

Policy Recommendations

Strengthening Multi-Agency Responses to Domestic Violence in Europe

Co-funded by the European Union

TACTICS

TACTICS – Improving the response and follow-up of victims and perpetrators of gender-based violence by police authorities

101096908 – TACTICS - CERV-2022-DAPHNE

Deliverable 5.2 “Policy Recommendations”

Responsible Partner: University of Tartu

Contributors: Babeş-Bolyai University, Comisión para la investigación de malos tratos a mujeres, Gesine Intervention, Mouvement pour l’Egalité entre les Femmes et les Hommes, Psytel, Union of Women Associations of Heraklion, Women’s Support and Information Center, WWP EN – European Network for the Work with Perpetrators

March 2026

The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the TACTICS project and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Co-funded by the European Union

TACTICS

Policy Recommendations

Strengthening Multi-Agency Responses to Domestic Violence in Europe

Contents

Introduction 4

Policy Context and Institutional Framework 5

Key Challenges Identified 8

Policy Recommendations 9

Conclusion 22

Resources for Further Reading 23

Introduction

Domestic violence (DV) and gender-based violence (GBV) remain persistent and multi-faceted challenges across Europe. Even where robust legal frameworks exist, institutional responses can be fragmented, producing inconsistent risk assessment, delayed intervention, and gaps in victim protection and perpetrator accountability.

The **TACTICS** project ("Improving the response and follow-up of victims and perpetrators of gender-based violence by police authorities") addressed these issues through comparative ecosystem mapping, national roadmaps, and multi-agency consultations in seven partner countries (Belgium, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Romania, and Spain). This deliverable synthesizes TACTICS findings into **concise, actionable policy recommendations for national and EU-level decision makers, police leadership, and service providers.**

Policy Context and Institutional Framework

Across Europe, responses to DV are shaped by a combination of **national legislation, institutional mandates, and international standards**, particularly the **Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention)**, which obliges states to implement coordinated risk assessment, victim protection measures, and multi-agency cooperation mechanisms. **EU Directive 2024/1385** further strengthens this framework by establishing minimum standards on the prevention of violence against women and DV, including measures on victim protection, access to support services, and criminalisation of certain forms of violence.

While all countries participating in the TACTICS project have established legal frameworks to address DV, the institutional structures and **operational mechanisms vary significantly**. The following examples from the country partners (in alphabetical order) illustrate key policy and institutional structures across several participating countries:[1]

➔ **Belgium** has adopted a **multi-partner national approach** to combating DV, integrating prevention measures, victim protection services, and legal prosecution of perpetrators. A **front-line risk assessment tool** is used by police and public prosecutors when complaints are registered. Complaints are classified specifically under DV categories, ensuring institutional recognition and case prioritization.

➔ **Estonia** operates a **coordinated case management model** for high-risk domestic violence cases through the MARAC (Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference) approach, in which representatives from police, social services, victim support organizations, and prosecutors collaborate on safety planning and case monitoring. The Estonian framework allows information sharing among institutions when a victim faces serious danger, ensuring coordinated intervention.

In addition, Estonia has adopted a national strategic framework through the ***Lähisuhtevägivalla ennetamise tegevuskava 2024–2027*** (Domestic Violence Prevention Action Plan), jointly implemented by the Ministries of Justice, the Interior, Social Affairs, and Education and Research. The action plan sets **cross-sectoral objectives to strengthen prevention, improve responses to DV cases**, and **develop services for both victims and perpetrators**. It emphasises awareness-raising, victim-centred and trauma-informed approaches, and the development of sustainable, needs-based services, while promoting coordinated action across sectors and institutions.

➔ In **France**, the response to DV involves multiple institutional actors, including the **National Police**, the **Municipal Police**, and **social workers embedded in police stations** who facilitate referrals to victim support services. This institutional structure allows for **community-level intervention combined with national law enforcement capacity**, but it also

1 For a more thorough overview, please look at TACTICS Deliverable 4.2 Updated Regional Roadmaps for each of the partner countries.

creates coordination challenges due to differences in mandates, training, and resources across police forces.

➔ **Germany**'s DV response is strongly influenced by both **national legislation and international legal commitments**, including the Istanbul Convention. Key institutional elements include the **Protection Against Violence Act (*Gewaltschutzgesetz*)**, which enables civil protection orders such as restraining orders against perpetrators; police powers allowing the temporary removal of perpetrators from shared residences; and proactive victim support mechanisms that enable police to transfer victims' contact details to specialized counselling centres, which then initiate support.

➔ Recent legislative reforms in **Greece** have strengthened the legal framework for addressing DV. **Law 5090/2024** introduced new criminal-law provisions, expanded definitions of victims, and reinforced procedural protections for reporting professionals. Moreover, the development of the National Risk Assessment Tool remains in "evaluation", and the entire Risk Assessment process is subject to joint ministerial decisions, a process that is time-consuming and adds significant bureaucratic barriers for future modifications/improvements. Moreover, the Risk Assessment process and the guidance for multidisciplinary work exclude the engagement of non-Public sector entities. The Police is following internal guidelines and a set of mandates, not publicly known, in accordance with the Legislation towards survivors.

➔ **Romania**'s DV response is grounded in **Law No. 217/2003**, which establishes a comprehensive definition of DV and clarifies the responsibilities of public institutions involved in prevention and combating DV. The law provides a comprehensive definition of abuse and establishes coordinated responsibilities across public institutions, including law enforcement, social services, healthcare providers, and the judicial system. Over time, the law has undergone **significant amendments to strengthen victim protection and align with European standards**, including the introduction of protection orders (2012) and **provisional protection orders issued directly by police in situations of imminent risk (2018)**. Further amendments were introduced in **Law No. 1/2025** to strengthen intervention mechanisms, further expanding and refining the response.

➔ **Spain** has a highly institutionalised response system, notably the **VioGén system**, which integrates police, judicial, penitentiary, and social services to monitor gender-based violence cases. This approach is supported by Organic Law 1/2004 on comprehensive protection measures. There is also a broad political consensus through the **State Pact against Gender-Based Violence**, approved in 2017 and updated in 2025 to recognise economic, digital and vicarious violence and to strengthen specialised police units, especially in rural areas.

Despite differences in institutional arrangements, the country examples illustrate several common policy trends and challenges across Europe.

Common Policy Trends

Across the analysed countries, several common institutional characteristics emerge:

1. **Legal frameworks aligned with international standards** (especially the Istanbul Convention).

2. **Police-led intervention systems** often serve as the first point of contact for victims.

3. **Growing recognition of the importance of multi-agency collaboration** involving social services, healthcare providers, and victim support organisations.

4. **Emerging technological and digital tools** to improve risk assessment and coordination.

However, differences remain in the **degree of institutional integration, data sharing mechanisms, and the formalization of coordination structures**, which directly affect the effectiveness of domestic violence response systems.

Key Challenges Identified

The analysis conducted within the TACTICS project across the participating countries highlights several recurring challenges that limit the effectiveness of DV response systems. One of the most significant issues is the fragmentation of institutional coordination between police authorities, social services, healthcare providers, and victim support organizations. Although multiple actors are involved in responding to DV cases, cooperation often remains informal or inconsistent, leading to gaps in information sharing and delayed interventions. In addition, risk assessment procedures are not always standardized or consistently applied across institutions, leading to inconsistent identification of high-risk situations and inadequate protective measures for victims.

Another critical challenge is the limited availability of integrated information systems that enable secure, efficient data exchange among institutions responsible for managing DV cases. In many contexts, data sharing depends on personal professional relationships rather than formalized protocols, reducing transparency and coordination. The analysis also revealed gaps in specialized training for frontline professionals, particularly police officers and local service providers, who may lack adequate preparation to address the complex dynamics of DV and to apply trauma-informed approaches in their interventions.

Finally, structural limitations related to insufficient resources, including funding, personnel, and institutional capacity, continue to affect the availability and accessibility of victim support services, such as shelters, counselling centres, and perpetrator intervention programmes. Together, these challenges demonstrate the need for stronger institutional coordination, standardized procedures, improved data systems, and sustained investment in professional training and victim support infrastructure. These challenges directly inform the policy recommendations presented in the following section.

Policy Recommendations

The following recommendations are informed by the comparative analysis conducted within the TACTICS project across seven European countries. Each recommendation includes the responsible authorities, suggested minimum actions, indicators for monitoring progress, and potential risks and mitigation measures.

Recommendation 1: Institutionalize Multi-Agency Coordination Mechanisms

Governments should establish formal and sustainable multi-agency coordination mechanisms that bring together police authorities, social services, healthcare providers, judicial actors, victim support organisations, specialised NGOs, and third-sector organisations, as well as perpetrator programmes involved in responding to DV. Although multiple institutions are typically engaged in handling DV cases, cooperation often remains informal or dependent on individual professional relationships. Institutionalizing coordination mechanisms would help ensure consistent collaboration and reduce fragmentation in case management.

These mechanisms should include **regular coordination meetings, clearly defined institutional roles and responsibilities, shared operational protocols, operational data management systems, and structured communication channels between institutions.** Some practices identified in the TACTICS partner countries demonstrate the benefits of closer institutional cooperation. For example, in France, **social workers are embedded within police stations**, enabling immediate referrals and stronger collaboration between police and victim support services. In Estonia, **victim support services are often located in the same buildings as police units**, facilitating communication and joint case handling, although their limited working hours (Monday–Friday, 9:00–17:00) may restrict access to support outside standard office hours.

In addition to structured network cooperation, **practical operational collaboration between institutions and between institutions and the third sector is equally important**. For instance, following a DV police intervention, follow-up activities should ideally be carried out in cooperation with other local professionals, such as social workers or child protection specialists. Joint follow-up visits or coordinated case monitoring can help ensure that the needs of victims and their children are assessed more comprehensively and that appropriate support measures are implemented at an early stage.

At the same time, institutionalisation should not weaken a victim-centred approach. There is a risk that formal procedures and legal requirements may overshadow victims' individual needs and perspectives. To mitigate this, coordination mechanisms should include robust accountability frameworks and ensure the active involvement of independent, specialised women's support services (WSS) and third-sector organisations, which play a key role in safeguarding victim-centred practice and advocacy.

Multi-agency coordination should therefore not be limited to high-risk cases but applied across the DV response system to support early intervention and prevent escalation. Embedding co-operation within institutional structures can strengthen system coherence and improve victim protection.

Responsible authorities:

- Ministries of Interior/Social Affairs/Health/Justice
- Police
- Local Authorities

Minimum actions:

- Enact/mandate **local DV coordination boards** (police, prosecutors, social & health services, child protection, NGOs/third sector) with terms of reference (roles, membership, decision rules), data-sharing protocols, and budget lines.
- Require **joint follow-up** after police interventions (e.g., home visits with social workers/ child protection specialists and, where appropriate, NGO service providers).
- Extend the **Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC)** model beyond high-risk cases to support early intervention, ensuring participation of public authorities, victim service providers, specialised NGOs, and perpetrator programme providers.
- Establish **accountability mechanisms** that include independent specialised support services to ensure a victim-centred approach is maintained.
- Establish or designate **local coordination hubs** or **focal points** to support multidisciplinary case management at the regional or local level, including models such as Family Justice Centres.

Indicators:

- % of jurisdictions with functioning boards
- % cases with coordinated safety plans within 10 days
- re-victimisation rate at 6/12 months

Risks & mitigation:

- ***Role confusion*** → publish a clear standard of procedures (SOP) and accountability matrix.
- ***Meeting fatigue*** → embed KPI-linked agendas and dashboards.
- ***Loss of victim-centred focus*** → ensure formal inclusion of independent specialised WSS and third sector actors in coordination and oversight mechanisms.

Recommendation 2: Standardize Risk-Assessment Procedures

Authorities should implement **standardized risk-assessment procedures** applied consistently across all institutions involved in responding to domestic violence cases, including relevant NGOs and third-sector organisations. Effective risk assessment is essential for identifying potential escalation, preventing repeat violence, and ensuring that appropriate protective measures are implemented in a timely manner. However, in many contexts, different institutions use different assessment tools or apply them inconsistently, leading to gaps in case evaluation and coordination.

To address this challenge, national frameworks should promote the use of **shared risk-assessment tools** and guidelines across police authorities, social services, healthcare providers, and third sector organisations involved in victim support and perpetrator interventions. The selection and development of these tools should involve specialised NGOs and civil society organisations (CSOs), ensuring that risk indicators reflect **frontline experience and victim perspectives**. Standardized procedures would enable professionals across sectors to operate with a shared understanding of risk factors and intervention thresholds, facilitating coordinated decision-making and case management.

In addition to adopting common tools, professionals across public institutions and the third sector should receive adequate training on their use to ensure accurate and consistent application. Harmonizing risk-assessment practices across institutions can significantly improve the identification of high-risk situations, support earlier intervention, and strengthen the overall effectiveness of domestic violence response systems.

Responsible authorities:

- National coordination bodies
- Police; Health/Social Services
- NGOs/third sector organisations

Minimum actions:

- Adopt a **national risk framework** aligned with EIGE guidance (structured professional judgement + management plan), **developed and tested in consultation with CSOs and specialised NGOs**.
- Define **inter agency thresholds** (triage categories, mandatory actions, timelines).
- Implement **joint training** and **clear protocols** for all actors involved, including NGOs and victim support services.
- Implement **quality assurance measures**, including calibration exercises, **inter-rater reliability checks**, supervisory review, and case audits.

Indicators:

- % frontline trained/certified
- time from report to risk triage
- % plans including child-specific measures
- repeat violence rates

Risks & mitigation:

- ***Overreliance on tools*** → Allow practitioner override only to increase the risk level indicated by the tool, with a documented rationale.
- ***Bias*** → Periodic validation and fairness audits of tools and outcomes.

Recommendation 3: Develop Integrated and Secure Information Systems

Countries should develop secure digital platforms that enable systematic information (and sensitive personal data) sharing between institutions involved in DV response, including police authorities, social services, healthcare providers, judicial actors, penitentiary services, victim support organizations, perpetrator programmes, and relevant NGOs and third sector organisations, such as women support services and organisations supporting children's wellbeing. These platforms should support coordinated case management by integrating risk assessment results, referral information, protective measures, and follow-up actions. Where such digital systems are not yet in place, binding multi-agency agreements at the local or regional level should be established to enable structured and lawful information sharing under clear and secure frameworks.

While safeguarding personal data remains essential, policies should ensure that **information sharing is permitted in all DV cases, not only in high-risk cases**. Expanding data-sharing mechanisms to lower- and medium-risk cases can help prevent escalation and ensure earlier intervention. Accordingly, legal and institutional frameworks should balance data protection requirements with the need to protect victims' safety, recognizing that **human safety must take precedence when managing DV cases**. Clear protocols, secure digital systems, and professional training on responsible data use should therefore be established to enable timely and effective information exchange across institutions.

Responsible authorities:

- Ministries of Interior/Justice/Digital
- Judicial Authorities/Data Protection Authorities (DPAs)
- NGOs/third sector organisations (as participating entities)

Minimum actions:

- Build/upgrade national **case management platforms** (interoperable across police, justice, social/health, NGOs, and other relevant third sector organisations, including perpetrator programmes) with role-based access, audit trails, and **event-driven alerts** (e.g., breach of order).

- Clarify **lawful bases** for data sharing (e.g., **GDPR** Art. 6(1)(e) public task; **Art. 6(1)(d) vital interests**, and **Art. 9(2)(c)/(g)** for special category data) and codify **proportionate, purpose-limited sharing** in SOPs.

- Provide **practitioner guidance** for DV contexts (consent vs. alternative bases; necessity & proportionality; documentation) across all participating institutions and organisations.

Indicators:

- % high-risk cases visible to all relevant agencies within 24h
- % alerts acted on within Service Level Agreement (SLA)
- DPA-compliant DPIAs completed

Risks & mitigation:

- ***Privacy concerns*** → Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA), data minimisation, independent oversight.

- ***Cybersecurity*** → Encryption, incident response testing, and regular audits.

Recommendation 4: Strengthen Professional Training

Mandatory and continuous training should be provided to all professionals involved in DV response, including police officers, social workers, healthcare professionals, prosecutors, penitentiary services, judicial authorities, and third sector organisations. However, beyond sector-specific capacity building, there is a strong need to develop **cross-sectoral training programmes** that bring together professionals from different institutions, including NGOs and specialised service providers. DV cases typically involve multiple actors working across institutional boundaries, and effective coordination requires a shared understanding of procedures, roles, and responsibilities.

Cross-sectoral training can help professionals develop common operational frameworks, improve communication between institutions, and build trust among stakeholders. Training programmes should therefore address topics such as DV dynamics, trauma-informed approaches, risk assessment, referral procedures, and multi-agency collaboration practices. Joint training initiatives, including participation of third sector organisations, can significantly strengthen

coordinated responses to DV by ensuring that professionals across sectors operate within a shared knowledge base and coordinated intervention model. European knowledge platforms such as DVKnowledge (dvknowledge.eu) can support this process by providing accessible training materials and practical resources for professionals working across sectors.

Responsible authorities:

- National training academies
- Universities
- NGOs/third sector organisations

Minimum actions:

- Make **cross-sector training mandatory** (DV dynamics, trauma-informed practice, risk tools, child safeguarding, data sharing), including participation of third sector actors and including training on victim-centred communication and trauma-sensitive approaches in frontline interactions.
- Use **scenario-based joint exercises**; leverage EU knowledge platforms and open materials.
- Develop training materials that include **interactive tools and real-life case scenarios**, and ensure localisation of training content to reflect regional contexts, cultural factors, and specific barriers faced by victims.

Indicators:

- % staff trained; training quality scores
- observed practice improvements via audits

Risks & mitigation:

- ***High turnover*** → Combine e-learning, micro-credentials, and face-to-face joint exercises.
- ***Variation in quality*** → National curriculum and accreditation standards.

Recommendation 5: Establish Specialized Domestic Violence Police Units

Governments should promote the establishment and strengthening of **specialized police units dedicated to domestic violence and gender-based violence cases**. Domestic violence investigations require specific expertise, including understanding the dynamics of abuse, identifying patterns of coercive control, assessing risk factors, and interacting with victims in a trauma-informed manner. Specialized units can significantly improve the quality and consistency of police responses by ensuring that cases are handled by trained investigators with relevant experience.

These units should include officers who receive **advanced training on domestic violence dynamics, victim protection, risk assessment, and multi-agency cooperation**. Specialized investigators are better equipped to conduct sensitive victim interviews, gather evidence effectively, and coordinate with social services, healthcare providers, and judicial authorities. This can help improve case outcomes, increase victim trust in law enforcement, and enhance the overall effectiveness of domestic violence investigations.

In addition, specialized domestic violence investigators should work closely with other professionals involved in domestic violence response, including victim support services, perpetrator programmes, and social workers. Strengthening such cooperation can facilitate coordinated interventions, ensure timely referrals to support services, and improve follow-up procedures after police interventions. By investing in specialized investigative capacity within police institutions, policymakers can strengthen accountability for perpetrators while providing more effective protection for victims.

Responsible authorities:

- Police leadership
- Ministries of Interior

Minimum actions:

- Create/expand **dedicated DV units** with advanced training (coercive control, evidence-led cases, victim interviewing, children's needs) and **embedded social workers** where feasible.
- Require **co-location** with victim support where possible; define Memorandums of Understanding for joint investigations and referrals.

Indicators:

- victim satisfaction
- charge rates
- time to protective measures
- repeat call outs

Risks & mitigation:

- ***Resource stretch*** → Phased rollout prioritising high-incidence areas.
- ***Silo risk*** → Joint KPIs and shared supervision sessions.

Recommendation 6: Increase Resources for Victim Support Services

Governments should ensure **sustainable and adequate funding for victim support services** that play a critical role in the prevention and response to DV. These services, including shelters, crisis centres, counselling services, legal assistance, and helplines, provide essential protection, guidance, and recovery support for victims and their children. However, in many contexts, such services operate with limited resources, unstable funding, or insufficient staff capacity, which can restrict their availability and effectiveness.

Strengthening DV response systems, therefore, requires **long-term investment in victim support infrastructure**, ensuring that services are accessible, geographically available, and able to respond to victims' needs in a timely manner. In addition to increasing financial resources, policymakers should also support the expansion of specialized services, **improve accessibility for vulnerable groups**, and strengthen cooperation between victim support providers and other institutions involved in DV response. Resources should include specialised women's support services, specialised civil society organisations (CSOs), and entities with proven expertise within the NGO ecosystem, recognising their key role in providing frontline support and ensuring victim-centred approaches.

Ensuring stable funding and sufficient capacity for victim support services is essential not only for protecting victims but also for enabling coordinated multi-agency responses and supporting long-term recovery and safety.

Responsible authorities:

- Finance
- Social Affairs
- Judicial System
- regional authorities

Minimum actions:

- Multiyear funding for **shelters, 24/7 helplines**, legal aid, psychosocial support, and **child-centred services**; align with Istanbul Convention standards on availability and accessibility, including for vulnerable groups such as refugees and victims with disabilities.
- Contract **outcomes-based service models** (with safe, nonpunitive metrics).

- Promote the **adoption of innovative tools** to enhance victim protection in high-risk cases (e.g. emergency alert or panic button applications), ensuring they are integrated into broader response systems.

Indicators:

- shelter capacity vs. demand
- time to access counselling
- child services coverage
- victim-reported safety

Risks & mitigation:

- ***Budget volatility*** → Diversify funding streams (state + EU + local) and plan multi-year budgets.
- ***Service fragmentation*** → Maintain national service directory and standard referral APIs.

Recommendation 7: Strengthen Perpetrator Accountability Through Specialised Intervention Programmes

DV response systems should not only focus on victim protection but also ensure structured and effective engagement with perpetrators. While many countries have developed coordinated support services and protection mechanisms for victims, comparable institutionalized approaches for perpetrators remain less systematically implemented. Strengthening perpetrator accountability requires the development of clear **referral pathways from police authorities, courts, and social services to specialized perpetrator intervention programmes**, such as behavioural change programmes or counselling services.

These programmes should be integrated into national DV response frameworks and applied consistently following police interventions or judicial decisions. Perpetrator programmes should also recognise their preventive potential, including in avoiding escalation in high-risk situations, and provide voluntary access pathways for individuals who acknowledge problems with violent behaviour and seek support. Participation in perpetrator programmes may also be considered as a mandatory measure in family law contexts, particularly for perpetrators with children, including in cases where children are directly or indirectly affected by DV, and where custody or visitation rights are maintained.

To ensure their effectiveness and accessibility, governments should also allocate **sustainable, long-term funding for evidence-based perpetrator programmes, enabling specialized organizations (including NGOs and third-sector providers) to operate efficiently and collaborate** with other institutions involved in DV prevention. Addressing structural gaps in

availability and funding, including limited programme capacity and lack of financial coverage by social welfare offices or family courts, is essential. Establishing structured intervention mechanisms for perpetrators alongside victim support services helps reduce recidivism, increase accountability, and strengthen long-term prevention efforts.

Responsible authorities:

- Justice
- Probation
- Police
- NGO
- Penitentiary Services

Minimum actions:

- Establish **mandatory referral pathways** from police/courts to **evidence-informed behaviour change programmes**; ensure victim safety protocols and partner contact support.
- Introduce **quality standards and accreditation**; monitor outcomes (completion, re offending, victim safety).
- Consider **mandatory participation** in perpetrator programmes in **family law cases** involving children and ongoing custody or visitation rights.
- Ensure adequate funding mechanisms, including coverage of participation fees by relevant authorities.

Indicators:

- referrals
- completion rates
- recidivism
- victim safety outcomes

Risks & mitigation:

- ***Net-widening*** → Clear eligibility/prioritisation criteria.
- ***Uneven quality*** → National quality assurance, accreditation, and periodic audits.

Recommendation 8:
Ensure Protection and Access to Services for Migrant and Refugee Women

DV policies should ensure that **migrant and refugee women have equal and safe access to protection and support services**, regardless of their migration or residency status. Migrant women often face additional barriers when seeking help, including language barriers, limited knowledge of their rights, fear of authorities, and **dependency on a partner for residence permits or visa status, as well as actual legal and administrative restrictions**. These may include residence obligations tied to a specific region, which can limit access to available shelters elsewhere, or restrictions in social welfare systems that may prevent coverage of shelter or support service costs. These factors may discourage victims from reporting violence or accessing support services, increasing their vulnerability to continued abuse.

Governments should therefore adopt policies that **guarantee access to victim support services, shelters, legal assistance, and social services independently of the victim's migration status**, ensuring that seeking help does not lead to negative immigration consequences. Clear safeguards should be established to protect victims whose residency status may depend on an abusive partner, including access to independent residence permits where appropriate. These measures are consistent with **Article 59 of the Istanbul Convention**, which encourages states to provide independent residence permits to victims whose residence status depends on an abusive partner. In addition, consideration should be given to ensuring that victims retain legal and administrative protection during and after proceedings, including in cases where complaints are not upheld, so that individuals are not left in a heightened state of vulnerability.

In addition, professionals working in DV response, including police officers, social workers, healthcare professionals, victim support specialists, and perpetrator programmes, should receive **specialized training on the needs of vulnerable groups,** particularly migrant and refugee women and the specific needs of migrant perpetrators. Such training should include awareness of migration and asylum legislation, residence permit regulations, and culturally sensitive approaches to victim support. Strengthening professionals' understanding of these issues can improve the identification of vulnerable victims, ensure appropriate referrals, and help build trust between migrant communities and public institutions. Collaboration with specialised NGOs and third sector organisations is essential in this context, as they often provide frontline support, cultural mediation, and trusted access points for migrant communities.

By addressing legal, institutional, and knowledge-related barriers, policymakers can ensure that domestic violence response systems are **inclusive, accessible, and capable of protecting all victims**, including those in particularly vulnerable situations.

Responsible authorities:

- Interior
- Migration/Asylum
- Social Affairs
- DPAs

Minimum actions:

- **Firewalled access** to victim services **irrespective of migration status**; clear protocols against data sharing for immigration enforcement in DV contexts.
- Provide **interpreting**, culturally sensitive support, and legal information on residence rights.
- **Remove administrative and territorial barriers** that restrict access to shelters and services (e.g., residence obligations, welfare-related limitations).

Indicators:

- service uptake by migrant women
- time to protection
- satisfaction
- complaint rates about data misuse

Risks & mitigation:

- ***Fear of authorities*** → Community outreach and trusted intermediaries.
- ***Confidentiality concerns*** → Clear policies and transparent communications.
- ***Legal conflicts between migration enforcement and victim protection*** → Clarify legal frameworks and provide guidance to ensure that victim protection takes precedence in DV cases, supported by comparative analysis and exchange of practices across countries.

Recommendation 9: Promote Data Collection and Monitoring

Governments should strengthen **systematic data collection and monitoring mechanisms** related to DV in order to support evidence-based policymaking and improve institutional responses. Reliable and comparable data on DV incidents, risk assessments, interventions, referrals, and case outcomes are essential for understanding the scope of the problem and identifying gaps in existing response systems.

Authorities should therefore develop **standardized indicators and data collection practices across institutions**, including police authorities, judicial actors, social services, healthcare providers, and victim support organizations. Improved data systems can enable better tracking of DV cases, enhance coordination between institutions, and support the evaluation of policies and interventions.

At the same time, monitoring frameworks should also assess the effectiveness of prevention measures, victim support services, and perpetrator intervention programmes. Strengthening data collection and analysis can help policymakers identify emerging trends, allocate resources more effectively, and continuously improve DV prevention and response strategies. Improved data systems are also essential for supporting monitoring mechanisms such as GREVIO evaluations under the Istanbul Convention.

Responsible authorities:

- National statistical bodies
- coordinating ministries; EIGE liaison

Minimum actions:

- Define **standard indicators** across police/justice/social/health/NGOs; align with EIGE and GREVIO expectations.
- Publish **annual dashboards** (incidents, risk tiers, measures, outcomes) with safeguards for anonymity.

Indicators:

- completeness
- timeliness
- comparability of datasets
- publication compliance

Risks & mitigation:

- ***Data quality issues*** → Capacity building and clear metadata definitions.
- ***Comparability*** → Common definitions and data governance.

Conclusion

Domestic violence is a complex and persistent societal problem that requires coordinated institutional responses. The TACTICS project, developed in collaboration with universities, relevant NGOs, and third-sector organisations, demonstrates that although significant progress has been made across Europe, important gaps remain in multi-agency collaboration, risk assessment, data sharing, and professional training.

By implementing the policy recommendations outlined in this report, policymakers can strengthen domestic violence response systems, improve victim protection, and enhance accountability for perpetrators. The comparative analysis conducted within the TACTICS project provides practical examples and tested approaches that can support policymakers in strengthening coordinated responses to DV.

Ultimately, effective DV prevention and response require a **holistic, victim-centred, and coordinated approach**, supported by strong institutional partnerships and sustained political commitment.

Resources for Further Reading

The following sources informed the policy analysis and recommendations presented in this report, including international legal frameworks, European policy instruments, national legislation, and project outputs developed within the TACTICS project.

International and European Frameworks

Council of Europe. **Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention).** Adopted 11 May 2011. https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention

European Commission. **Directive 2012/29/EU establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime (Victims' Rights Directive).** https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32012L0029

European Parliament. **The Istanbul Convention: A tool to tackle violence against women and girls.** https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document/EPRS_ATA(2023)739312

European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). **Guide to risk assessment and risk management of intimate partner violence against women for police.** https://eige.europa.eu/publications-resources/publications/guide-risk-assessment-and-risk-management-intimate-partner-violence-against-women-police

European Commission. **Victims' Rights in the EU – Overview.** https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/criminal-justice/victims-rights_en

European Network for Victims' Rights (ENVr). **Revision of the Victims' Rights Directive – Policy Updates.** https://envr.eu

Council of Europe. **GREVIO – Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence.** https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention/grevio

National Policies, Systems, and Legal Frameworks

Estonia – Social Insurance Board. **MARAC (Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference) model in Estonia.** https://sotsiaalkindlustusamet.ee/MARAC

Greece – Hellenic Police. **Domestic Violence Operational Guidelines and Panic Button Application.** https://www.astynomia.gr

Spain – Ministry of the Interior. **Sistema VioGén (Integrated Monitoring System in Cases of Gender-Based Violence).** https://sistemaviogen.ses.mir.es/publico/viogen

Spain – Organic Law 1/2004 of 28 December on **Comprehensive Measures for Protection against Gender-Based Violence.** https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2004-21760

EU Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN). **Social workers in police stations in France.** https://eucpn.org/document/social-workers-in-police-stations-france

Council of Europe (GREVIO). **France: Baseline Evaluation Report on Legislative and Other Measures Giving Effect to the Istanbul Convention.** https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention/france

Germany – Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth. **Act on Protection Against Violence (Gewaltschutzgesetz).** https://www.bmfsfj.de

Germany – Federal Government. **Violence Assistance Act (Gewalthilfegesetz)** – adopted 2025.

Romania – **Law No. 217/2003 on Preventing and Combating Domestic Violence.** https://legislatie.just.ro

Romania – **Law No. 26/2024 regarding protection orders in cases of domestic violence.** https://legislatie.just.ro

TACTICS Project Outputs

TACTICS Project Consortium. 2024. **Regional Report on the existing Domestic Violence Response System between police and professionals. Belgium/Estonia/France/Germany/Greece/Romania/Spain.** Avalilable at: https://www.work-with-perpetrators.eu/tactics/regional-reports

TACTICS Project Consortium. 2024. **Regional Roadmaps to Improve Domestic Violence Response Systems.** Project Deliverable D4.1. Available at: https://www.work-with-perpetrators.eu/tactics/roadmaps

TACTICS Project Consortium. 2025. **Responding to Domestic Violence. Training Manual for Police and Frontline Workers.** Project Deliverable 3.1. Available at: https://www.work-with-perpetrators.eu/tactics/trainers-manual

TACTICS Project Consortium. 2026. **Updated Regional Roadmaps to Improve Domestic Violence Response Systems.** Project Deliverable D4.2.

TACTICS Project Consortium. 2026. **Replication Guidelines for Multi-Agency Coordination in Domestic Violence Response.** Project Deliverable D5.3.

TACTICS Project Consortium. 2025. **DVKnowledge Platform. Knowledge Hub on Domestic Violence Response and Prevention.** https://dvknowledge.eu

Additional Resources

European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN). **Domestic Violence Prevention Resources.** https://eucpn.org

European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). **Gender-Based Violence Data and Policy Resources.** https://eige.europa.eu

TACTICS

Co-funded by the European Union