

A mission to halve Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG): A VAWG sector briefing on metrics and their limitations

Introduction.....	2
Principles when Measuring VAWG:.....	3
• Feminist.....	3
• Intersectional.....	3
• Anti-Racist.....	3
• Accountability and Transparency.....	3
• Cross-Governmental.....	4
• Comprehensive and Trauma informed.....	4
Istanbul Convention Obligations on Data Collection and Processing.....	4
Current Approaches and Limitations to Measurement.....	5
ONS Data.....	5
Crime Survey for England and Wales.....	5
Criminal Justice Data.....	7
i) Police Reports.....	7
ii) Crown Prosecution Service.....	7
iii) Ministry of Justice.....	8
Domestic Homicides.....	8
Perpetrator Research.....	9
Victim Services.....	9
The Fundamental Rights Agency Survey.....	10
Ofcom Transparency Reports.....	10
Public Attitudes.....	11
Recommendations.....	12
Consultation.....	12
Disaggregation of victim and perpetrator data.....	12
Transformation of CJS data.....	12
Introducing a greater perpetrator focus to data collection and processing.....	13
Funding Support VAWG Services.....	13
Independent monitoring body.....	13
Regular Review/ Scrutiny.....	13

Introduction

This briefing is to start a conversation with policy makers and experts on the different considerations when measuring VAWG, and limitations to current metrics. We welcome the government's commitment to halve VAWG in a decade. We believe this is an ambitious mission which requires dedicated leadership and investment. We re-assert the [VAWG sector manifesto](#) call for a comprehensive, whole-society approach to tackling VAWG that looks beyond the criminal justice system and centres those who face the greatest barriers to support and protection.

VAWG includes but is not limited to: rape, sexual harassment, coercive control, stalking, so-called honour based abuse, online abuse, domestic homicide, femicide, domestic abuse, including economic abuse, child sexual exploitation and child sexual abuse.

Below are key principles and recommendations as we make the case for an approach that not only looks at reduction of VAWG incidents but also addresses harms. This is in recognition of the fact that the lives of women and girls are multi-faceted and likely to include myriad forms of men's violence across their lifetimes, with far reaching impacts and harms, not solely at an individual level but rippling out to families, networks and communities and reproducing the inequality of women and girls.

While data cannot tell the whole story it is essential to informing policy and funding decisions. High quality data can build understanding of the ways in which VAWG is perpetrated, the impact on survivors, and the services they need. Good data can support more effective interventions and approaches to prevention. However, collecting and producing good data requires resourcing. Frontline services operating under chronic shortfalls in funding and facing huge levels of demand for their life-saving and life-changing services have been unable to divert adequate capacity towards it. Any approach to improving VAWG metrics must recognise the vital information and evidence VAWG specialist services have and create funding for them to build their data systems that will help build evidence of demand, provision, unmet need and best practice.

This briefing has been endorsed by over 80 leading organisations and experts in the VAWG sector.

Principles when Measuring VAWG:

- Feminist

Recognising that VAWG is rooted in misogyny and underpinned by power imbalances based on gender and societal norms. VAWG, overwhelmingly perpetrated by men, is a cause and consequence of gender inequality. A feminist approach understands that each incident is not an isolated issue but connected to behaviours and attitudes that are deeply entrenched in our society. Attempts to measure VAWG must recognise that quantitative **and** qualitative knowledge are necessary to understand violence, together with practice based and experiential knowledge.

- Intersectional

Understanding that women and girls' experiences of violence are shaped by a myriad of characteristics, including but not limited to their sex, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, ability, gender identity, religion or belief and socioeconomic and immigration status. Available data on VAWG often fails to disaggregate protected characteristics and is therefore often an unreliable measure of the disproportionate harm faced by certain communities. An intersectional approach recognises how forms of violence may be compounded by an individual's location with systems of inequality.

- Anti-Racist

Focusing on how racism, racial inequalities and discrimination intersect with VAWG, ensuring that the experiences of women and girls from Black and minoritised communities are specifically recognised and addressed. Approaches to measuring VAWG must recognise the way in which Black and minoritised women have historically been absent in official statistics, despite 'by and for' organisations reporting the unique and disproportionate harm faced by women and girls from Black and minoritised communities. An anti-racist approach also acknowledges how systemic racism within institutions and public services, such as the police, impact the way that VAWG is reported, investigated and addressed.

- Accountability and Transparency

Consistently assessing the effectiveness of current interventions on VAWG, including the evaluation of laws, policies, public services and the specialist VAWG sector ability to reduce violence against women and girls. This means being open about the processes, decision making, and the learning related to measuring VAWG. It means acknowledging systemic weaknesses and gaps in approaches. It means having accountable and transparent processes for data collection, analysis and publication.

- **Cross-Governmental**

A cross-government response in which all government departments, statutory agencies and local commissioners are responsible and accountable for progress.

- **Comprehensive and Trauma informed**

An understanding that incidents themselves are not, and cannot, be the whole story - that harm and trauma vary from survivor to survivor, that the impacts of VAWG can be long-lasting and far reaching, not just for the victim /survivor(s) themselves but also their families and communities. It recognises the multiple and overlapping forms of VAWG and understands the limits of quantitative data in measuring and representing this.

Istanbul Convention Obligations on Data Collection and Processing

The Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (2011), hereinafter “the Istanbul Convention”, requires state parties to collect disaggregated relevant statistical data at regular intervals and support research in the field of all forms of violence covered by the scope of the convention, in order to study root causes and effects, incidences and conviction rates, as well as the efficacy of measures taken to implement the convention.¹

Further obligations to collect data and compile statistics are also set out in the UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, 1993 and in the The Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action 1995.

Current Approaches and Limitations to Measurement

ONS Data

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) has made a number of welcome improvements to the collection of VAWG data, including capturing more forms of VAWG, removing the upper age limit for the crime survey, producing an annual domestic abuse bulletin, incorporating data from support services and piloting a VAWG dashboard. The VAWG dashboard did not progress

¹ <https://rm.coe.int/ensuring-data-collection-and-research-on-vaw-and-dv-article-11-of-the-/16809ef846>

beyond a pilot and in the last financial year data from support services was suspended from the bulletin due to funding cuts.

The ONS faces several ongoing challenges in accurately measuring VAWG across the UK, leading to significant gaps in data collection. One major issue is 'systemic' factors that prevent disclosure and underreporting by survivors such as prior harmful interactions, discriminatory and/or poor responses from statutory services, fear of deportation, racialised myths and assumptions and victim-blaming. We know from years of research that disclosure rates are higher when survivors have access to trusted specialist VAWG support services, including 'by and for' organisations, further illustrating the importance of qualitative insights from the VAWG sector and survivors.

Additionally, certain forms of violence and abuse are either not captured at all by current ONS data or not to a sufficient extent. This includes emotional and psychological abuse, online abuse, economic abuse, so-called honour-based abuse and female genital mutilation (FGM). Additional recording issues include how strangulation and suffocation are recorded as one rather than separate offences.

Variations in definitions and methodologies across different studies and data sources make it difficult to obtain comparable year by year data, some questions are not as detailed as they could be, and often get cut down as new forms are added. Most significantly, the data also fails to fully capture how experiences of violence vary based on factors like ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status.

Crime Survey for England and Wales

Victimisation surveys such as the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) do not capture the experiences of certain groups and underreports certain types of VAWG. As it is households surveyed, women and girls who experience violence and abuse and are located in other contexts such as prison, immigration detention centres and other forms of Home Office contracted accommodation such as hotels, care homes and mental health institutions or are rough-sleeping/hidden homelessness are excluded. Young people are also not included in the survey meaning there is less data on the prevalence or impact of forms of abuse for children and young people.

In relation to the questions on domestic abuse, the current reported prevalence measure underestimates gender asymmetry and coercive control, and as above, excludes domestic abuse outside of household settings, such as in care settings. Young people under 16 in their own relationships do not have their experiences included. The Domestic Abuse Act 2021 recognised children as survivors in their own right where they are affected by domestic abuse, but their experiences are not included in the survey. Despite the removal of the upper age limit, this has not achieved parity for older survivors. Disaggregated data on survivors aged 60 and above is limited to two age ranges each spanning over 15 years, whereas the largest age range

for victims below the age of 59 is 10 years. Furthermore, there is a lack of sufficient data on the long-term impacts of violence on survivors, including the psychological, economic, and social consequences. Disaggregated data by region also contains vast inconsistencies across the UK, as devolved nations have their own methods of collecting data.

The ONS has made changes to victimisation surveys in recent years, most recently to new domestic abuse questions which were created in consultation with some specialist services. These are currently being trialled on a split sample basis. We await the final evaluation of the changes in Spring 2025 and urge the evaluation to explore how the new questions respond to the issues we have outlined above.

Criminal Justice Data

It is important that there is not a reliance on criminal justice system (CJS) data to try and understand prevalence due to the inaccurate picture it provides. VAWG is systemically underreported: the CSEW shows that fewer than one in six victims of rape or assault by penetration reported the crime to the police and this is likely to be an underestimate², with this figure being around one in five for victims of domestic abuse.³ The lack of ethnicity data across all criminal justice system institutions and agencies is also a systemic failing that must be addressed.

"Lack of robust police data on victims' ethnicity is a fundamental failing... It is unacceptable that poor data is hampering forces' abilities to police and the ability of other organisations to help address any inequalities that would become clear if that data was collected"⁴. - HMICFRS report

Another issue with CJS data is the inability to track data from reporting through the criminal justice process, meaning there is not an accurate representation of the journey of cases. Additionally the data does not represent when a suspect is charged or investigated for multiple offences.

On the subject of data collation and sharing, we repeat the VAWG sector's long standing call for the introduction of a complete firewall to stop data-sharing between statutory agencies and immigration enforcement to enable victims to come forward to report abuse and access help.

²

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/bulletins/crimeinenglandandwales/yearendingseptember2024#sexual-offences>

³ [Partner abuse in detail, England and Wales - Office for National Statistics](#)

⁴ <https://hmicfrs.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/publication-html/tees-valley-inclusion-project-super-complaint/>

i) Police Reports

Police-recorded VAWG is a well-established measure but cannot be used to represent prevalence because of chronic and historic under-reporting of instances of VAWG, which is particularly present within communities that have a historic distrust of the police due to institutional misogyny and racism.

Operation Bluestone worked in a number of 'pathfinder site' police forces and found that:

“none of the pathfinder forces had sufficient data systems, analysts or analytical capability to support good strategic analysis to improve rape and other sexual offences investigations, contribute to any focused local crime prevention activity or any forward planning to improve focused local crime prevention activity or any forward planning to improve the demands on the investigative workforce.”⁵

Police-recorded VAWG generally focuses on specific offences, rather than patterns of behaviour, which means that course of conduct crimes such as coercive control and stalking aren't consistently recorded as such as highlighted in the recent [report investigating the super complaint against the police handling of stalking](#). Improvements are needed in the ways the police ask about, and record, frequency.

Police data is also subject to discrepancies between the 43 police forces, as different forces may record and report VAWG offences differently, and there are ongoing concerns about the consistency and accuracy of data on key demographics such as ethnicity and sex that make it difficult to assess the nature and scale of VAWG offending. It is important to recognise the way in which institutional misogyny and racism may influence the way in which VAWG is recorded in police forces, with reports often being missed due to the minimisation of abuse against women and girls⁶. It is also important to recognise that “in general, ethnic minorities (excluding white minorities) appear to be over-represented at many stages throughout the CJS compared with the white ethnic group”.⁷

Ethnicity of victim is estimated to be missing in a significant proportion of cases, and without it we are unable to understand who might be affected by any particular type of offence, and who might be more or less likely to report. Changes in crime reporting as well as police priorities can lead to further fluctuations in any data set.

⁵

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/63c02994d3bf7f6c287b9ff7/E02836356_Operation_Soteria_Y1_report_Accessible.pdf

⁶ <https://www.endviolenceagainstwomen.org.uk/met-police-are-still-failing-victims/>

⁷

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/ethnicity-and-the-criminal-justice-system-2022/statistics-on-ethnicity-and-the-criminal-justice-system-2022-html>

For example, in May 2023 changes were made to the Home Office Counting Rules for conduct crimes (stalking, harassment and coercive and controlling behaviour). The requirement for the police to record two crimes when one of them was a conduct crime, such as when there are multiple instances of harassment that make up a course of conduct, was removed, though police continue to investigate these offences⁸. This has led to a reduction in police-recorded offences often associated with conduct crimes, such as stalking, harassment and domestic abuse⁹. Whilst it is difficult to say conclusively whether these changes have led directly to the fall in recorded crimes over the last year, including domestic abuse and honour-based abuse, it is important to acknowledge the impact these changes may have had when analysing published data.

Reductions in police-recorded DA may represent a range of factors such as reductions in survivor confidence in the police response or changes to recording practices/definitions and so can be unreliable as a measure of the reduction of the prevalence of DA.

ii) Crown Prosecution Service

The CPS uses a different case management system to the police and cases do not carry across, i.e. a case cannot be tracked across the police and CPS.

The equality profiles of suspects, defendants and victims, by sex and age are reported in the quarterly performance management data tables. Ethnicity is reported for suspects and defendants only, this has been provided by the police and is subject to varying levels of error and omission at local levels. The CPS does not consider this information as a reliable measure of prevalence.

The CPS has a “flagging” system whereby different flags are assigned to different case types - rape, adult rape, child sexual abuse, domestic abuse. This provides a helpful breakdown as to specific outcomes, attrition and timeliness in each crime type. However these flags remain even where the charge made against the suspect differs from the original flag applied, creating inaccuracies in the data.

⁸

<https://domesticabusecommissioner.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/2404-Home-Office-Counting-Rules-Briefing-from-the-Domestic-Abuse-Commissioner.pdf>

⁹

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/bulletins/domesticabuseinenglandandwalesoverview/november2024>

Domestic Homicides

The ONS publishes analysis on data from the Home Office Homicide Index in its annual domestic abuse bulletin¹⁰. Imkaan and CWJ have produced a summary of the extent to which it is possible to disaggregate this data and other data sources on deaths in the context of domestic abuse by sex, relationship to suspect and ethnicity.¹¹ It is possible to use the data published by the ONS to explore domestic homicides of adults by sex and relationship to suspect, including specifically for Intimate Partner Violence (IPV), however this does not include ethnicity. It is possible to explore domestic homicides of adults by sex and ethnicity however not specifically for IPV data (ibid).

More up to date data is included in the Domestic Homicide Project run by the Vulnerability, Knowledge and Practice Programme, which also includes data on other deaths in the context of domestic abuse, including suspected victim suicide following domestic abuse and unexpected deaths¹². The data in this project includes a breakdown between IPV homicides and other family homicides, which is also disaggregated by ethnicity, but not by sex. There are tentative findings from the project which suggest that Black and minoritised women are disproportionately likely to be victims of intimate partner homicides, and it is important to note that this disproportionality arises from the barriers to help-seeking encountered and from agency failings when women do seek help¹³.

Domestic homicide reviews are now publicly available in [a single repository](#), although this is not comprehensive. There are a number of additional projects exploring trends in domestic homicide reviews including the [HALT study](#) which has fed into thematic reviews on behalf of the Domestic Abuse Commissioner.

The [Femicide Census](#) is a voluntary project that carries out freedom of information requests to every police force area and combines this with additional available data to provide an estimate and analysis of femicides each year, currently up to 2021. Karen Ingala Smith provides the most up to date estimates of women killed by men on an X feed [@CountDeadWomen](#). There are critical gaps in the data from police force areas, with data on the ethnicity of victims only provided for 41% of the victims (Femicide Census 2021)

¹⁰<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/articles/domesticabusevictimcharacteristicsenglandandwales/yearendingmarch2024#domestic-homicide>

¹¹ [PR: Failings by the state can be a matter of life or death: Groundbreaking new report on the deaths of Black and minoritised women due to domestic abuse launched — Centre for Women's Justice](#)

¹² [Domestic Homicide Project - VKPP Work](#)

¹³ [PR: Failings by the state can be a matter of life or death: Groundbreaking new report on the deaths of Black and minoritised women due to domestic abuse launched — Centre for Women's Justice](#)

Perpetrator Research

Research is needed to better understand who perpetrators of VAWG are, what motivates them to abuse, as well as what stops them. To prevent femicide and homicide, we need to better understand perpetrators who kill, so that, out of a very large cohort of perpetrators, we can also identify and target interventions towards them. This is critical to the ambition to halve VAWG. Operation Soteria has provided valuable work in advocating for a suspect-focused, context-led and victim-centred approach and valuable insights on the importance of data have been produced - particularly around repeat offenders and ensuring they are identified and tracked.

Without a national statutory data set, it is currently impossible to measure domestic and sexual abuse perpetration, track perpetrators through various systems, or understand whether or not responses and interventions are successful. The perpetrator sector is under-developed in terms of data collection and analysis. Government has failed to invest either in sector-wide data collection or even in data collection across the interventions it funds.

Understanding the impact of perpetrator work must also acknowledge the potential for women's support and advocacy to be contributing to reductions or cessations of abuse. This reflects the need for wider understanding of perpetrator work and its impacts, as conversely there are also families and communities preventing access to support or directly perpetrating abuse in the context of cultural, community and faith expectations.

Victim Services

Frontline specialist VAWG services draw on decades of experience in supporting women and children (of all ages and levels of risk) experiencing the trauma and impacts of abuse, incorporating prevention work, crisis support and recovery.

The ONS should report on the level of provision of and demand for victim services, as a critical indicator of the responsiveness of government at local and national levels to VAWG.

This includes the support provided by specialist services as well as the support provided by other professionals, in particular statutory services meeting their obligations in relation to VAWG:

- Inclusive provision: data on the availability of service types and the availability of refuge vacancies including specialisms, as recorded on the UK VAWG directory, Routes to Support ([Routes to Support: Database on local domestic abuse services](#))
- Availability: of an individuals' chosen support service, including 'by and for' services, single sex (female and male) and mixed sex service provision.
- Unmet need: data from specialist services across the VAWG sector, and NHS services on the numbers of and reasons for declined referrals, caseloads and waiting lists for access to service can be used to assess the need for increased resourcing of provision

as well as data relating to decreased or closure of service offers due to reduced or insecure funds.

- Positive outcomes: Increased number of survivors meeting outcomes as set out by existing outcomes frameworks used by providers. This includes the well established On Track outcomes framework developed by Women's Aid and Imkaan in partnership with commissioners, survivors, services and academics, which is a comprehensive set of survivor-identified outcomes against which services can document and measure their inputs, outputs and the progress of the survivors they support.
- Quality provision: Increased number of services meeting established sector standards and reduced negative capture on services failing to meet obligations, on systems held by specialist services.
- Training: Levels of takeup of training delivered by specialist VAWG services by statutory and non-statutory agencies, including financial service firms and employer and community initiatives.

This evidence should be used more effectively to influence funding. Investing in violence against women and girls and domestic abuse services is a cost-effective solution that will result in a significant return on investment for taxpayers (See e.g. <https://www.womensaid.org.uk/investing-to-save-report/>).

To ensure survivors are supported to recover from domestic abuse and to prevent the recurrence of abuse, the Government should ensure that: the specialist VAWG sector has sustainable multi-year funding to provide holistic support to survivors at the point of need, that commissioning practices reflect quality of provision and that access to services is equitable and needs based. This must include specialist 'by and for' provision that reflects the experiences of women and children experiencing multiple inequalities. Alongside this, commissioning of high quality, accredited perpetrator responses should be included, taking a multi-year approach, and with separate additional funding streams. We need to see proportionate government investment into perpetrator responses, both to stop perpetration and support its victims.

Ofcom Transparency Reports

Under the Online Safety Act 2023, the regulator, Ofcom, will be able to implement transparency reporting for online services, including social media platforms¹⁴. Online service providers will be required to report on specific safety measures and design functions outlined by Ofcom. This will include a requirement on user-to-user and search services to report on incidence of illegal content as well as content that is harmful to children. This can also include reports on the dissemination of harmful content on platforms, including data collection on the number of users

¹⁴ <https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3137>

that have been exposed to harmful content, how quickly harmful content is shared and removed, and the prevalence of such content¹⁵.

Ofcom can also require reports on the systems and processes that services use to protect users from harm, including how users are directed to information about safety, the effectiveness of user reporting tools, the design of algorithms that affect the display of harmful content, and the accuracy of systems for identifying harmful content.

According to the draft guidance for transparency reporting, Ofcom intends to use the information in these reports to identify patterns and trends. Ofcom may also request specific thematic information relating to priority areas. This reporting over time could be used to observe and identify trends in online VAWG, as well as online providers' ability to effectively address VAWG occurring on their platforms. Due to the OSA's focus on illegal harms, such data will have some gaps when measuring online VAWG which falls within the so-called 'legal but harmful' category if not seen as part of a course of conduct, such as stalking and coercive control.

Public Attitudes

Halving VAWG must involve tackling the misogyny which underpins violence against women and girls. It is therefore vital to track and monitor public attitudes to understand the scale of misogyny in the UK. Whilst there have been several measures of public attitudes towards violence against women and girls (VAWG), including surveys by Women's Aid¹⁶ and Ipsos Mori¹⁷, there is no definitive census.

The CSEW is one of the most frequently used sources of data on crime and public attitudes in the UK as it includes self-reported experiences of crime¹⁸, including domestic abuse, sexual assault, and stalking, and also collects data on perceptions of safety, including risk of personal and household crime. However the CSEW does not currently run a consistent census on public attitudes to VAWG.

Likewise, public attitudes campaigns have historically been subject to poor monitoring and evaluation, making it challenging to learn from best practice¹⁹. Whilst there is potential for good

¹⁵

<https://www.ofcom.org.uk/siteassets/resources/documents/consultations/category-1-10-weeks/consultation-draft-transparency-reporting-guidance/main-docs/consultation-on-transparency-guidance.pdf?v=371129>

¹⁶

<https://www.womensaid.org.uk/womens-aid-releases-new-research-on-how-uk-public-attitudes-tolerate-domestic-abuse/>

¹⁷ <https://www.ipsos.com/en-uk/britons-increasingly-scared-speak-out-womens-rights-data-shows>

¹⁸

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/adhocs/2226crimesurveyforenglandandwalescsewestimatesofpersonalandhouseholdcrimeantisocialbehaviourandpublicperceptionsbypoliceforceareayearendingmarch2024>

¹⁹

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a747e76e5274a7f9c5866be/2015-03-08_This_is_Abuse_campaign_summary_report_2_.pdf

work in this space, there is a need for better public information campaigns about VAWG which are subject to monitoring and evaluation, and an annual public attitudes census on VAWG to track the prevalence of harmful attitudes to women and girls on a national scale and monitor long-term attitude change.

Recommendations

Consultation

We request a consultation process be opened so that there is a clear structure and transparency around how the VAWG sector and VAWG experts can inform and guide the development of the Government's approach to measuring VAWG, including the proposed theory of change (TOC) which must take a whole-system approach. This must include consultation with smaller specialist VAWG organisations, including those from the 'by and for' sector. There are important debates around key metrics that need to be considered in the development of accurate and meaningful measures to progress to ending VAWG. It is also vital that the expertise of the specialist VAWG sector is embedded in the development and review of the VAWG strategy, for example through the newly appointed VAWG Strategy Advisory Board.

Disaggregation of victim and perpetrator data

We request the disaggregation of data by sex, ethnicity, disability and age and other protected characteristics, as well as immigration status, of the victims and perpetrators and relationship, of all data relation to VAWG and additionally relating to violent crime.

There is a particular need to improve recording of ethnicity by police forces.

Transformation of CJS data including a greater perpetrator focus

The development of this data will assist with the tracking of cases and specifically perpetrators across the system - from report to the end of involvement with the CJS (including prison and probation). As it currently stands, the different mechanisms and metrics used across statutory bodies (and their failure to properly record data relating to survivor ethnicity and other protected characteristics) results in significant gaps and understandings of the CJS, its impact and outcomes.

Funding Support VAWG Services

Specifically on data collection and processing, particularly small, specialist providers that have a specific reach and expertise on VAWG. For example, over 90% of Imkaan members do not have staff dedicated to monitoring and evaluation.

Improved Data-gathering on Children and Young People

To commission research to improve the data and understanding of the prevalence of specific experiences of VAWG, CSA and CSE experienced by children and young people.

Independent monitoring body

We recommend an independent monitoring mechanism for the government's VAWG Strategy with powers to oversee and requisition data from departments and statutory agencies such as exists for independent commissioners. Alongside this, we would suggest the commissioning of in-depth research to ensure the victim-survivor experience is fully captured.

Regular review

We recommend that a review takes place every 3 years in consultation with the VAWG sector to assess the impact of the theory of change and its success in reducing VAWG and the effectiveness of the Government's approach to measuring VAWG.

This briefing is endorsed by:

- 1. End Violence Against Women Coalition**
- 2. Women's Aid Federation of England**
- 3. Imkaan**
- 4. Respect**
- 5. Welsh Women's Aid**
- 6. Surviving Economic Abuse**
- 7. Stay Safe East**
- 8. Refuge**
- 9. Cheshire Without Abuse**
- 10. Trans Without Abuse**
- 11. Panahghar**
- 12. Roshni Birmingham**
- 13. Shakti Women's Aid**
- 14. Cambridge Women's Aid**
- 15. Liverpool Domestic Abuse Service**
- 16. HARV Domestic Abuse Services**
- 17. PALADIN National Stalking Advocacy Service**
- 18. The Emily Davison Centre**
- 19. Loving Me**
- 20. HARV Housing CIC**
- 21. Wycombe Women's Aid**
- 22. The Elm Foundation**
- 23. EVA Women's Aid**
- 24. Kiran Support Services**

25. IDAS (Independent Domestic Abuse Services)
26. SignHealth
27. Al Hasaniya Moroccan Women's Centre
28. IKWRO - Women's Rights Organisation
29. Sheffield Women's Aid
30. Kurdish and Middle Eastern Women's Organisation (KMEWO)
31. P.H.O.E.B.E
32. Sikh Women's Aid
33. RISE - Sussex
34. IRISi
35. Karma Nirvana
36. The First Step
37. Humraaz
38. Agenda Alliance
39. Women's Aid Leicestershire Ltd.
40. Vida Sheffield
41. Living Without Abuse
42. Your Sanctuary
43. Stop Domestic Abuse
44. Restore Women's Aid
45. Trafford Domestic Abuse Services (TDAS)
46. Housing for Women
47. Advance
48. SATEDA
49. Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse (AAFDA)
50. Own My Life
51. White Ribbon UK
52. PHOEBE
53. WRC
54. London VAWG Consortium
55. MKACT Domestic Abuse Service
56. Ashiana Network
57. Cats Protection Lifeline
58. The Angelou Centre
59. Staffordshire Women's Aid
60. Amadudu Women's Refuge
61. Jewish Womens Aid
62. FiLiA
63. The Traveller Movement
64. Apna Haq
65. Birmingham and Solihull Women's Aid
66. Safer LBG
67. Safe in Sussex
68. Rights of Women

- 69. Southall Black Sisters**
- 70. Latin American Women's Aid**
- 71. Split Banana Education**
- 72. Solace Women's Aid**
- 73. Standing Together Against Domestic Abuse**
- 74. Suzy Lamplugh Trust**
- 75. The Pankhurst Trust (incorporating Manchester Women's Aid)**
- 76. Dewis Choice, Aberystwyth University**
- 77. Woman's Trust**
- 78. Plan International UK**
- 79. Tender**
- 80. NIARA VISION**
- 81. Hibiscus**
- 82. Centre for Women's Justice**