelters and other services for victims, and providers of psychosocial treatment for perpetrators of domestic violence.

The police have made the most progress in the development and implementation of risk assessment, even though they do not use a validated tool but an informal form that was developed

⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ Circuit Barcelona contra la violència vers les dones. Available at: <http://ajuntament.barcelona.cat/bcnantimasclista/en/preventing-and-acting/barcelona-circuit-against-gender-violence>

⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ Circuit Barcelona contra la violència vers les dones, THE RVD-BCN: Risk assessment guide for violence against women perpetrated by their partner or former partner (2011). Available at: <http://ajuntament.barcelona.cat/dretsocials/sites/default/files/arxiu-documents/RVD-BCN%20Publicacio%20ANGLES%20novembre%202012.pdf>

⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ RESPONSE Manuel de formation pour la détection des violences de genre par les services de santé des femmes (2017) Manuel de formation à destination des équipes de santé JUST/2015/RDAP/AG/MULT/9746. Available at: http://psytel.eu/RESPONSE_Manuel_FR.pdf

based on existing validated tools such as the SARA, the DASH and the DA. The informal form consists of 24 questions, and allows police officers to enter their own observations. Although this form is used as a basis for training on risk assessment, it has not been officially adopted. The form does not contain direct questions pertaining to some key risk factors, such as possession of weapons (legal and/or illegal). The form is not gender sensitive, nor specifically tailored to the understanding of intimate partner violence against women.

In the social welfare centres in Croatia, experts (social workers, psychologists, social pedagogues, legal workers) who work within centres conduct a risk assessment of family violence based on their professional knowledge and experience. There are no special tools used for risk assessment but if there are children living in the family or if they are at risk, a child development risk assessment and child safety assessment list can be used, especially when suspicion of neglect or child abuse exists.

Some shelters conduct risk assessment prior to the intake of victims as well as after they have been admitted, although this is not a standardised procedure and is based on the knowledge and experience of the professional.

Risk assessment is also carried out by professionals running perpetrator programmes. It is based on a semi-structured interview, which is part of the development of the safety plan for the victim, and is conducted at intake of the perpetrator. The victim is also interviewed in several phases of the perpetrator's treatment. The victim is informed of the treatment itself, on the obligations of the perpetrator during the treatment, and is warned about potential threats by the perpetrator. The risk assessment process includes the assessment of: the type of violence she was exposed to; the imbalance of power in the relationship; the cyclic character of violence; its frequency; the rise of intensity of violence; changes in the type of violence; the intensity of coercive control; the possession of weapons or threats with weapons; and intimidation. Following risk assessment, the victim is referred to services for assistance and sup-

port. The questions used during the risk assessment interview are based on integrated practical experience and other known models that have been adapted to the social environment.

Probation services also conduct risk assessment when monitoring perpetrators of crime and provide them with community support, thereby reducing the cost and risk of repeating criminal offences. Within the framework of their work with the offenders after the pronouncement of the final verdict, they carry out the system of perpetrator assessment, developed according to the British model OASIS. Two main elements are assessed: (1) the risk of inflicting serious damage and (2) the risk of probability of repeating the criminal offence. The model itself has not yet been officially validated, due to lack of resources. The probation officer will collect information about the person under probation based on interviews conducted with the perpetrator, documentation received from other institutions (prison/penitentiary; welfare centre; medical institutions), and through on-site visits to the place of residence (when necessary).

Risk assessment is not part of a multiagency framework and there are no clear and mandatory procedures and processes about sharing information drawn from risk assessment.

In **Italy**, risk assessment processes for intimate partner violence are in place in different institutional settings and adopted by various actors involved in victim protection and offender management. In some cases, such processes are formally adopted and use a validated risk assessment tool for intimate partner violence (State Police, Carabinieri; emergency departments; anti-violence centres; perpetrator programmes). In other cases, risk assessment is conducted according to the official mandate of the institution involved or due to specific legal provisions (judiciary, social services and child protection services).

The Italian State Police is implementing a risk assessment procedure for the emergency police squad called Protocol EVA (Esame delle Violenze Agite — examination of acted violence). Moreover, the State Police, together with the Carabi-

nieri, is (non-homogeneously) implementing risk assessment procedures based on an Italian adaptation of the B-SAFER called SARA Plus. Police may also ask victims of intimate partner violence to fill in an actuarial tool for the self-assessment of risk called ISA (increasing self-awareness).

Since 2018, the Italian emergency departments are mandated to implement the 'National guidelines on relief and social health assistance to women who suffer violence', according to which they have to carry out a risk assessment procedure based on a five-item version of the 'Brief risk assessment for the emergency department (danger assessment)'.

Anti-violence centres are mandated to carry out risk assessment according to the 'State-regions agreement on minimum requirements for anti-violence centres and shelters (2014)'. These include non-codified risk assessment procedures based on the professional experience and expertise of practitioners as well as on standardised tools such as the SARA and the ISA. On average, half of the existing centres for the treatment of perpetrators carry out risk assessment using different techniques such as questionnaires, interviews or validated tools such as the ODARA or SARA.

Based on an agreement between the Order of Psychologists of the Region of Lazio and the Department of Prison Administration, some prisons are experimenting with risk assessment procedures based on the Historical clinical risk management-20, Version 3 for detainees of intimate partner violence-related crimes.

The Province of Trento is pilot testing the MARAC, with the establishment of an interdisciplinary working group focused on the shared assessment of risk, risk management and a monitoring system.

The judiciary is not officially implementing any codified risk assessment procedure nor systematically applying any validated risk assessment tool. Yet, indirectly, at different stages of (civil or criminal) judicial proceedings, judges and prosecutors carry out an assessment of 'the social dangerousness' of the (alleged) perpetrator of

intimate partner violence-related crimes for decisions on conditional release or on the application of preventive or custodial measures. Moreover, the recently adopted resolution of the Superior Council of the Judiciary of 9 May 2018 stresses the need for judges and prosecutors to prioritise risk assessment.

Despite risk assessment being integrated in domestic policy and legislation for some years now, and (public and private) institutions increasingly referring to it, evidence-based knowledge concerning its applicability and its efficacy in the Italian context is not developing accordingly. A positive development is that according to different sources (Baldry 2016; Baldry and Roia 2011; Galasso and Ricci 2016; Costa and Castegnaro 2017; national strategic plan 2017-2020), a number of research projects or institutional monitoring mechanisms focusing on the empirical assessment of risk assessment procedures are currently in place.

In **Cyprus**, a risk assessment protocol and tool was recently introduced for use by front-line police officers. The risk assessment protocol adopted by the Cyprus Police is embedded in the Ratification Law 14(III)/2017 (Article 51 of Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence) and Articles 20 and 21 of Law No 51(I)/2007 (rights, support and protection of victims of crime). Furthermore, the second national action plan for the prevention and combating of violence in the family (2017-2019) foresees the development and adoption of a multiagency risk assessment mechanism for more effective management of incidents/cases of domestic violence. It adopts the structured approach based on professional judgement (approach combining the use of flexible guidelines and tools for risk assessment, and professional judgement of a trained practitioner). The risk assessment protocol was developed using several validated tools as examples of good practice, including the SARA, the DASH and the B-SAFER, but adapted to the needs of the Cyprus context. The risk assessment tool is 'situation centred' in that it does not necessarily assess risk posed by the perpetrator or faced by the victim. It aims to assess risk associated with the specific

situation that the two sides find themselves in, as well as that of other family members (such as children or parents). Risk factors include factors associated with the perpetrator as well as factors associated with the victim. Risk factors are accompanied by explanations and the tool allows for additional comments by the investigator. The tool is directly linked to risk management measures to be implemented according to the level of risk and wherever such measures are mandated by law. These measures are included in the risk assessment tool and guidance is provided on their use. As stated, the risk assessment protocol is implemented by the police. However, the role of other agencies and services, including the courts, is emphasised as being mainly for the implementation of risk management measures. For example, in cases where protection measures are recommended, the courts will be informed of the risk assessment results. Social welfare services are informed about and involved in cases involving children and in cases where accommodation must be secured for the victim and her children. Mental health services may be involved in cases where the perpetrator or victim suffers from a mental health issue. The Association for the Prevention and Handling of Violence in the Family is a key actor in the victim support system and victims may be referred to their services, which include shelter and counselling services. A specific referral form must be completed by the police for such cases.

As the risk assessment protocol has only recently been introduced, there is no information available regarding its implementation and its effectiveness in managing risk and reducing intimate partner violence against women.

Risk assessment is informally carried out by social welfare services when investigating cases of family violence, but this takes place mainly in cases where children are involved, either as victims or as witnesses of intimate partner violence. The assessment is conducted based on professional judgement and experience, although social workers have not undergone any specialised training.

The Association for the Prevention and Handling of Violence in the Family also informally carries

out risk assessment with victims of family violence who use its services, although this is not a standardised procedure and no specific tools for risk assessment are used.

In **Latvia**, according to the Rules of the Cabinet of Ministers (25 March 2014) on prevention of danger of violence, it is required that police officers assess risks of violence threats. However, there is not yet a unified manner of assessing the risks. Generally, the police, together with the Ministry of Welfare and crisis centres, carry out risk assessment. Risk assessment is conducted with the use of a questionnaire, with which information is gathered from the victim on possible threats to their life and health. The risk profile/survey includes all forms of violence, including emotional abuse, economic violence, physical violence, and sexual violence.

At first contact, the police carry out risk assessment for intimate partner violence and this information is then communicated to the social services of the Ministry of Welfare, where a more in-depth risk assessment is carried out. Thus, for each case, the risk assessment is carried out twice.

In 2014, full training for police on risk assessment was carried out in all sections and in all regions. From the overall personnel, 60 % of police staff were trained. The issue of violence is also included in vocational training programmes that police officers are currently undergoing in college.

Social workers in social services and NGOs also carry out a general risk assessment; however, there is currently no unified instrument being used.

In 2016-2018, a pilot project (financed by the EU justice programme) was carried out in order to test and implement a unified form for risk assessment.

As risk assessment tools are not yet properly and comprehensively implemented in Latvia, there are no monitoring or evaluation mechanisms in place to help assess the effectiveness of existing risk assessment practices and measures.

In **Lithuania** the police collect information about a perpetrator's previous administrative violations, crimes and convictions based on police databases and records. Risk is then measured according to the severity of previous crimes.

One of the most revealing evaluations on issues of risk assessment and management is the public audit report 'Organising protection against domestic violence' released on 15 May 2015 by the National Audit Office of Lithuania. The report critically assessed whether the protection of victims of domestic violence is efficient and if they receive immediate help and support. Police received criticism for failure to effectively respond to calls on domestic violence and for the limited instruments and effective tools available to ensure victims' safety and prevent revictimisation⁽¹⁴⁷⁾. Following the recommendations of the audit, the regulations for police to effectively respond to the calls of domestic violence were renewed in 2015, 2016 and 2017. The amendments aimed at improving police intervention in domestic violence cases and ensuring victim safety. However, no concrete steps were recommended to assess risk.

The Prosecutor General approved recommendations to assess the special protection needs of victims of crime in 2016 following transposition of the Victims' Rights Directive. The recommendations provide the criteria to identify the potential risk for victims within a scale from 10 points (low risk), towards middle-scale risk (11-20 points), to 21 points or more (high risk)⁽¹⁴⁸⁾. The method follows the actuarial approach and the identification of a high risk means that in the period of pre-trial investigation all protection measures for a victim should be applied immediately⁽¹⁴⁹⁾. Specifically, the identification of a high risk case allows the police pre-trial investigator to request the prosecutor to assign restrictive measures (separate residence or no-contact order) for the perpetrator in order to better protect victims. In 2018 the Police Commissar General issued the Order on

regulations of police interventions into cases of domestic violence, operation and control of temporal protection measures issued by a court (No-5-V-611), Chapter V of which is dedicated to risk assessment⁽¹⁵⁰⁾. This chapter refers to the recommendations approved by the Prosecutor General (2016) and includes several additional items as risk factors such as previous violent crimes by the perpetrator, attempts to impose pressure on a victim (e.g. pressure to stop cooperation with police or to not provide evidence) or signs that a victim is obviously intimidated.

No other sector is involved in risk assessment processes beyond victim identification and there is no data on multiagency initiatives to assess and manage risk of intimate partner violence.

In **Luxembourg**, risk assessment for intimate partner violence is mainly understood as a process conducted by the police to aid the Public Prosecutor when making decisions around perpetrator eviction orders. It is based on a police report without the use of guidelines or tools, and relies on the professional judgement and experience of the police officer in charge of the case.

A number of victim support services use risk assessment in work. For example, Visavi, a general information and support service for women, often uses the dynamic risk assessment systems (DyRiAS) instrument, with the support of the Ministry of Gender Equality. It is an actuarial system and the main objective of this tool is to help women support their claims of violence and high risk to the police and public. The DyRiAS tool is not fully implemented for different reasons: for Visavi, it cannot be used with all women because first, it is in German, and second, it is very long, with intrusive questions that are not always suitable, depending on the situation of the victim at a given time.

Although risk assessment is not formally implemented, there is a methodology of multiagency

⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ Valstybės auditas (2015), 'Apsaugos nuo smurto artimoje aplinkoje organizavimas. Tyrimo ataskaita' [State audit: Organisation of the protection on violence, research report]. Vilnius. Available at: <http://www.vkontrole.lt/>

⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/86bc22f0dfa611e58a92afc65dd68e97>

⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ LR Generalinis prokuroras (2016), Usakymas dėl rekomendacijų dėl nukentėjusiųjų specialių apsaugos poreikių vertinimo patvirtinimo [Lithuania republic, Prosecutor General, Order on recommendations on victims' special protection needs], 29.2.2016, pp. 1-63.

⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/90fa3a207ef711e89188e16a6495e98c>

cooperation that supports smooth implementation of the law on domestic violence. The Cooperation Committee on Domestic Violence has a key role in assessing the implementation of the law, in collecting data from all actors involved and evaluating policy and making recommendations for improvement. The committee creates a forum for sharing information on specific cases of domestic violence and coordinating action on offender management and victim safety.

The committee comprises representatives from the police, the Public Prosecutor, the relevant ministries (Justice, Internal Affairs, ministry of Gender Equality), services looking after victims and diverse NGOs working in the field of domestic violence.

There are no evaluations and/or assessments of national practices or tools on risk assessment and/or risk management of intimate partner violence in Luxembourg.

In **Hungary**, risk assessment for domestic violence in general and for intimate partner violence specifically is not a regulated or standardised practice. Risk assessment seems to be conducted in an indirect, reflexive way, as part of different tasks of professionals. There are some risk assessment provisions in case of child endangerment/abuse, but it is not linked to intimate partner violence specifically.

Risk assessment is not formally carried out by the police. Elements of risk assessment are taken into account when applying relevant legislation (e.g. on restraining orders), or through individual assessment/implementation of measures regarding victims or witnesses requiring special treatment. A methodological guide for the police is currently under preparation for cases of violence between relatives. It is expected that this will include provisions on risk assessment.

The NANE Women's Rights Association operates a helpline for victims of domestic violence where risk assessment is performed informally. During the implementation of the 'Vodafone for Women's Safety' project, NANE conducted risk assessment based on the 'Big 26' risk assessment tool, developed by the domestic abuse intervention programme, Duluth, Minnesota. The Big 26 tool adopts the structured approach based on professional judgement and is carried out following an initial non-structured interview/victim-led talk. The project 'Vodafone for women's safety' was implemented in partnership with Vodafone, NANE, the Budapest Police Headquarters and the private company Top Cop Security, between 2011 and 2016. The project was presented as a promising practice in the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights' annual report for 2011, for effective protective measures against repeated violence in the context of domestic violence and stalking⁽¹⁵¹⁾.

Currently in **Malta**, the national agency that conducts risk assessment is Aġenzija Appoġġ. This agency provides support for children, families and the community. The risk assessment provided by the agency uses the DASH checklist, which has been translated and adjusted to reflect the needs and culture of Maltese society. The purpose of the assessment is to identify victim needs and to inform victim safety planning.

The police do not carry out risk assessments. However, given that the law requires that police and social workers conduct risk assessments, there is an understanding that social workers from Aġenzija Appoġġ will conduct the risk assessment within the police station and the police will report findings to the court in cases where there is a need for a temporary protection order.

Following the ratification of the Istanbul Convention, a steering committee has been set up by the Ministry for European Affairs and Equality that has brought together identified stakehold-

⁽¹⁵¹⁾ European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, (2012), *Fundamental rights: challenges and achievements in 2011. Annual report 2011*, p. 225. Available at: http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/2211-FRA-2012_Annual-Report-2011_EN.pdf

ers, namely the Malta Police Force, Aġenzija Appoġġ and the Primary Health and Emergency, Probation and Education Department to develop a multiagency risk assessment meeting where high risk cases will be discussed following risk assessment with the DASH checklist. The head of the multiagency risk assessment meeting will be Aġenzija Appoġġ, since they have the greatest expertise in this area.

In terms of evaluation of risk assessment and risk management practices, the national audit 2015 ⁽¹⁵²⁾ found that the national authority, the Aġenzija Appoġġ Domestic Violence Unit, lacked human resources and thus had to prioritise cases of domestic violence, resulting in immediate assistance being offered to high risk cases while putting those that scored 'low risk' on a waiting list. It also found that there are no specific services for male victims of violence. Following this report, Aġenzija Appoġġ now has one male social worker available for male victims, and the service that assists men who are abusive, formerly called Men's Services, has been renamed Managing Abusive Behaviour Services.

The central approach to risk assessment of intimate partner violence in **the Netherlands** is the 'Meldcode' (reporting code), mandated by law in 2013 ⁽¹⁵³⁾. The Meldcode is broader in scope and covers all forms of violence, but intimate partner violence is clearly included. Other forms of violence included in the Meldcode are child abuse, abuse of elderly people, honour-based violence and female genital mutilation.

The Meldcode improves the quality of care offered and instructs professionals clearly on what to do when confronted with domestic violence. The advantage of the Meldcode is that it homogenises procedures throughout the country and this raises the chance of quick action and early detection. The Meldcode is a legal obligation and comprises five steps ⁽¹⁵⁴⁾. Assessments are conducted via a validated tool developed in the Netherlands that will be further revised in Janu-

ary 2019, in order to develop assessment frameworks (Afwegingskader) for professionals in each specific sector. Certain sectors are legally obliged to work with the Meldcode: the healthcare sector (including mental healthcare sector), youth care, education, childcare, social support, and justice.

An important partner in these steps is Veilig Thuis (safe home) which has 26 referral/primary care centres throughout the country. Both victims and perpetrators can contact Veilig Thuis and they provide support to both. In addition, professionals can request training from Veilig Thuis and the 26 regional centres are on standby to assist any professional that may require support.

In 2010, Kadera (a non-governmental foundation) developed the 'indicator checklist domestic violence' ⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ in cooperation with Dimence and de Kern. This list was revised in 2013 and the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sports has included it as a tool in the national toolkit working with the Meldcode reporting code for domestic violence and child abuse. In 2016, Kadera reviewed the list again and developed it into the 'Interactive indicator checklist domestic violence and child abuse' with the help of the organisations FairWork, Pharos and Movisie.

In **Austria**, risk assessment is a prerequisite to the imposition of emergency barring orders. A risk assessment tool — the Salfag (situational analysis of domestic violence) — has recently been developed by the Federal Ministry of Interior for use by law-enforcement agencies. Its aim is to standardise the assessment of risks in domestic violence cases. It uses criteria drawn from risk assessment tools like the SARA or ODARA and includes questions about the concrete situation, the perpetrator and the victim. With the help of this instrument, the police officers on site should be able to assess the dangerousness and dynamics of the situation and the potential for escalation in the course of the first intervention. However, it is not specifically developed to assess lethal risk, as required by the Istanbul Convention, and

⁽¹⁵²⁾ National Audit Office, (2015), *Performance audit: Tackling domestic violence*. National Audit Office, Malta. Available at: <https://www.um.edu.mt/library/oar/bitstream/123456789/11762/1/Domestic%20Violence%20July%202015.pdf>

⁽¹⁵³⁾ Besluit verplichte meldcode huiselijk geweld en kindermishandeling (2018) . Available at: <http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0033723/2018-07-28>

⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ Signalenkaart:Huiselijk geweld en kindermishandeling. Available at: <https://signalenkaart.nl/>

⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ The checklist is age specific and can be found at: <https://signalenkaart.nl>

has not yet been formally implemented. Some parts of Austria have introduced multiagency risk assessment procedures or tools in the form of regular meetings or case conferences. Some law-enforcement agency districts use MARACs, and representatives of various agencies regularly attend. The most important MARAC, the Viennese one, cannot continue its work as the police no longer attend the conference.

Additionally, in cases of dangerous threat or coercion, the district police department can involve the Department for Threat Management and Danger Analysis for a more thorough analysis of the risks of further victimisation. Depending on the case, the risk assessors cooperate with various institutions, like the youth welfare office or victim protection centres. If necessary, the department experts may suggest further measures for risk management to the police attorney.

Risk assessment is a standard procedure in intervention centres/victim protection centres as it is seen as a precondition for developing a safety plan with the victim. In Styria, risk assessment is mainly done by the violence protection centre based on the DyRIAS. The Vienna Intervention Centre systematically applies the DA tool. The DyRIAS is often used only as a second step (once the DA identifies a risk) as it is a more time-consuming process.

Over the last decade, in **Poland**, the legal and policy framework has undergone considerable development with respect to protection and support measures for victims of domestic violence. The current Polish system is based on the blue card procedure, multiagency cooperation and the coordination system originally used by the police, but extended to other stakeholders in 2010. The blue card defines a set of measures to deal with complaints of domestic violence, including remedial responses and cooperation with non-police entities. Both the police and the prosecutors cooperate with crisis intervention centres and district centres for family assistance. The procedure may be initiated by any of the following institu-

tions: police, social services, the healthcare system, the education system and local government committees for the prevention of alcohol abuse. According to the legal and policy framework, the procedure can be initiated whenever there is any suspicion of domestic violence.

Since January 2014, Polish police officers from all regions have started to use risk assessment tools for cases of domestic violence during or directly after police intervention. The development of tools to support risk assessment was initiated in May 2013 and the working group responsible for its preparation consisted of police officers from the Prevention and Road Traffic Bureau in General Police Headquarters, and representatives of the NGOs National help assistance for victims of domestic violence (blue line) and Nobody's Children Foundation. Two risk assessment tools in the form of questionnaires were prepared, together with the 'Guidance of conduct', which is an integral part of the tool⁽¹⁵⁶⁾. Each questionnaire includes 13 risk factors to evaluate risk to the life and well-being of a victim. The 'Guidance of conduct' describes the legal basis for making an arrest in cases of domestic violence, as well as the basis for removing a child from a family. The guidance also reminds police officers of the necessity of initiating the blue card procedure in cases of domestic violence regardless of the level of risk identified. It should be noted that use of the risk assessment questionnaires is not obligatory; they are used only where there are doubts regarding decisions around the arrest of a perpetrator.

All police officers that may come into contact with domestic violence cases have been equipped with these tools. A 'Handbook for police officers — how to use risk assessment tools' was elaborated for training purposes. Training is — in theory — compulsory in every police station in Poland for coordinators of the blue-card procedure. However, there is no data available on whether the training is actually taking place. No evaluation of the tool implementation has been carried out to date.

⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ Marzena Kordaczuk-Wąs, 'Algorytmy i kwestionariusze dla policjantów' [Algorithms and questionnaires for police officers], Niebieska Linia nr 6/2013.

In 2014, the 'National help assistance for victims of domestic violence (blue line)' created special risk assessment tools (algorithms) for healthcare system ⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ and education system ⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ workers. The tools consist of a questionnaire aimed at helping teachers and healthcare system workers to assess the risk of violence, and an algorithm of conduct corresponding to the risk diagnosed. The education and healthcare systems received two algorithms each: in the first case, one for children under 9 years old and another one for children over 9 years old; in the second case, one used for children and another one used for adults. The tools were tested by education and healthcare system workers from September 2014 to March 2015 and received positive feedback.

Risk assessment in cases of domestic violence took place in **Portugal** for the first time in 2006, according to the resolution of Council of Ministers No 21/2005. In 2014, a registration form for risk assessment for cases of domestic violence was developed for use by police authorities, specifically the Republican National Guard and the Public Security Police. The tool was designed with the support of Minho University and the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic. The tool has two versions, one for the first line of police intervention (RVD — 1L Risk assessment report on domestic violence situations) ⁽¹⁵⁹⁾ and another for reassessment (RVD — 2L Risk assessment report on domestic violence situations) ⁽¹⁶⁰⁾. The tool has 20 indicators corresponding to a risk scale (low, medium or high), and can predict future violent behaviour, supporting law-enforcement decisions. It is both a risk assessment and a management tool and adopts the structured professional judgement approach.

When the tool was developed in 2014, there was intensive specialised training for trainers among police officers, with the aim of training other po-

lice officers in the country. Training on risk assessment and management is part of the initial curriculum of police officers. A domestic violence policing manual was also developed for police authorities, where all procedures on domestic violence are foreseen, as well as a set of instructions for completing the domestic violence risk assessment forms. The same tool is used by the Public Prosecution Service, a constitutional body entrusted with powers to prosecute and to participate in the implementation of criminal policy.

According to the risk assessment, different sectors (e.g. justice, health, social work, child protection) can be involved so the protection needs of the victims may be guaranteed and the control needs of aggressors satisfied. Although an internal monitoring mechanism is in place, the results are not publicly available.

The Directorate-General of Reintegration and Prison Services has adopted the SARA risk assessment tool following the structured professional judgement approach. It targets the perpetrator as part of the programme for aggressors of domestic violence (PAVD). Its purpose is to assess whether aggressors meet the inclusion criteria to participate in the PAVD (low or moderate risk) and is recommended for use as part of an in-depth assessment to be used for judicial and probationary decisions. The PAVD was externally evaluated by a university entity — the Cooperativa de Ensino Superior Politécnico e Universitário.

The Portuguese Association for Victim Support (an NGO) uses the DA risk assessment tool that assesses risk of extreme dangerousness and lethal violence for victim education, awareness, safety planning and service provision. The Portuguese Association for Victim Support's professionals receive and provide training on the tool. The DA is currently being adapted for use in Por-

⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ 'Kwestionariusz oceny ryzyka występowania przemocy w rodzinie oraz algorytmy postępowania dla ochrony zdrowia' [Questionnaire for the risk assessment of domestic violence and algorithms for health protection system], Niebieska Linia.

⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ 'Kwestionariusz oceny ryzyka występowania przemocy w rodzinie oraz algorytmy postępowania dla oświaty' [Questionnaire for the risk assessment of domestic violence and algorithms for education system], Niebieska Linia.

⁽¹⁵⁹⁾ Ficha RVD – 1L Avaliação de risco para situações de violência doméstica [RVD – 1L Risk assessment report on domestic violence situations]. Available at: http://www.ministeriopublico.pt/sites/default/files/documentos/pdf/ficha_rvd_1l.pdf

⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ Ficha RVD – 2L Avaliação de risco para situações de violência doméstica [RVD – 2L Risk assessment report on domestic violence situations]. Available at: http://www.ministeriopublico.pt/sites/default/files/documentos/pdf/ficha_rvd_2l.pdf

tugal. There is no information on monitoring or assessment mechanisms in place to evaluate and assess the effectiveness of the practice.

In **Romania**, risk assessment and risk management have been elaborated extensively in Law 174/2018. This law presents the methodology and the way that police officers should handle cases of domestic violence. The law will be established by order of the Minister of Internal Affairs and the Minister of Labour and Social Justice. In Article 22 paragraph 10, the order comprises: the intervention procedure of the police in cases of violence; domestic cooperation and cooperation with the other institutions responsible for preventing and combating domestic violence; the model of the risk assessment form and a description of how to use it; the issuing procedure and the model of the provisional protection order; and the procedure for enforcement of the provisional protection order.

A multidisciplinary and multiagency working group was established in order to propose the final forms of secondary legislation following the adoption of the legislation regarding violence against women. The composition of the group is the following: 17 members — including four representatives of the National Agency for Equal Opportunities (coordinating body of legislation development), one representative (judge) from the National Institute for Magistrature, five representatives from the police (different departments dealing with several phases of law implementation), two representatives from the Ministry of Education, one representative from the Ministry of Health, one representative from the Public Ministry (prosecutor), one representative from the College of Psychologists, one representative from the National College of Social Workers, and three representatives from NGOs — representing networks of NGOs dealing with violence against women, sexual violence and women's rights.

In **Slovenia**, the social work centre primarily carries out risk assessment according to the Family Violence Act. The social work centre has a central

role in addressing family violence and providing support as well as carrying out risk analysis and management. Their main mechanisms for providing support include contacting the victim and establishing a support plan, encompassing various forms of support to respond to victim needs. In most cases, the social work centre is informed about family and intimate partner violence after the violent incident has already been reported to the police. Although the social work centre has the main role in risk assessment as they are the official case holders, in risk management it is the police and the courts that have the main responsibility.

Risk assessment at the social work centre takes place only after a multidisciplinary team has been formed and is based on the professional judgement of a practitioner. The structure of the multidisciplinary team and its content is unavailable to the perpetrator. The risk assessment carried out by the social work centre is considered the only official document on the matter, which means it is of fundamental importance regarding other forms of risk management carried out by the courts (e.g. restraining orders and similar victim protection measures). Risk assessment also serves as a basis for free legal aid. The social work centre may also refer the perpetrator of violence to educational, psychosocial or health programmes and can consider irregular attendance as an aggravated circumstance in court proceedings.

The only tools for risk assessment analysis in cases of intimate partner violence in Slovenia are the guidelines for social care workers established in 2010, and available in a professional newsletter issued by the Community of Centres for Social Work, entitled 'Bilten Kaljenje: Preventing domestic violence' (2011) ⁽¹⁶¹⁾. The guidelines include recommended procedures for the professional responsible for a particular case of domestic violence (what to assess, what information to gather regarding the victim, the perpetrator and their social network, and possible sources of support). As there are no clear guidelines specifically for risk

⁽¹⁶¹⁾ <https://www.scsd.si/oscsd/kaljenje/>

assessment in place, organisations are lacking well-developed tools for risk assessment analysis.

Also developed recently were risk assessment tools in the context of the POND project, 'Recognising and treating victims of domestic violence in healthcare settings' ⁽¹⁶²⁾, with the aim of providing support for healthcare risk assessment analysis. In 2015, the Ministry of Health developed professional guidelines for responding to domestic violence in healthcare services. The professional guidelines encompass information on how to detect family and intimate partner violence, information on necessary procedures that need to be put in place when there is a reasonable suspicion of family and intimate partner violence, how to properly and effectively implement necessary documentation work, and how to provide support to the victim.

In **Slovakia**, until recently the police force only used ad hoc risk assessment procedures. However, in January 2017, front-line police officers were ordered by the Police President to use a risk assessment questionnaire ⁽¹⁶³⁾ in cases of reporting suspicion of domestic violence. The questionnaire is based on guidelines developed by experts on domestic violence issues within the framework of the 'Coordination — methodical centre for gender-based and domestic violence' project ⁽¹⁶⁴⁾. The guidelines are called 'The basic risk assessment for violence against women for police officers at first contact' ⁽¹⁶⁵⁾. The questionnaire serves as a tool for first-contact police officers to review suspicion of domestic violence and to thus take effective measures to protect the life and health of people at risk. The questionnaire contains 12 questions based on the DA tool and DASH checklist, and adopts the structured professional judgement approach.

The intended use of the risk assessment tool is victim safety and the implementation of victim protection measures. The questionnaire was put into practice without pilot verification and without proper police training and supervision.

Only some police officers were trained in risk assessment processes in 2017 in the Trenčín self-governing region within the framework of the project 'Coordination — methodical centre for gender-based and domestic violence'. The police force has also revised guidelines for domestic violence as an internal document, which also covers steps for the management of risk, but it is not available from official sources.

There are no evaluations and/or assessments of national practices or tools on risk assessment and/or risk management of intimate partner violence against women. The Prosecutor General's 2017 report states that 'The number of detected cases of domestic violence increased by 81 per cent in 2017 in comparison with 2016.' However, it is not clear what data the report used, and if this increasing number is due to the use of the application risk assessment questionnaire for the first time. Although the report states that application of the risk assessment questionnaire will be evaluated by the prosecutor and police, there is no evidence that this has taken place.

The national non-stop free-of-charge helpline for women experiencing violence, working under the Institute for Labour and Family Research, carries out risk assessment using the DASH checklist. There is no information about monitoring or assessment of the system of using risk assessment practice and tools by counsellors. The intended use of the risk assessment practice is for victim safety. The helpline provides crisis assistance, information, and referral to follow-up specialised services. Counsellors also answer basic questions about legal aid and assist women in seeking further help in their region. As there is no monitoring and assessment system, it is not possible to assess the effectiveness of the practice.

In **Finland**, implementation of risk assessment began following ratification of the Istanbul Convention and was introduced in the 5-year national action plan to combat violence against women (2010-2015), specifically development and imple-

⁽¹⁶²⁾ <http://www.prepoznajnasilje.si/en/stop-domestic-violence>

⁽¹⁶³⁾ Unofficially available at: <http://www.pravnelisty.sk/clanky/a536-o-dotaznikoch-a-zadrzani-podozriveho-na-zaklade-poctu-ziskanych-bodov>

⁽¹⁶⁴⁾ Project was realised by the Institute for Labour and Family Research.

⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ Unofficial online source: <http://www.pravnelisty.sk/clanky/a536-o-dotaznikoch-a-zadrzani-podozriveho-na-zaklade-poctu-ziskanych-bodov>

mentation of the MARAC model⁽¹⁶⁶⁾. The current national implementation plan for the Istanbul Convention also includes measures with regard to its Article 51, more specifically with the aim to spread the MARAC model further into regions where it does not yet exist and to allocate funds for training on the MARAC risk assessment tool and support for the existing local MARAC multi-professional groups. However, risk assessment and risk management are only done systematically in specialised services, where the staff have received specific training on it, such as shelters. In the public social and health services, risk assessment tools are used only if local management provides support for it and if practitioners have received training on the MARAC model and risk assessment tools. The police also participate in MARAC groups and use the MARAC risk assessment tool as part of their work.

There are currently 31 MARAC teams operating in about 90 Finnish municipalities. The National Institute for Health and Welfare is responsible for coordinating and evaluating the project.

During implementation of the previous national action plan (2010-2015), research was conducted on the effectiveness of the then newly adopted MARAC model in Finland. The results have thus far only been published in Finnish⁽¹⁶⁷⁾. The results have been very positive and have shown that the MARACs have significantly reduced revictimisation of sufferers of intimate partner violence. The cycle of recurrent violence was successfully broken in more than 70 % of cases, and no new criminal complaints for such cases were filed during the 6-month follow-up period. The results are in line with previous studies from other countries using the MARAC model.

In **Sweden**, specific risk assessment tools have been developed for use by the police, namely

the SAM checklist⁽¹⁶⁸⁾ and the Patriarch checklist for honour violence⁽¹⁶⁹⁾. The Patriarch checklist was developed specifically for the assessment of risk of patriarchal violence (defined as actual, attempted or threatened physical harm) with honour as a motive, including forced and arranged marriage and female genital mutilation⁽¹⁷⁰⁾. The SAM is a tool used in cases of stalking, and encourages evaluators to consider various risk scenarios with respect to the nature, severity, immi-nence and frequency/duration of future stalking and violent behaviours⁽¹⁷¹⁾.

The police screening tool for violent crimes is a tool developed in the Swedish city of Malmö, similar to SARA. It has only been used by the police in Malmö and was investigated in a doctoral dissertation by Klara Svalin in 2018.

The National Board of Health and Welfare (Socialstyrelsen) was commissioned by the Swedish government in 2007 to develop new tools to develop more uniform risk assessments. The result was the Feminist Research, Education, Development and Action (FREDA) Centre, containing three standardised subtools for assessment: (1) FREDA short questions; (2) FREDA description and; (3) FREDA danger assessment (this latter tool was a direct translation of the internationally recognised DA tool).

The Prison and Probation Service (Kriminalvården) uses the SARA risk assessment tool when assessing the participation of men who have been convicted of violence towards a woman in the IDAP.

The risk assessments conducted by the police are mainly done with the purpose of preventing crime (by identifying high risk cases), whereas the risk assessments done by social services are mainly about supporting and protecting intimate partner violence victims (and making the victims

⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ <https://rikosentorjunta.fi/en/marac>

⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ Three reports (including the Piispa and Lappinen report of 2014) have been published in 2012-2015 as well as one article published in 2017. Available (in Finnish only) at: https://www.julkari.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/134851/YP1703_Piispa%26October.pdf?sequence=1

⁽¹⁶⁸⁾ Belfrage, H. and Strand, S., (2009), 'Validation of the stalking assessment and management checklist (SAM) in law-enforcement: a prospective study of 153 cases of stalking in two Swedish police counties', *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, Vol. 11, No 1, pp. 67-76.

⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ Belfrage H., Strand, S., Ekman L. and Hasselborg A., (2011), 'Assessing risk of patriarchal violence with honour as a motive: six years experience using the Patriarch checklist', *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, Vol. 14, No 1.

⁽¹⁷⁰⁾ Belfrage H., Strand, S., Ekman L. and Hasselborg A., (2011), 'Assessing risk of patriarchal violence with honour as a motive: six years experience using the Patriarch checklist', *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, Vol. 14, No 1.

⁽¹⁷¹⁾ Belfrage, H. and Strand, S., (2009), 'Validation of the stalking assessment and management checklist (SAM) in law-enforcement: a prospective study of 153 cases of stalking in two Swedish police counties', *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, Vol. 11, No 1, pp. 67-76.

and, potentially, children safer). However, these two authorities evidently interact with each other and each other's risk assessments. Scarce resources are undoubtedly also a factor in the reasons for conducting a risk assessment, but are not the main driver. The main driver is that the police and social services by law are obliged to investigate and support potential victims of intimate partner violence (regardless of whether it is a low- or high risk case). However, if the case concerned is high risk, it is likely that this case will be dealt with earlier than a low-risk case.

Although no assessment or monitoring mechanisms are in place for the risk assessment practices implemented, they have been the topic of academic research and have been validated.

Risk assessment and management are delivered differently across the four nations of the **United Kingdom**. Criminal and civil justice mechanisms are devolved in Northern Ireland and Scotland and victim services (except those relating to reserved policies such as immigration and welfare benefits) are devolved in all four countries. The DASH 2009 ⁽¹⁷²⁾ risk identification, assessment and management model is a multiagency tool implemented in many of the 43 police services in England and Wales since 2009. It is a 27-question risk-identification interview with victims of domestic violence. As well as a positive or negative response to a question, officers are expected to record explanatory and contextual information in free text boxes on a DASH risk assessment form. Based on victims' responses, officers are required to submit a DASH form, using their professional judgement to allocate a grade of 'standard', 'medium' or 'high' risk. It is a tool for identifying and managing immediate and future risk of harm; it is not a tool intended simply to predict the likelihood of future discrete acts of abuse.

One police force — in Merseyside, England — does not use the DASH, but uses another risk assessment tool called the Merseyside risk identification tool ⁽¹⁷³⁾, which is similar to the SARA. It is used for every incident of domestic abuse, to 'identify any risk factors at that time in order to inform the risk assessment process'. Attending officers gather the relevant information from the victim at the scene. The formal risk assessment takes place later, at the police station, by dedicated staff on receipt of the form. The focus is offender and perpetrator management with emphasis on victim safety as the outcome.

Recently, a new tool has been developed specifically to identify high risk and serial domestic abusers, the Priority Perpetrator Identification Tool (PPIT). There was an evaluation of the application of PPIT in three police areas in England ⁽¹⁷⁴⁾.

In Scotland, which passed new legislation in 2018 ⁽¹⁷⁵⁾ that redefined intimate partner violence to include coercive behaviours and psychological violence, risk assessment is carried out with victims across health services, victim services, and the police. Risk assessment and risk management approaches are being revised to reflect this new specific offence and in particular the psychological element.

In 2016 the Scottish government extended multi-agency public protection arrangements for sexual offending to cover other 'risk of serious harm' offenders, including perpetrators of intimate partner violence against women. In addition, the police in Scotland have for some years been using multiagency tasking and control panels that focus exclusively on controlling repeat offenders of intimate partner violence against women. The police in Scotland are currently developing a performance framework for multiagency tasking and control panels in order to demonstrate their effectiveness.

⁽¹⁷²⁾ DASH risk model. Available at: <https://www.dashriskchecklist.co.uk/>

⁽¹⁷³⁾ HMIC (2014), Merseyside Police's approach to tackling domestic abuse. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/merseyside-approach-to-tackling-domestic-abuse.pdf>

⁽¹⁷⁴⁾ Robinson, A. L. and Clancy, A., (2017), 'New initiatives to tackle domestic violence using the Priority Perpetrator Identification Tool (PPIT)', Cardiff University, Cardiff. Available at: <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/107138/1/Robinson%20%26%20Clancy%20%282017%29%20New%20PPIT%20Initiatives%20for%20Tackling%20Domestic%20Abuse.pdf>

⁽¹⁷⁵⁾ Domestic Abuse (Scotland) Act 2018. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2018/5/pdfs/asp_20180005_en.pdf

Annex 3. Tables

Table 1. Most widely used risk assessment tools in the EU Member States

Most widely used risk assessment tools in the EU Member States							
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Member States	Goal	Source of information	Adaptations
Danger assessment (DA)	Lethality/reassault	Health professionals, social workers	Actuarial Victim focused 20 items	Germany	Safety planning	Victim	DA-I (for immigrant women)
				Italy			DA-R (for same-sex relationships)
Spousal assault risk assessment (SARA)	Recidivism/reassault	Clinicians, trained professionals in all sectors	Structured Offender focused 20 items Latest version (SARA-V3) includes 24 risk factors	Austria	Safety planning, court rulings	Victim, perpetrator, case files	Lethality screen
				Portugal			
				Sweden			
				Czechia (SARA DN)			
				Denmark (SARA SV)			
				Ireland			
				Spain			
				Italy (SARA Plus)			
				Portugal			
				Slovakia			
Sweden							
Ontario domestic assault risk assessment (ODARA)	Recidivism/reassault	Front-line police officers, victim support professionals	Actuarial Offender focused 13 items	Germany	Criminal justice decision-making	Case files	SARA SV — Denmark
				Slovakia			

Most widely used risk assessment tools in the EU Member States									
Brief spousal assault form for the evaluation of risk (B-SAFER)	Recidivism/reassault	Police officers Mental health professionals	Structured Offender and victim focused 10 items	Italy Sweden	Risk management plan	Victim, perpetrator	Adapted from the SARA		
Domestic abuse, stalking and harassment, and honour-based violence (DASH)	Serious harm (life-threatening and/or traumatic, and from which recovery, whether physical or psychological, can be expected to be difficult or impossible)	Police officers Front-line practitioners working with victims of domestic abuse	Structured Victim focused 27 questions 11 additional questions on stalking and harassment 10 additional questions on honour-based violence	Estonia Ireland Slovakia United Kingdom	Risk management and referral to MARAC for multiagency response for high risk cases	Victim	ACPO DASH for police CAADA DASH for partner agencies		
DyRiAS — Intimate partners	Lethality/reassault	Intervention centres/violence protection centres	Actuarial Victim focused 39 items	Luxembourg Austria	Safety planning	Victim	DyRiAS — School DyRiAS — Workplace violence		
Historical clinical risk management-20	General risk of violence	Psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, institutional and community corrections officers, police and public-safety officers	Structured Perpetrator focused	Czechia Italy	Offender management	Perpetrator			
The Big 26 (Duluth, Minnesota)	Severity/lethal violence	Multiagency tool	26 items	Hungary	Safety planning	Victim			

Table 2. Tools developed at EU Member State level

Nationally developed risk assessment tools in use in the EU Member States					
Belgium					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
Risk assessment instrument for partner violence and risk management ⁽¹⁷⁶⁾	Recidivism/reassault	Police Social workers	Structured approach Offender and victim focused 13 items	Offender management Victim safety Victim protection measures Criminal justice measures Multiagency cooperation	Police file Victim Perpetrator
Triage instrument FJC Limburg ⁽¹⁷⁷⁾	Recidivism/reassault	Police officers High-risk cases referred to multidisciplinary team	Structured approach in two phases — risk level can be adjusted by multidisciplinary team Offender and victim focused 48 items	Offender management Victim safety Victim protection measures Criminal justice measures Multiagency cooperation	Case files
Processus de domination conjugale — Wallonia ⁽¹⁷⁸⁾	Severe/lethal violence Psychological harm Impact of violence on victim	All front-line professionals	Structured approach Offender and victim focused 23 items	Victim safety Offender management Multiagency cooperation	

⁽¹⁷⁶⁾ Matkosi, S., Groenen, A., Van Vossle, A. and Coteur, K. (2016). Risicotaxatie Instrument Partnergeweld & Risicomangement. Diepenbeek: UC Leuven-Limburg. Available at: www.risicotaxatie.be and www.évaluation-des-risques.be

⁽¹⁷⁷⁾ FJC Limburg. (2018). Triage instrument FJC Limburg. Flemish Government – Department of Wellbeing, Public Health and Family. Department of Houses of Justice (document not published).

⁽¹⁷⁸⁾ La séjournelle inc. (2008). Le processus de domination conjugale: Un modèle interactif et évolutif. Québec: author. Available at: <http://csrc.ca/>

Nationally developed risk assessment tools in use in the EU Member States						
Bulgaria						
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information	
Questionnaires for the identification of risk of imminent and repeated violence in partner relationships and risk assessment of serious violence	Recidivism/reassault Assessment of the danger of the perpetrator Lethal violence Serious psychological harm	NGO practitioners	Structured approach Victim focused Different indicators	Victim safety	Victim assisted Existing programmes for perpetrators	
Czechia						
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information	
Questionnaire for the identification of risk of repeated violence in relationships and risk assessment of serious violence ⁽¹⁷⁹⁾	Recidivism/reassault Lethal violence Psychological harm	NGO practitioners	Structured approach Victim focused 32 items, with space for professional judgement	Victim safety	Victim	
Estonia						
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information	
Intimate partner violence case information sheet 'Lähisuhtevägivalla infoleht'	Reassault/reoffending Psychological abuse	Police officers	Victim focused	Victim safety planning Offender management Referral to other victim support services and local authorities	Victim	

⁽¹⁷⁹⁾ Rosa-Centrum pro.Zeny

Nationally developed risk assessment tools in use in the EU Member States					
Ireland					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
Risk assessment matrix ⁽¹⁸⁰⁾	Risk of lethality and serious physical harm	Police officers	Structured approach Four to five items	Protection measures	Victim
Spain					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
Police risk assessment (VPR)	Recidivism/reassault	Police officers	Actuarial approach	Safety planning	Victim
Police assessment for the evolution of risk (VPER) ⁽¹⁸¹⁾	Multi-recidivism, type of violence, severity		Victim focused 39 items (VPR) 43 items (VPER)	Protection measures	
Scale for the prediction of risk of serious intimate partner violence (EPV-R) (Basque Country) ⁽¹⁸²⁾	Lethality/reassault	Police officers Forensic services	Actuarial approach Victim- and offender focused 20 items	Safety planning Protection measures	Victim Perpetrator
Protocol for the assessment of risk of violence against women by a partner or ex-partner (RVD-BCN) (Barcelona) ⁽¹⁸³⁾	Lethality/reassault	Multiagency	Structured approach Victim focused 16 items	Safety planning	Victim

⁽¹⁸⁰⁾ An Garda Síochána (2017), Policy of An Garda Síochána on domestic abuse intervention, An Garda Síochána, Dublin. Available at: <https://www.garda.ie/en/Crime/Domestic-abuse/Domestic-Abuse-Intervention-Policy-2017.pdf>

⁽¹⁸¹⁾ González-Alvarez, J. L., López-Ossorio, J. J. and Muñoz-Rivas, M. (2018), La valoración policial del riesgo de violencia contra la pareja en España – Sistema VioGén. Madrid: Ministerio del Interior., <http://www.interior.gob.es/>

⁽¹⁸²⁾ Echeburúa, E., Amor, P. J., Loinaz, I. and de Corral, P. (2010), Escala de Predicción del Riesgo de Violencia Grave contra la pareja — Revisada — (EPV-R) [Severe intimate partner violence risk prediction scale — Revised]. *Psicothema*, 22(4), pp. 1 054-1 060. Available at: www.psicothema.es/pdf/3840.pdf

⁽¹⁸³⁾ The Barcelona network to fight violence against women, Freijo Marta Alvarez et al (2011). *The RVD-BCN risk assessment guide for violence against women perpetrated by their partner or former partner*. Available at: <http://ajuntament.barcelona.cat/dretsocials/sites/default/files/arxius-documents/RVD-BCN%20publicacio%20ANGLE%20novembre%202012.pdf>

Nationally developed risk assessment tools in use in the EU Member States					
Croatia					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
System of perpetrators' assessment	Recidivism/reassault Infliction of serious damage	Probation officer Implementers of psychosocial treatment for domestic violence perpetrators	Clinical/unstructured approach Offender focused	Criminal justices measures	Perpetrator Case files
Informal risk assessment form	Recidivism/reassault Severe/lethal violence	Police officers	Structured Offender and victim focused 24 items	Offender management Victim safety Victim protection measures Criminal justice measures	Victim Perpetrator
Italy					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
Protocol EVA (Esame delle Violenze Agite — examination of acted violence) ⁽¹⁸⁴⁾	Recidivism/reassault Lethal violence	Law-enforcement agencies (mainly State Police but also Carabinieri)	Structured approach Offender and victim focused 15 items	Victim safety Victim protection measures Criminal justice measures	Victim Perpetrator Case files
Increasing self-awareness (ISA) ⁽¹⁸⁵⁾	Reassault Lethal violence	Victim self-assessment tool for use by anti-violence centres	Actuarial approach Victim focused 13 items	Offender management Victim safety Victim protection measures Criminal justice measures	Victim

⁽¹⁸⁴⁾ Directive of the Ministry of Interior, Central Operational Service, 20 January 2017, No 77, establishing that all state police headquarters (Questure) adopt the EVA protocol.

⁽¹⁸⁵⁾ Cesvis Centro Studi Vittime SARA. Available at: http://www.sara-cesvis.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=115&Itemid=136

Nationally developed risk assessment tools in use in the EU Member States					
Interdisciplinary working group for the establishment of an innovative provincial model for the support of women who have suffered violence ⁽¹⁸⁶⁾	Recidivism/reassault Lethal violence	Front-line professionals — all sectors	Structured approach, MARAC Offender and victim focused A simplified checklist with 17 items and a more comprehensive risk assessment sheet	Victim safety Victim protection measures	Victim Perpetrator Case files
Cyprus					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
Protocol for the assessment of risk in cases of intimate partner violence ⁽¹⁸⁷⁾	Recidivism/reassault Lethal violence	Police officers	Structured approach Situation focused 12 items	Victim safety Offender management Victim protection measures Criminal justice measures	Victim Perpetrator
Latvia					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
Risk assessment questionnaire (family conflict) ⁽¹⁸⁸⁾	Reassault Lethal violence Psychological harm Impacts (e.g. social, economic, health)	Police officers	Structured approach Victim focused 14 items	Victim protection measures Offender management Medical, psychological and social referral Referral of children to protective services	Victim

⁽¹⁸⁶⁾ Gruppo di lavoro inter-disciplinare finalizzato alla realizzazione di un modello provinciale innovativo di presa in carico delle donne che hanno subito violenza, Province of Trento, 27 October 2017, Delibera 1776/2017.

⁽¹⁸⁷⁾ Cyprus Police, Department for Combating Crime, Nicosia.

⁽¹⁸⁸⁾ http://www.lm.gov.lv/upload/projekts/faili/risku-izvertejums_soli-tuvak.pdf

Nationally developed risk assessment tools in use in the EU Member States					
Lithuania					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
Recommendations on assessment of victims' special protection needs ⁽¹⁸⁹⁾	Risk of secondary victimisation in criminal proceedings	Police officers Prosecutors	Actuarial approach Victim focused 17 items	Victim protection measures	Victim Perpetrator Data on nature of crime
Netherlands					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
'Meldcode' reporting code ⁽¹⁹⁰⁾	Reassault Lethal violence Psychological harm Socioeconomic impact, e.g. risk of homelessness, financial abuse Addiction	Professionals in police, healthcare, youth care, education, childcare, social support	Structured approach Focus on the victim, the perpetrator, children, other family members Multiple items (over 30)	Offender management Victim safety Victim protection measures Criminal justice measures Prevention by early detection	Victim Perpetrator Children Family members
Austria					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
Salfag (situational analysis of domestic violence)	Reassault	Police officers	Structured approach Items (unknown)	Protection measures — barring order	Situation Victim Perpetrator

⁽¹⁸⁹⁾ General Prosecutor of the Republic of Lithuania, *Recommendations on assessment of victims special protection needs*, 29.2.2016, No. I-63. Available at: <https://www.e-tar.lt/portala/lt/legalAct/86bc22f0d1a611e58a92afc65dd68e97>

⁽¹⁹⁰⁾ Law: 'Meldcode' Reporting Code, 16 July 2013, <http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0033723/2018-07-28>, <https://signalenkaart.nl/>

Nationally developed risk assessment tools in use in the EU Member States					
Emergency barring order (with use of a checklist) ⁽¹⁹¹⁾	Reassault	Police officers	Structured approach Offender and victim focused Items (unknown)	Protection measures — barring order	Victim Perpetrator
Poland					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
Risk assessment questionnaire and the algorithm of conduct in case of suspicion of domestic violence against an adult ⁽¹⁹²⁾	Reassault/reoffending in intimate partner violence cases Lethal violence Psychological harm	Healthcare professionals (doctors, psychologists, nurses, administrative workers)	Structured approach Offender and victim focused 17 items	Victim safety Victim protection measures Referral to multidisciplinary teams (blue-card procedure)	Victim

⁽¹⁹¹⁾ Haller, B., Pelikan, C. and Smutny, P. (2004). The Austrian protection against domestic violence act 1996, in: Council of Europe (ed.): Crime policy in Europe, Strasbourg, pp. 37-46.

Birgitt Haller (2005). Gewalt in der Familie: Evaluierungen des österreichischen Gewaltschutzgesetzes, in: Dearing, Albin/Haller, Birgitt (Eds.), Schutz vor Gewalt in der Familie. Das österreichische Gewaltschutzgesetz, Wien, pp. 269-388 (only in German).

⁽¹⁹²⁾ Risk assessment questionnaire and the algorithm of conduct in case of suspicion of domestic violence against an adult [kwestionariusz oceny ryzyka oraz algorytm postępowania w przypadku podejrzenia przemocy w rodzinie wobec dorosłego], the National Help Assistance for Victims of Domestic Violence 'Blue Line'. Available at: http://www.niebieskalinia.pl/attachments/article/5482/ochrona_zdrowia_dzieci.pdf

Nationally developed risk assessment tools in use in the EU Member States					
Portugal					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
RVD — 1L and RVD — 2L risk assessment report on domestic violence situations ⁽¹⁹³⁾	Reassault/reoffending in intimate partner violence Lethal violence Psychological violence Impacts (e.g. social, economic, health) Special needs of victims	Republican National Guard and Public Security Police Public Prosecution Service	Structured approach Offender and victim focused 20 items	Offender management Victim safety and protection Criminal justice measures Medical, psychological and social referral Referral of children to protective services Reinforce the information provided to victims	Victim Perpetrator
Slovakia					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
Danger risk assessment questionnaire in cases of reporting suspicion of domestic violence ⁽¹⁹⁴⁾	Reassault/reoffending in intimate partner violence	Police officers	Structured approach Victim focused 12 items	Victim safety Victim protection measures	Victim

⁽¹⁹³⁾ Ficha RVD – 1L Avaliação de risco para situações de violência doméstica [RVD – 1L Risk assessment report on domestic violence situations]. Available at: http://www.ministeriopublico.pt/sites/default/files/documentos/pdf/ficha_rvd_1l.pdf

Ficha RVD – 2L Avaliação de risco para situações de violência doméstica [RVD – 2L Risk assessment report on domestic violence situations]. Available at: http://www.ministeriopublico.pt/sites/default/files/documentos/pdf/ficha_rvd_2l.pdf

⁽¹⁹⁴⁾ Police Presidium, Ministry of Interior Slovak republic, Order of the Police President no. PPZ – KP – OVYS – 153-008/2017 from 19.12.2016 to use danger risk assessment questionnaire in cases of reporting suspicion of domestic violence.

Nationally developed risk assessment tools in use in the EU Member States					
Finland					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
MARAK — questionnaire and protocol for multiagency conferences of MARAK teams to improve the safety of the victim ⁽¹⁹⁵⁾	Severe/lethal violence, risk of reassault	Police, social care and healthcare professionals	Structured approach: standardised questionnaire to assess the risk and if risk is elevated, referral to the local multi agency MARAK team, which assesses the victim's case to improve his/her safety	Improving victim safety	Victim
Sweden					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
Checklist for the assessment of risk for patriarchal violence with honour as motive — Patriarch ⁽¹⁹⁶⁾	Actual, attempted or threatened physical harm, including forced marriages Severe/lethal violence	Police officers Social services Victim support centres	Structured approach Victim focused 15 items	Safety planning	Victim
Stalking assessment and management checklist (SAM) ⁽¹⁹⁷⁾	Recidivism Severe/lethal violence	Police officers	Structured approach Offender and victim focused 30 items	Risk management	Victim Perpetrator Case files

⁽¹⁹⁵⁾ Original MARAC model (from United Kingdom). Available at: <http://www.safelives.org.uk/practicwe-support/resources-marac-meetings>
The National Institute for Health and Welfare. Available at: www.thi.fi/marak

⁽¹⁹⁶⁾ <http://www.rpkundsval.se/wp-content/uploads/2009/05/Patriarch-4.pdf>

⁽¹⁹⁷⁾ <http://www.evidensbaseradkrim.se/manualer/SAMkodschema.pdf>

Nationally developed risk assessment tools in use in the EU Member States					
FREDA — Swedish National Board of Health and Welfare (198)	Reassault Severe/lethal violence	Social services Healthcare providers Women's shelters/ victim support centres	Victim focused (sometimes also used for children/non-heterosexual relations/honour-related violence, even if it is not specifically developed for these groups) 20 items	Victim safety Victim protection measures Criminal justice measures	Victim
United Kingdom					
Instrument	Risk assessed	Intended user	Characteristics	Goal	Source of information
Domestic abuse, stalking and harassment, and honour-based violence (DASH) (199) ACPO DASH for police Safelives-DASH for non-police partner agencies	Serious harm (life-threatening and/or traumatic, and from which recovery, whether physical or psychological, can be expected to be difficult or impossible)	Police officers Front-line practitioners working with victims of domestic abuse	Structured approach Victim focused 27 items 11 additional items on stalking and harassment 10 additional items on honour-based violence	Risk management and referral to MARAC for multiagency response for high risk cases	Victim
Priority Perpetrator Identification Tool (PPIT) (200)	Reassault Severe/lethal violence Serial perpetration	Police officers	Structured approach Offender focused 10 items	Offender and perpetrator management Referral	Perpetrator Case files
Merseyside risk identification tool (201)	Reassault Severe/lethal violence	Merseyside police and local health workers	Structured Victim focused	Victim safety planning Referral to MARAC for multi-agency response for high risk cases	Victim

(198) <https://www.socialstyrelsen.se/globalassets/sharepoint-dokument/artikelkatalog/ovrigt/2014-6-15.pdf>(199) <https://www.dashriskchecklist.co.uk/>(200) Robinson, A. L. and Clancy, A. (2015), *Development of the Priority Perpetrator Identification Tool* (PPIT) for domestic abuse, Cardiff: Cardiff University. Available at: <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/75006/1/Robinson%20%26%20Clancy%20%282015%20Development%20of%20the%20Priority%20Perpetrator%20Identification%20Tool%29%20for%20Domestic%20Abuse.pdf>(201) Merseyside Police's approach to tackling domestic abuse, HMIC, 2014. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/merseyside-approach-to-tackling-domestic-abuse.pdf>

Table 3. Children's experiences of intimate partner violence against women: victim status

Children's experiences of domestic violence in the legal and policy framework on intimate partner violence	No	Member States
Status as victim dependent on witness role in intimate partner violence cases	20	Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechia, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Greece, Croatia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Austria, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Finland, Sweden, United Kingdom (England, Wales, Northern Ireland)
Victims of domestic violence in intimate partner violence cases based on relationship to primary victim (parent, usually mother)	8	Ireland, Spain, France, Latvia, Netherlands, Finland, Sweden, United Kingdom (Scotland)
Other (aggravating circumstance)	2	Italy, Portugal
Child position in intimate partner violence situation not defined	2	Luxembourg, Slovakia

GETTING IN TOUCH WITH THE EU

IN PERSON

All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct information centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you at: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

ON THE PHONE OR BY EMAIL

Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union.

You can contact this service:

- by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls),
- at the following standard number: +32 22999696 or
- by email via: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

FINDING INFORMATION ABOUT THE EU

ONLINE

Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website at: https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en

EU PUBLICATIONS

You can download or order free and priced EU publications at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publications>. Multiple copies of free publications may be obtained by contacting Europe Direct or your local information centre (see https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en).

EU LAW AND RELATED DOCUMENTS

For access to legal information from the EU, including all EU law since 1952 in all the official language versions, go to EUR-Lex at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu>

OPEN DATA FROM THE EU

The EU Open Data Portal (<http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en>) provides access to datasets from the EU. Data can be downloaded and reused for free, both for commercial and non-commercial purposes.



<http://eige.europa.eu>



Publications Office
of the European Union

