



Nothing for Us, Without Us - Summary of Research and Global Expert Consultation

Introduction:

Every Woman Treaty (EWT) represents a global coalition of 1,700 women's rights leaders from 128 nations. We have been working diligently with frontline leaders, legal scholars, physicians, academics, and practitioners for seven years to advance a global treaty to end violence against women and girls. This report summarizes the findings of the Global Expert Consultation, which was designed to engage stakeholders from around the world to distill the most innovative thinking on a framework to end violence against women and girls. Stakeholders included survivors, activists, frontline practitioners, academics, legal and medical experts, human rights organizations, and advocates. Through the Global Expert Consultation process, we sought to solicit, understand and disseminate these stakeholders' expertise and solutions for ending violence against women and girls. This Consultation process was undertaken in tandem with a more general, information-sharing diplomatic outreach to responsible ministries in nations across the globe, government representatives in Geneva, NYC, and Washington DC, and various UN entities.

Objectives:

Sending the draft Core Platform - a consolidation of provisions that interlocutors single out as key - for review and feedback in 2019 was the cumulative research step in an ongoing consultation with stakeholders to ensure we have a solid, thoroughly vetted draft that represents our values of inclusion. The Consultation process was designed to allow us to evaluate both the quality of the draft Core Platform and the inclusiveness of the outreach.

We evaluated the quality of the draft Core Platform by seeking to understand the following:

- Are we on the right track, generally?
- Have we identified all areas that need to be changed or missed any?
- Did we gather enough data to make those changes?

After coding the data, we were able to analyze the data by topic and identify areas in which respondents agree that changes should be made to the Core Platform. This feedback is summarized below and presented in full in Appendices I (Qualitative Findings on the 26 Articles) and II (Qualitative Findings on the Final Feedback Questions). This Report only explains the data gathered on the then 26 Articles; the current, longer draft text can be requested from Every Woman Treaty.

We also sought to evaluate the effectiveness of the outreach process. The process is described below, with tables showing responses in Appendices III (Demographic Charts of Respondents) and IV (Global Consultation Qualitative Feedback Process and Codebook).

Consultation Process and Development of the Core Platform:

Experts who have firsthand experience with violence against women and girls and understand proven interventions came together through Every Woman Treaty as a global learning community. They discussed the detrimental impacts of gaps in the current normative framework and the powerful value of these interventions for survivors in different regions of the world and within different stakeholder communities, such as indigenous women and women with disabilities.

Multi-phase consultations were undertaken in the initial five years to facilitate an inclusive and substantive global dialogue. This global dialogue focused on types and forms of violence against women and girls and the wide range of stakeholders who are impacted. There was a focused effort to examine the gaps in the global framework and design an intervention – a new treaty – that would complement and build upon the current global and regional frameworks.

Below are the steps included in the multi-phase Consultation:

- Based at the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at Harvard University, the Initiative on Violence Against Women collaborated with a wide range of legal scholars, practitioners, attorneys, and country experts in every region of the world to understand what implementation of the legal framework looks like in country, on the ground. The Initiative also partnered with frontline experts to reach out to a wide range of stakeholders to understand what access to justice means to survivors in different regions of the world. In addition, the Initiative:
 - Conducted an extensive review and deep consultation with experts on the Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, The Belem do Para Convention, The Maputo Protocol, The Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (the Istanbul Convention), The Cairo Declaration on Human Rights In Islam, and The Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women in the ASEAN region.
 - Undertook the *Global Research Engagement*, a collaborative research partnership with law schools from 15 countries who researched and delivered 18 research memorandums on violence against women in every region in the world to inform our understanding and further analysis of the need for a global treaty (2013 - 2016).
 - Developed and released for access and awareness the *Violence Against Women E-Library*, a curated database of research, reports, and articles on violence against women housed at Harvard University <https://projects.iq.harvard.edu/violenceagainstwomen>.

- Through extensive and inclusive outreach to individuals and organizations in every region of the world, a Global Expert Working Group was launched, with experts from every region including key stakeholders such as survivor experts, frontline practitioners, former CEDAW committee members, experts on the different regional frameworks, attorneys, activists and legal scholars (2013 - 2018).
- The Global Expert Working Group engaged in Regional Expert Consultations to inform and guide the development of a global treaty on violence against women. The initial outreach question was, “We want to design a consultation with grassroots women to understand how they experience violence against women and what prevents them from seeking/using legal remedies” (2014).
- A draft Core Platform outline was developed from feedback received across this five-year period 2013 - 17. The outline laid the foundation for what a treaty to address violence against women and girls should include, to be effective for survivors in every region of the world, as well as complementary to the existing global and regional frameworks on violence against women. The different regional frameworks on violence against women and the *Handbook for Legislation on Violence Against Women* by UN Women were major resources for the development of this outline.
- To delve more deeply into the issue areas in the draft outline, 15 Expert Special Committees were formed with specialists from 50 countries having expertise in 16 aspects of violence against women and girls (2015 - 2017). Each Committee produced a memorandum that described the type of violence, the current international legal framework, and recommendations for how a treaty could effectively address that type of violence (2017).
- The Committees’ memos and the legal research were reviewed by a team of human rights lawyers and legal scholars, who shaped this content into a re-drafted Core Platform comprising six Parts (1 Purposes, Definitions, General Principles, and General Obligations, 2 Prevention, 3 Investigation, Prosecution, Reparations, 4 Substantive Law, 5 Implementation and Monitoring Mechanisms and 6 Final Clauses) (2018 - 2019).

Format of the 2019 Global Consultation Survey:

To make participation as accessible as possible, the draft Core Platform was put into a survey format that divided the whole into smaller sections: one for each Article and four open “Final Feedback” questions at the end. The survey included opportunities for respondents to provide both quantitative and qualitative feedback.

Surveys were sent in Google Form and Word formats to accommodate varying internet access, disabilities, and translations. The team hosted two bridge video conference sessions for people to ask questions, and this was done with inclusive scheduling to meet the needs of the six global regions.

However, there were still barriers to access: most notably, the survey was long and required considerable time to complete. Languages were limited to English and Spanish, and the Spanish version was only available from August 2019.

Outreach:

Approximately 5,700 surveys were sent to 175 countries and multiple stakeholder groups to provide feedback. Every outreach message asked people to forward the survey to others, so surveys also were shared among larger networks, the number of which we can only estimate. Everyone contacted received at least one reminder message, and additional follow-up messages were sent, tailored to specific stakeholders and countries requesting their participation. We contacted:

- The Working Group members
- EWT Coalition members
- Non-Governmental Organizations addressing violence against women (from our VOIS -Voice Operated Information System - database, established in 2014 and updated in 2018)
- Additional organizations identified by the team to fill gaps in geographic and stakeholder categories, including:
 - Faith organizations
 - Organizations that work with men and boys
 - Organizations and individuals in law enforcement
 - Organizations in potential lead nations

We received 317 responses from 92 countries. Appendix III shows demographic information for respondents by region, profession, and sector. People were able to choose more than one professional role and sector. The highest number of responses were from respondents who identified as activists and/or from the women's advocacy sector, probably because these roles fit into work within, for example, legal or academic professions.

The countries contributing the highest number of responses (in descending order) were the US, India, Nigeria, and Pakistan, with Cameroon and the UK tied for fifth place.

Quantitative feedback:

The survey format offered respondents the option to rank each Article of the draft Core Platform as either:

1. This section is very strong;
2. This section is acceptable; I can live with it;
3. This section (or part of this section) is not acceptable. I object; or
4. I don't know this area well enough to respond.

Overall, of the 26 Articles, 23 were rated 1 by a majority of respondents, and 100% were rated 1 or 2 by a majority of respondents. This demonstrates a high level of approval for most of the Articles.

No Articles received 3 ratings from more than 6.6% of respondents, and only 12 Articles were rated 3 by more than 3% of respondents. People who gave ratings of 3 were able to explain their objections. This qualitative feedback is discussed below.

We included #4 as a response option for people who may not have technical expertise in a particular area. While this was necessary for the data collection process and to make the Global Expert Consultation more inclusive, it does not inform our findings or contribute meaningful data. Very few respondents took advantage of this answer option, and most felt they were qualified to offer an opinion on every Article. 7.2% and 7.1% of respondents felt unqualified to respond regarding Article 26 on Safety, Custody, and Visitation Rights and Article 25 on Prosecution and Application of Criminal Offenses, respectively, but these maximum values were outliers.

We also analyzed the responses to each question regarding the Articles by region, but did not find differences among the respondents from each region regarding their feedback on the Articles. Similar proportions of respondents from each region rated Articles as 3, or as 1 and 2.

Qualitative Feedback:

The following findings are the result of an analysis of the qualitative data collected in the Global Expert Consultation process. Given the structure of the survey, the vast majority of the qualitative data comes from individuals who marked #3 on a given Article. As a result, the data is a portrait of the respondents who were the most critical of the sample. The findings are grouped by theme and, in some cases, subtheme.

- Summary of Analysis of Article feedback^[1]
 - Phrasing and definitions matter. They have a wide-reaching impact on the treaty's ability to effectively serve all women.
 - If there is a list of groups, types of violence or proposed solutions, it must be comprehensive. In this instance, if something is unlisted, it becomes beyond the scope of the Core Platform.
 - The Core Platform or its supporting documentation needs to further clarify differences between itself and CEDAW and the Istanbul Convention.
 - Many states will, but should not be able to, use cultural relativism as an argument against certain provisions.
- Analysis of Final Feedback^[2]
 - When asked if anything important was missing, the majority of the comments focused on the following areas: inclusion of additional vulnerable groups and types of violence, access to resources for survivors and support to those assisting them, and increased education and training.
 - A small number of respondents mentioned clauses that were breaking points for them; however, most of this group said they would still be willing to engage and support the treaty regardless of using the Core Platform clauses. These were

mostly centered on contentious clauses, including conflict with traditional laws, disagreement with access to contraception, divorce, and abortion.

- Respondents were asked if there is anything that their country would absolutely not agree to, and the responses fell into four categories: funding, implementation, cultural or religious conflict, and legal issues.
- Based on their direct experiences, respondents shared what they had seen that was attempted and failed. Most answers cited issues in the following areas: the adoption of laws, effective implementation, corruption of law enforcement, accountability for state parties, and access to justice in the country context.

Data Processing and Coding:

Quantitative data was gathered automatically through the use of Google Forms for the survey. To organize and analyze the survey's qualitative data, a six-person team categorized the data by broad theme and specific subject area in two rounds of reviews. The codebook used for this analysis can be found in Appendix IV. For consistency in interpreting the themes and codes, at least two team members reviewed each piece of survey data. In cases where the team members agreed on theme selection for less than 80% of pieces of data, the team conducted a two-part validation process to increase agreement. Additional information on this process can be found in Appendix IV.

Recommendations from the Consultation Team:

When feedback is incorporated into a revised draft of the Core Platform, we recommend the following be considered:

- Replace lists of groups of people, types of violence, and possible solutions with language that is wide-reaching and inclusive.
- Review all key terms and re-evaluate the clarity and implications of current definitions.
- Review philosophical debates that arose and make an intentional decision whether to make a stand and what that position should be. These debates include but are not limited to cultural relativism and abortion.
- Clarify and explicitly state similarities and differences between the Core Platform and CEDAW and the Istanbul Convention in supporting documentation, including process differences such as depth of inclusiveness.
- Review proposed additional provisions and consider their addition to the Core Platform, especially those that uplift historically marginalized people.

Key team members:

- Vidya Sri
- Millicent Bogert
- Sarah Buksa
- Karolina Deuth
- Maria Gargano

- Nancy McLennan
- Maria Pachon

Assisted by:

- Meredith Gusky
- Sveto Ishoq
- Yogitra Jothi
- Uma Manorama
- Maddalena Zarcone

Appendix I: Qualitative Findings on the 26 Articles

- I. Inclusion of additional groups
 - A. Add Another Vulnerable Group of Women or Girls
 1. There are a number of groups that were not explicitly listed in this preliminary Core Platform, but should be, including, but not limited to: indigenous women, elderly women, women with disabilities, and LGBTQIA+ individuals, specifically trans women and trans women of color.
 2. Alternatively, there are concerns that listing groups may cause non-listed groups to be excluded. The proposed solution is to not list groups at all.
 - B. Vulnerable State/Legal Situations
 1. Women and girls who are exposed to higher rates of violence due to vulnerable or legal situations should also explicitly be named. These include, but are not limited to: women living in rural areas, incarcerated women, divorced women, single parents, and child witnesses to violence.
 2. Past sexual history should explicitly be prohibited as evidence in cases that involve violence against women.
 3. Trafficked women and girls must also be explicitly listed and protected.
 4. The text should include a clarification of types of violence, not just groups of people or life circumstances.
 - C. Women and Girls with Disabilities
 1. Women and girls with disabilities experience higher rates of violence.
 2. Systems (justice and otherwise) are often inaccessible for individuals with disabilities, and the Core Platform should explicitly address this.
 - D. Phrasing

1. If and when a listing or description of groups is needed, all previously listed groups must be repeated, not just a selection, for fear of exclusion.
 2. Gender-neutral language should be used to describe a woman's partner or spouse.
- E. The text's definition of gender can have an impact on trans and non-binary individuals' inclusion in and protection under the Core Platform.

II. Treaty obligations and rights

A. Human Rights / Theory

1. The text must explicitly state that the document is legally binding.
2. There are human rights principles that could strengthen the Core Platform.
 - a) The text should explicitly add the right to human dignity, from which all rights flow.
 - b) Freedom from violence should be listed as an explicit stand-alone right instead of being a form of discrimination.
 - c) There is a difference between a lack of discrimination and equality.
3. The rights included in the Core Platform intersect with other human rights areas, including LGBTQIA+ and sexual and reproductive health rights, and could be strengthened with their inclusion.

B. State Responsibilities

1. The state has a responsibility to not perpetrate violence.
2. Which state parties should be held responsible for cases of GBV and family violence needs to be clearly specified in order to facilitate lawsuits.
3. There is disagreement over whether the state or an international entity (such as the UN) should be responsible for a number of specific treaty provisions.
4. There is a simultaneous concern that explicit requirements of states would cause states to reject provisions, and yet such requirements should be more explicit.
5. The Core Platform should contain concrete recommendations for state budgets.
6. There should be a provision that states are responsible for the violence perpetrated by non-state actors.

C. Stronger Wording

1. Some language is too specific. It implies to states that if something is not listed, then it is permissible. If listing, include language such as "any other form of sexual violence of comparable gravity" to combat this misunderstanding.

2. Some language is too general.
3. Word choice matters and impacts the strength of this document, with the need for stronger language to emphasize state responsibility.

D. Agency of Survivors/Rights of women

1. It must be explicitly stated that treaty provisions are applicable to all spheres.
2. There are a number of non-traditional human rights that should be included, including the right to defend oneself and the right to live free from fear of violence.
3. GBV response provisions should be less prescriptive and more survivor-driven.
4. There should be further clarification of a victim's rights.

III. Western values/cultural concerns

A. There is significant disagreement regarding cultural relativism.

Contradictory findings include:

1. Cultural relativism may be used as a way to preserve discriminatory laws.
 - a) Religion should not apply in VAW cases, even in theocratic countries.
 - b) LGBTI language may cause certain countries to reject sections of the Core Platform.
2. The text must include additional language to combat harmful traditional practices.
 - a) The harm of traditional gender stereotypes, honor, sorcery, and kidnapping to facilitate marriage are not sufficiently addressed.
3. There should be greater emphasis on religious and customary solutions for non-criminal discrimination and incidents. Communities are also working hard to move away from this.

B. There are concerns about how phrasing and treaty obligations will translate across cultures and economies.

1. Data is viewed differently in non-western contexts. In some contexts, data is viewed as flexible and manipulable.
2. Exclusion of social and economic rights language demonstrates a western worldview.

C. Some of the proposed provisions may prove to be burdensome for lower-resource countries.

1. Funding from NGOs and donor countries is volatile and often use-restricted.
2. Capacity to train only exists in western and oil-rich countries.

- a) The text should mandate training from third parties to reduce the burden.

D. Different contexts have higher rates of different types of violence, and the text does not adequately address these differences.

IV. Comparisons with CEDAW, Istanbul Convention and/or other human rights instruments

A. CEDAW

1. There are concerns that the Core Platform replicates much of CEDAW.
 - a) Specific concerns were raised in proposed Articles 6 (Equality and Non-Discrimination) and 7.7 (Duty to Prevent Violence Against Women and Girls).
2. CEDAW GR 33 (on women's access to justice) sufficiently addresses intersectional barriers to reporting and justice while the Core Platform does not, but should, specifically in Article 23 on Access to Justice.
3. CEDAW GR 35 sufficiently addresses women's autonomy while the Core Platform does not, but should.
4. A failure of CEDAW is its failure to recognize freedom from violence as a unique human right, rather than 'retro-fitting' freedom from violence into a discrimination framework.

B. Istanbul Convention (IC)

1. There are concerns that the Core Platform replicates much of IC.
2. IC effectively addresses several issues that the Core Platform does not.
 - a) It specifically addresses domestic violence.
 - b) It includes migrant women, women refugees, and asylum seekers by name.
 - c) It has a separate section for risk management & assessment (Art. 51).
 - d) IC Art. 31 is considered preferable to Core Platform's Art. 15(5)(i).
3. IC has experienced a number of barriers to gaining signatories.
 - a) It omits divorce and emergency contraception, inclusion of which in the Core Platform could decrease its signatories.
 - b) One of IC's barriers to ratification is attributed to the use of the term "gender."
4. EWT Article 26 should not mention IC or any specific regional treaty by name.

C. CAT

1. Torture only applies to state actors and should not be misused in the Core Platform.

V. Patriarchy/discrimination

- A. Some of the language in the draft text perpetuates patriarchal discrimination.
 1. Language of protection emphasizes the patriarchal idea of the 'weak woman'.
 2. Calling women and girls "vulnerable" takes away agency.
 3. Language of perpetrator and portrayal of masculine perpetrator is combative and biased against men and boys.
- B. There needs to place a greater emphasis on intersectional feminism.
 1. See above I. Inclusion of additional groups.
 2. The choice to use "sex" instead of "gender" has implications regarding the inclusion of non-cisgender women and girls.
 3. There is no acknowledgement that men and boys can also be victims of sexual and gender-based violence, indicating that the text has a singular view regarding the cause of sexual and gender-based violence: sexual violence is the result of gender power imbalances.
- C. Any education programming must be gender transformative in order to create new masculinities and social norms.
- D. Patriarchy may limit the effectiveness of some proposed solutions.
 1. Mediation, for example, may not be possible due to a victim's lack of freedom and autonomy.
 2. There are concerns of solutions involving money that payouts may harm victims by creating motivation for harm from men.

VI. Definitions & Phrasing

- A. Align definitions to other human rights instruments.
- B. Definitions need to be clear, as definitions matter and have implications for whom the treaty impacts and how.
 1. There are specific concerns about the definitions of "gender," and "child," "violence."
- C. Word choice needs to be intentional, as connotations can impact implementation.
 1. Specific word choices to consider include 'survivor or victim' and 'sexualized violence or sexual violence.'
 2. The use of "should" or "shall" has implications for the extent to which provisions are binding.
 3. The use of "legislation" does not address the other means of law crafting in common law states.

4. Each state will interpret language through their own cultural view and language choices will affect different countries in different ways.
5. The use of the words “across levels of the ecological framework” in Article 7 (Duty to Prevent Violence Against Women and Girls) is unclear.
6. There are further specific recommendations that are out of the scope of these findings to list and should be reviewed thoroughly.

VII. Technical issues (implementation & legal)

A. Changes in legislation

1. There are concerns over abolishing rape laws and replacing them with sexual assault laws.
2. Law is bound by evidence and testimony, and legislation must criminalize false accusations. Requiring otherwise is out of the scope of the law.
3. There may be some resistance to changing divorce laws.
 - a) Additionally, there are concerns over mandating how assets are split and the possible unintended negative consequences on the marital home.
4. Explicitly discourage customary/religious laws that negatively impact equality, as states will argue cultural relativism, ultimately harming women and girls.
5. Legislation must be improved in the key intersectional area of LGBTQIA+ rights.
6. There must be a prohibition of child marriage.

B. Lack of resources

1. Many states do not have the capacity to provide training.
2. High-resource expectations may discourage low-resource countries.
 - a) The Core Platform should identify and address alternative funding systems.
 - b) Unrealistic expectations will force states to choose, leaving some critical but difficult, work unfunded.

C. Policy/procedure changes

1. There are a number of specific recommended additions, including, but not limited to:
 - a) Independent judiciary
 - b) Translators, including indigenous languages
 - c) Gender transformative education
 - d) Support and training for first responders and lawyers
 - e) Rape kit collection by medical professionals

- f) Judge and jury education
 - g) Helplines for victims
 - h) Sufficient number of shelters
 - i) Rehabilitation and education for offenders
 - j) Training and support for survivors and their children
 - k) Prevention measures, such as bystander training
 - l) Provision independent advocates
 - m) Increased police accountability measures
2. There are concerns about some provisions, including, but not limited to:
- a) Data collection and survivor privacy and safety
 - b) Alternative rehabilitation could allow states to justify marriage to a rapist
 - c) Mandating the gender of police limits survivor autonomy
 - d) Specialized courts may perpetuate discrimination in VAW cases
3. There needs to be more guidelines for an independent monitoring body.

Appendix II - Qualitative Findings on the Final Feedback Questions

1) Do you think anything important is missing?

a) Access to resources for women reporting and/or fleeing violence

- i) Housing, education support, aid
- ii) Regardless of if they are refugees or at home
- iii) Focus on context of humanitarian emergencies
- iv) Translation services for indigenous women
- v) Mediation
- vi) Restorative justice
- vii) Provide services to avoid forced pregnancies
- viii) Confidentiality and privacy for victims
- ix) Make sure reporting is done with their free, prior, and informed consent
- x) Holistic and culturally appropriate health and well-being support services
- xi) Access to social protection - pensions and insurance
- xii) Speedy trial
- xiii) Protection for those who defend themselves
- xiv) Education on how to recognize and deal with and report violence

b) Include other groups

- i) Juvenile justice

- ii) Violence against women in politics
- iii) Trafficked women/girls
- iv) Widows of all ages (to include young widows)
- v) Indigenous women with language barriers - UNDRIP
- vi) Comprehensive definition of indigenous and marginalized community
- vii) Women and girls with disabilities in all sections, they need their own section and should be focused on in other sections such as access to justice, including them in vulnerable groups is not enough
- viii) Gender spectrum inclusivity, trans women, text adopts binary gender model, especially through the use of women and girls, nonbinary and trans folks
- ix) Children born out of rape and their mothers
- x) Women who are foreigners and divorce a local husband and lose residency status
- xi) Drug users
- xii) Girls who are placed outside their homes - foster care, detained at border, residential treatment, etc.
- xiii) Women in conflict with the law
- xiv) Economic marginalization
- xv) Stolen babies
- xvi) Dalits/untouchables
- c) Support to those defending/interacting with survivors
 - i) Capacity building of law enforcement and courts
 - ii) Support to defenders
 - iii) Cultural competency training
 - iv) Training to prevent revictimization
 - v) Training first responders - including in other languages so they can assist non-native language speakers
 - vi) Specific provision for training of customary court judges and traditional rulers
 - vii) Support to those protecting their human rights
 - viii) Freedom of expression for women and human rights defenders
- d) Additions/Definitions
 - i) Add institutional violence
 - ii) Redefine technology-facilitated violence based on Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women report
 - iii) Definition of violence including power and control dynamic
 - iv) Include victim-blaming and rape culture
 - v) More explicit obligations for businesses

- vi) Add to harmful practices - forced remarriage, widow inheritance, stoning of witches, degrading/life-threatening mourning and burial rites
- vii) Add workplace, employers responsible for providing a safe workplace
- viii) Mention different court systems
- ix) Mention convention of Belem do Para
- x) Closing the women between men and women
- xi) Add cultural stigmatization, ageism, and acid throwing
- xii) Need to specifically focus on theocracies and conflict with religious law
- xiii) Add article targeting general community
- e) Implementation changes
 - i) Infrastructure improvement within civil society i.e. street lights, etc.
 - ii) Preventative education of youth and for all, especially in public education
 - iii) Repeal laws criminalizing sex before marriage because they deter rape reporting
 - iv) Role of media
 - v) Monitoring programs and sustainable development
 - vi) Role of civil society/state to make policies that favor women's rights orgs
 - vii) Include femicide
 - viii) Add section exploring male accountability, greater offender accountability - teach them how to be allies across contexts, prevention, care, and rehab of aggressors/potential aggressors, including men, as part of the solution
 - ix) How can countries in conflict that lack basic resources and infrastructure sign onto this?
 - x) Multi-sectoral cooperation
 - xi) Domestic violence and civil protection orders
 - xii) Challenges to implementation in federal states and indigenous governments
 - xiii) Ensure services across nation
 - xiv) Toxic masculinity, legacy of colonialism
 - xv) Guidelines for monitoring signatories, monitoring body of experts and their duties
 - xvi) Don't call indigenous people "tribal"
 - xvii) Prevent states from using national traditions as an excuse
 - xviii) Accountability for states
 - xix) Define relationship between state and national bodies

- 2) *Are there any clauses that, if adopted, would prevent you from continuing to support (the entity) Every Woman Treaty and to engage in this process?*
- a) Must become more holistic
 - b) Explicitly reference the patriarchy, women can also be agents of it
 - c) No abortion even in case of rape
 - d) Access to justice and fair trial
 - e) Discuss women's issues in the UN Human Rights Council
 - f) Issues with emergency contraception and divorce
 - g) Cyber law and access to info law
 - h) Take into account the most vulnerable especially in conflict
 - i) Provision of contraceptives (did not say pro or against)
 - j) Concern with how this could work in Iraq due to cultural traditions, laws, and male-dominated society
 - k) Maybe we don't need female-only units
- 3) *In addition to your personal opinion, is there anything here that your country absolutely could not agree to regardless of which party or faction is in government?*
- a) Funding Challenges
 - i) Guatemala respondent feedback - The budget is not possible
 - ii) Uganda respondent feedback - corruption would make it hard to allocate and ensure money goes to survivor healthcare
 - iii) Tanzania respondent feedback - Budgeting may be an issue
 - iv) Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China (SAR) respondent feedback - not a welfare state, outsources care and other services, so the financial commitment may be hard
 - v) India respondent feedback - may have an issue with special budget for women, girls, and Dalit NGOs
 - vi) USA respondent feedback - monetary support likely an issue
 - vii) Sierra Leone respondent feedback - budgetary support
 - viii) Nicaragua respondent feedback - allocation of funds
 - b) Implementation
 - i) Cambodia respondent feedback - they may agree on paper, but they won't really implement it
 - ii) India respondent feedback - security of women in conflict
 - iii) Cameroon respondent feedback - planning of activities and policies a challenge
 - iv) Myanmar respondent feedback - military/police/armed groups violate the law preventing GBV, so they will not agree to this
 - v) Chile respondent feedback - the police are repressive, so they do not take gender-based violence seriously
 - vi) Bangladesh respondent feedback - present regime does not hold law enforcement, who may be perpetrators, accountable

c) Cultural and/or Religious Conflict

- i) Nigeria respondent feedback - cultural beliefs against marital rape
- ii) Pakistan respondent feedback - some religious activists may have problems with this
- iii) Kazakhstan respondent feedback - workplace discrimination and sexual harassment widespread
- iv) Nigeria respondent feedback - issues with Article 9(a,b,c) - shorter cases for honor crimes, marrying the survivor, or cases involving marginalized/vulnerable women or girls
- v) Nigeria respondent feedback - forced marriage and child marriage are a challenge, especially in the north
- vi) Nigeria respondent feedback - a full version of this will not go over well with religious stakeholders
- vii) Syria respondent feedback - many laws regarding women's rights and equality due to Sharia law
- viii) Nigeria respondent feedback - religious beliefs in some parts of the country may oppose it, but as a whole, it will not stop us from supporting the treaty
- ix) India respondent feedback - marital rape will be contentious
- x) Pakistan respondent feedback - violence against girls and women of all ages, especially child marriage
- xi) Iraq respondent feedback - too far from religion - so all Articles calling for law to be implemented despite religious belief will be hard
- xii) Iraq respondent feedback - from religious people to parties to judges, most will not agree with these policies
- xiii) Mali respondent feedback - traditions and stereotypes still exist and it can be compromising to take political action against it

d) Legal Issues

- i) USA respondent feedback - won't sign this treaty, they didn't even sign CEDAW, has worsened under the then administration
- ii) Zambia respondent feedback - as a Christian nation, same sex relations are against the law
- iii) Malta respondent feedback - abortion is illegal
- iv) Mexico respondent feedback - abortion is criminalized, sexual health is an issue
- v) Cameroon respondent feedback - adopting a law against sexual and GBV
- vi) Ireland respondent feedback - Articles 15(5), 17(3), and 25 will be issues

- vii) Pakistan respondent feedback - there will be an issue with the “transitional justice” phrase
 - viii) Israel respondent feedback - Articles 8(12), 18, part of 19, part of 23, 25
 - ix) Liberia respondent feedback - Articles 24, 25, and 26
 - x) In general, making some aspects enforceable may deter governments from signing on
 - xi) USA respondent feedback - will not agree because of states’ rights
 - xii) Nigeria respondent feedback - does not believe in equality of the sexes, country’s Penal Code supports chastisement of women by spouses as long as no bodily harm is done
- 4) *Is there anything included in the articles laid out in this survey that in your direct experience has been tried and failed?*
- a) Accountability
 - i) USA respondent feedback - accountability of state actors
 - ii) Honduras respondent feedback - state obligations and accountability
 - iii) Uzbekistan respondent feedback - issues with disclosing data on harmful experiment to women and children
 - iv) Democratic Republic of Congo respondent feedback - follow-up/reporting guidelines for state parties and warlords - no legal proceedings
 - b) Implementation
 - i) Australia respondent feedback - victim support may not be enough; the victim may need several occasions to be ready to proceed
 - ii) Bangladesh respondent feedback - lack of implementation of laws due to no political will
 - iii) USA respondent feedback - focusing interventions solely on survivors, not engaging perpetrators
 - iv) Cyprus respondent feedback - poor support and poor investigation - access to justice limited to people with means
 - v) Chile respondent feedback - family courts and foster homes for survivors
 - vi) Israel respondent feedback - primarily supporting aftercare instead of preventative
 - vii) Sierra Leone respondent feedback - victim support
 - viii) Myanmar respondent feedback - harmful traditional practices and norms
 - ix) Canada respondent feedback - the patriarchy will not give up easily

- x) Nigeria respondent feedback - law enforcement
- xi) Democratic Republic of Congo respondent feedback - impunity for acts of gender-based violence, reparation to victims
- xii) Bulgaria respondent feedback - conflicting rights of victim and perpetrator
- xiii) Customary/religious laws bias decision making in several countries
- xiv) Bangladesh respondent feedback - Article 26 re: safety, custody, and visitation rights
- xv) Kenya respondent feedback - enforcement of law by duty bearers
- xvi) Afghanistan respondent feedback - all kinds of violence, especially in the home or indoors
- xvii) Bangladesh respondent feedback - equal socioeconomic/cultural/political participation
- xviii) Uganda respondent feedback - police unit for family violence/DV exists but do not respond without a bribe and do not follow through on cases and protection
- xix) Colombia respondent feedback - education of public authorities in gender approach usually doesn't work
- xx) Peru respondent feedback - has not failed but is not effective
- xxi) Uganda respondent feedback - fear to report rape due to bureaucracy, corruption and lack of ethics at the police station
- xxii) Cameroon respondent feedback - policy planning
- xxiii) USA - good policy, bad enforcement
- xxiv) Nigeria respondent feedback - lack of political will
- xxv) Belize respondent feedback - reparations
- xxvi) Cambodia respondent feedback - capacity building for government officers - these people are chosen based on if they will support certain parties, so this is not a priority for them
- xxvii) Mexico respondent feedback - training in GBV - no evaluation, not told how to apply it to their job
- xxviii) Pakistan respondent feedback - forced kidnapping, conversion, and marriage into majority of minority women

c) Funding

- i) In states with low financial means and/or people power, they might do nothing in response to the long list of demands - it should be enumerated
- ii) Asking states to establish funds may deter them, if there is a fund, the money should go to good civil society organizations, not states

- iii) India respondent feedback - implementation issues regarding financial commitment
- iv) Nicaragua respondent feedback - reparations and compensation
- d) Legal
 - i) India respondent feedback - implementation issues regarding legal help
 - ii) Cameroon respondent feedback - adoption of legislation
 - iii) USA respondent feedback - adoption of laws
 - iv) Nigeria respondent feedback - no need for medical evidence for rape
 - v) Hong Kong SAR respondent feedback - has laws to refer perpetrators to therapy but barely uses them
 - vi) USA respondent feedback - pro-arrest policy may prevent reporting
 - vii) Iraq respondent feedback - legal parts
 - viii) Somalia respondent feedback - fair trial
 - ix) Cambodia respondent feedback - access to justice
 - x) Uganda respondent feedback - Articles 6, 7 and 8
 - xi) Pakistan respondent feedback - existing law on women's protection challenged and disliked by men, current implementation is weak
 - xii) Liberia respondent feedback - Article 25
 - xiii) India respondent feedback - new policy evaluation
 - xiv) Nigeria respondent feedback - domestication of CEDAW
 - xv) Cameroon respondent feedback - policy re: indigenous people
 - xvi) North Macedonia respondent feedback - may not take it as a binding document
 - xvii) Iraq respondent feedback - government may agree to conventions but they are not applied

Appendix III - Demographic Charts of Respondents

Note: Respondents could check more than one option for these two questions, so the data adds up to more than 100%. Responses were received from **92 countries** in total.

List of Countries with the Highest Number of Responses

Country	Number of Responses
United States of America	27
India	22

Nigeria	20
Pakistan	15
Cameroon, United Kingdom	12
Canada	11
Australia	10
Iraq	8
Bangladesh, Democratic Republic of Congo	7

*Vast majority of respondents agreed to all treaty articles

*Highest number of objections was 17 (only one respondent objected 17 times).

Appendix IV: Global Consultation Qualitative Feedback Process and Codebook

Qualitative data were collected in response to open-ended questions associated with each Article and in the final feedback section in the survey. Only those who responded that they objected to the Article in question were given the opportunity to respond to the open-ended questions associated with each Article. A team of six worked on the organization and analysis of this qualitative data in two rounds. In the first round, pairs of two coders from the team of six assigned one or more themes to each piece of qualitative data from a set of seven themes. The seven themes developed for the first round were the following: Inclusion of additional groups, Treaty obligations, and rights, Western values/cultural concerns, Comparisons with CEDAW, Istanbul Convention or other Human Rights treaties, Patriarchy/Discrimination, Definitions/phrasing, and Technical issues (implementation, legal). For consistency in interpreting the themes and codes, at least two team members reviewed each piece of survey data.

The team achieved at least 80% agreement among coders across the entire data set after a validation process. First, the team revised and refined the definitions of 3 of the themes, and each coder took a second look at each piece of data that they previously assigned one of those three themes. Then the team assigned a third coder to review the data in any article that still did not have 80% agreement between the original two coders. The team subsequently selected the themes that any two of the three coders agreed on for those pieces of data.

The team implemented a second round of coding on the data assigned to three of the themes: Inclusion of additional groups, Treaty obligations, and rights, and Technical issues (implementation, legal). Codebooks containing 4-8 codes were developed for each of these three themes, and pairs of coders assigned codes from the appropriate set of codes to each piece of data assigned to one of these three themes in the first round. This round of coding also

required some validation. The team first divided up the long pieces of data that commented on multiple ideas and recoded the shorter pieces of data for theme and then code. Then a third coder reviewed the articles that still had less than 80% agreement among the original coders.

Below is the Codebook used for the analysis.

Round 1: Themes - 26 Articles

Theme	Description	When to use	When not to use	Example
Inclusion of additional groups	Groups of people that should be explicitly covered in the treaty.	When a group is mentioned by name.	When other missing concepts are mentioned; general comments.	"It needs to include trafficked women & girls explicitly."

<p>Treaty obligations and rights (formerly Structural/systematic concerns)</p>	<p>Concerns regarding the terms of the treaty including but not limited to state obligations, role of international organizations, and the rights and privileges granted to women and girls; concerns with legal framework of treaty; implementation at an international level.</p>	<p>When issues regarding the framework or provisions are mentioned; when definition changes regarding theoretical or substantive concerns are mentioned.</p>	<p>When practical issues regarding implementation at the state or local level are mentioned (use 'Technical issues (implementation, legal)'); when the format or written structure of the treaty is mentioned (use 'Definitions and phrasing').</p>	<p>"The main responsibility of a State is to guarantee rights; this statement 3) should be in the center of the section and developed. We are approaching States' obligations not giving guidance." "Article 3. para 7 Human races do not exist, the concept is not recognized in modern biology. As such the term should not be accepted anywhere. Rather, racist discrimination should be condemned." "Some states may object to the reference to emergency contraception in Article</p>
--	---	--	---	--

				<p>24(6). It would be better to omit this. (For example, there is no such reference in the Istanbul Convention, a relatively comprehensive treaty on violence against women.)"</p> <p>"This section needs additional provisions:</p> <p>a) prohibition of in camera hearings when a perpetrator is a law enforcement officer or a high ranking official; b) in order to prevent crimes, state should create help-lines and record all calls reporting violence against</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				girls/woman. ” “I do not find between the types of violence, economic violence and symbolic violence; Likewise, there are no measures against these two types of violence that States must implement”
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Western values/ cultural concerns</p>	<p>Concerns regarding Western values or other cultural values being represented in the treaty provisions.</p>	<p>When Western values are specifically mentioned, when any cultural concerns are mentioned (often this will involve implementation so use this code and the technical issues one)..</p>		<p>“This is written for Western developed states (and some oil rich states)- even European small states might not have the capacity to train their staff. What about getting the UN to train? I think you run the risk that states either won't sign it or will sign it, but the text will immediately end up in a drawer. I think it would help if it would be "working towards". ""1. Item 2a "This can be interpreted to mean mediating cases of sexual violence by community</p>
--	---	--	--	--

				leaders/chief /counsellors, which the Pacific is working hard to move away from.”
Comparisons with CEDAW, Istanbul Convention or other Human Rights treaties	Any mention (favorable or not) of CEDAW, Istanbul Convention, or other HR treaties comparing and contrasting with Every Woman Treaty.	When CEDAW or Istanbul Convention or another HR treaty is specifically mentioned.	When comparisons are made but no treaty is specifically mentioned.	“In accordance with CEDAW GR 35, the failure of a State party to take all appropriate measures to prevent, eradicate, and condemn acts of violence against women when its authorities know or should know of the danger of violence, or a failure to investigate, prosecute and punish, and to provide reparation to victims/survivors of such acts, provides tacit permission

				or encouragement to acts of violence against women and constitute human rights violations; the above failure by a State party should be backed up with sanctions for it to be effectively implemented ."
Patriarchy/ discrimination	Any mention of discrimination of women or patriarchy as it relates to treaty provisions.	When patriarchy is mentioned, when any form of discrimination is mentioned.	When specific groups are mentioned that may be discriminated against if not officially mentioned in the treaty (use 'Inclusion of additional groups').	"All good but earlier language of "protection" too patriarchal."

Definitions/ phrasing	Concept needs to be redefined, often based on substantive differences of opinion; change in wording needed but doesn't affect meaning as much; grammatical or stylistic changes; formatting or writing structure changes.	When any problem with definitions or wording is mentioned, grammatical or stylistic changes.	When definitions involve specifying minority or additional groups (use 'Inclusion of additional groups'); rarely, when definition revisions are required based on theoretical concerns (use 'Structural/systematic concerns').	"Article 2. para 3: Definition of violence against women and girls is too vague and does not refer to the notion of HARM..." "too long-maybe break up into distinct areas." "This section is too detailed."
--------------------------	---	--	--	---

<p>Technical issues (implementation, legal)</p>	<p>Issues dealing with implementation by a state within its own borders (particularly HOW to implement); legal and funding issues at the state or local level; changes to judicial or legal systems within a state.</p>	<p>When any problems relating to implementation, funding, laws and regulations, and other technical issues are mentioned.</p>	<p>When any technical problems are mentioned in comparison to other treaties (use 'Comparison to CEDAW/Istanbul Convention/Other HR treaty'); when legal issues at the international level are mentioned (use 'Treaty obligations and rights').</p>	<p>"In a legal system where family law and social security laws a federal jurisdiction and social security laws apply to all states, but property laws and criminal laws are state based, there is a risk of having different outcomes for victims and offenders in different states. This would seem to be inconsistent with providing a system of protection for all." "Likewise, Article 25(7) is likely to be problematic, as it would be unacceptable to states to have no such</p>
---	---	---	---	---

				offences in relation to allegations of violence against women, but to have such offences as regards other allegations (and it would be unlikely that states would abolish all offences relating to, for example, wasting police time).”
--	--	--	--	---

<p>No theme</p>	<p>Any comments about the survey itself or Every Woman Treaty; any comments that are short and are unclear what they reference; any comments on topics unrelated to the Core Platform.</p>	<p>When the comment doesn't reference anything related to the Article in question; when the comment is unclear.</p>	<p>When any other theme can be used.</p>	<p>"judgement is very late not good time" "a) They should not be dependent on such sources." "Culture, custom, religion, tradition or so-called "honor" may not be applied, invoked, or referred to under any circumstance or context to enable, justify, explain, include, or allow any form or type of harmful practice or violence against girls and women of all ages." This is such an important statement! This would be a good statement to use in</p>
-----------------	--	---	--	---

				promoting the treaty.”
--	--	--	--	------------------------

Round 2: Codes by Select Themes - 26 Articles

THEME: Inclusion of additional groups				
Code	Description	When to use	When not to use	Example
Add Another Vulnerable Group of Women or Girls	Suggests adding a certain group that is not specifically mentioned in another code (note: vulnerable groups mentioned specifically in other codes include: women with disabilities, incarcerated women, migrant women, refugee women, rural women).	When they suggest adding indigenous women, elderly, widows, women of color, LGBTI women, etc. in a simple, straightforward way.	When they want to add a non-vulnerable group (i.e. male police officers should also do that training → put this in “Non-vulnerable groups”). When the exclusion is based on the definition of gender (i.e. we need to avoid defining gender so that trans women are included → put this in “Definitions of Gender”)	“Add indigenous, vulnerable and minority women and girls in this Article.” “In fact, there should be explicit reference to trans women and girls throughout.” “You need to repeat the girls and women all ages here, as there is a lot of discrimination against older women.”

			When they want to add women with disabilities, incarcerated women, migrant women, refugee women, rural women, etc. , use women with disabilities or vulnerable state/legal situations.	
Vulnerable State/Legal Situations	Expresses concern about the exclusion of groups that are geographically, situationally or legally vulnerable.	When the concern is about how a group may be excluded during implementation due to their legal (immigration, incarceration) status or how exercising their rights may be inhibited by an existing law. When concerns are tied to a specific (usually remote) state or location (especially for	When they simply request to add a group that is not legally or geographically vulnerable (i.e. can we add indigenous people here → put this in “Add Another Vulnerable group”).	“Can we include geographical location? In the Pacific women in rural areas face extreme forms of violence and discrimination and also have significantly less or no chance at access justice and protection.” “Does not focus sufficiently on incarcerated women who

		rural or indigenous women).		also face violence.”
Women and Girls with Disabilities	Focuses on women and girls with disabilities.	When the comment suggests how to include women with disabilities or addresses challenges specific to that group.	When disabilities are not mentioned...	“There should be recognition of women and girls with disability in the first paragraph. The details in paragraph 5 relating to women and girls with disability fail to address the violence and neglect faced by women and girls on the basis of their disability. I call for there to be a specific section on women and girls with disability, not for it to be bundled in with vulnerable groups.”

<p>Phrasing</p>	<p>Suggests adding a word or definition or rewording; is concerned that states may use the language to exclude certain groups.</p> <p>Or when there is an inconsistency with somewhere else in the treaty or they suggest adding key words like intersectionality, etc.</p>	<p>When the focus is on phrasing and/or the way states may use that legal language/phrasing to manipulate their responsibilities to certain groups during implementation.</p> <p>When the comment is about rewording something, or adding a new word/definition to strengthen it.</p>	<p>When they add another group (i.e. add incarcerated women) → put this in “Vulnerable State/Legal Situations”.</p> <p>When they discuss the definition of gender, women, or girls (i.e. we should define gender here as... put this in “Definition of Gender”).</p>	<p>“In particular, we do not necessarily find it useful to mention particular groups of women and girls, as this can be used to exclude other groups (e.g. women living with HIV, LBT women). It would be appropriate to add these groups, as an alternative, although it is likely that they would simply be removed by member states.”</p> <p>“Some societies may not recognize some women as women, therefore would they be outside the scope of this Platform?”</p> <p>“Not consistent to vulnerable</p>
-----------------	---	---	--	--

				groups on page 17.”
Definition of Gender	Expresses a concern about how the way ‘women’, ‘girls’, ‘gender’, etc. are defined in the treaty and/or how this may exclude trans women, older women, and/or the LGBTQI community.	When definitions of gender, girls, or women are mentioned. When they are trying to avoid the use of those words. When they are expressing concern about how the definition of gender and related words may impact the exclusion of trans women or the LGBTQI community.	When they ask to add a group (i.e. can we add trans women here? → put in “Add Another Vulnerable Group”).	“to avoid the use of gender, say “incidents of violence against girls and women of all ages” 6)a) delete gender-sensitive” “There is also no definition of ‘women’ – should this be given in order to indicate the degree of inclusion?”

<p>Non-Vulnerable Groups</p>	<p>Wants to be more specific about non-vulnerable groups in the context of this treaty; Specifies groups for specific facets of implementation.</p>	<p>When they want to add or clarify an additional group that is not a vulnerable group or add more specific details about who should attend a training, what types of violence should be defined, what types of organizations should be involved, etc.</p>	<p>When the comment is about adding a vulnerable group (i.e. can we add indigenous women → put in “Add Another Vulnerable Group”).</p>	<p>“I don't want to object but want to offer that “women's organizations” or “women human rights defenders” be explicitly included as a civil society group/organization to include.”</p> <p>“It is unclear who will receive this training and I think the state law-enforcing forces should be mentioned here as they need this training.”</p> <p>“Number 2 should also include government bodies not all non-government and victims or survivor groups.”</p>
------------------------------	---	--	--	--

THEME: Treaty Obligations and Rights (Formerly Structural & Systemic Concerns)

Code	Description	When to use	When not to use	Example
Human Rights / Theory	Mentions Human Rights; Is based in theory; Brings up a general systemic/ structural question or problem; Suggests changes in order to “make it a treaty”; Critiques of the overall treaty; Based in Legal Theory.	When theoretical or abstract concerns about the thinking behind the provisions is mentioned; when human rights are mentioned; when a legal theory is mentioned.	When concerns about specific state obligations are mentioned (use “State Responsibilities” instead).	“While I understand the difficulty in achieving international consensus on the matter, the criminalization of same-sex practices creates a significant barrier in the reporting of violence experienced by sexual minority women. This applies both when the violence is perpetrated by intimate partners and family members or strangers.”

<p>State Responsibilities</p>	<p>Wants to add or remove something technical but substantive; concerns about what is or what is not required of states by this treaty.</p>	<p>When a specific requirement of state signatories is mentioned; when additional requirements are mentioned as needed for the treaty to function and to be legally binding.</p>	<p>When difficulties regarding implementation are mentioned (this topic will be coded in a different theme; focus on the part of the comment not related to implementation).</p> <p>When broad concerns about the treaty are mentioned (use "human rights/theory").</p>	<p>"The state also has the obligation: to raise awareness of the different forms of violence and their traumatizing nature to put in place policies that are necessary to change attitudes, gender roles and stereotypes."</p> <p>"As it currently stands, this section does not require the public health or educative models be applied to those who cause harm and we cannot expect behavior to change if we only engage with survivors. I would like to see this written explicitly. I am a subject area</p>
-------------------------------	---	--	---	--

				expert in sexualized violence prevention and education.”
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Stronger Wording</p>	<p>Wants to change, add, or remove a word or phrase in order to strengthen the legal foundation of the treaty and obligation of the SPs.</p>	<p>When a change in wording is needed to make the treaty enforceable; when state obligations listed are found to be ambiguous.</p>	<p>When a change in wording is needed to make the treaty implementable (cover this aspect when coding the technical issues theme; instead focus on another aspect of this comment that relates to this theme).</p>	<p>“I don't object to the substantive content of the Core Platform, however, I think the language 'to provide guidance and inform' is quite weak. Can we call on states rather than providing guidance? Is there stronger and varied language that can help to capture the responsibility of states parties to take more of a proactive role in preventing and eradicating GBV?”</p> <p>“If, however these are not 'how to' statements, then perhaps the word should be 'require' instead of 'inform'?”</p>
-------------------------	--	--	--	---

				<p>“I do have a suggestion with regards to the definition of torture. It would be better to add “whether physical or psychological” in order to ensure that the psychological and emotional impacts of a certain treatment or punishment are also taken into account. Therefore subsection 10 could be framed as follows: 10) Torture is defined as cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, whether physical or psychological, whether perpetrated by State or</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				non-State actors in all spheres including the public, private, domestic, and online/virtual sphere."
Agency of Survivors/Rights of women	Women's agency is mentioned, when other rights granted to women are mentioned.	When any rights or privileges or protections granted to women are mentioned; when agency is mentioned.	When a state's obligations regarding women's rights are mentioned (use "state responsibilities").	<p>"I feel like this too is missing the agency piece." "All girls and women should have the right to defend themselves." As long as that is left out, the law will never support it. And having it in, is hopefully a deterrent for anyone who is looking to systematically oppress girls and women."</p> <p>"Missing: the need to ensure processes for effective judicial intervention in all spheres for all actions of</p>

				protection (i.e. self-defense) girls and women need to take an asserting agency over their bodies and lives to stop and/or escape from perpetration of such violence.”
--	--	--	--	--

THEME: Technical issues (implementation, legal)				
Code	Description	When to use	When not to use	Example
Changes in legislation	Legislation is required in some states to implement a treaty.	When changes in the law and legal system must be made for effective implementation (whether or not the commenter thinks it will happen).	When changes to policy and procedure can be made without changing the law (use 'policy/procedure change').	<p>“I also think Article 9 (Legal Reinforcements - Penal, Civil and Administrative Provisions) should speak about the fact that ‘states should enact laws that ban involuntary sterilization’.”</p> <p>“As regards 15(5)(e), in my view states could not actually</p>

				legislate to make it compulsory for the title holder to the maternal home or marital home to allow the widow to return to live there.”
Changes to treaty language or provisions	Treaty will not be implemented as written and stronger languages and/or additional provisions are needed OR the language is too strong, and states will not agree to implement the treaty.	When the comment advocates for changes to the treaty language to ensure implementation; when the comment states that the treaty cannot be implemented as currently written; when the comment suggests additional provisions to improve implementation.	When changes to state policy or legal system are called for (use ‘changes in legislation’ or ‘policy/procedure change’ as applicable).	<p>“Note that police and law enforcers of all kinds have proper training with regard to trafficked survivors - without the training cases are unlikely to be brought and victims/witnesses unlikely to give evidence.”</p> <p>“However, governments and administrative authorities have been known to collect data in ways that minimize rates of violence against women. I would suggest an independent source be in charge of data</p>

				collection, or at least a Women’s Institution/Department or an appropriate NGO.”
Lack of resources	States lack the resources (capacity, funding, data).	When the data note specifically that states will lack some resources such as money, employees, capacity, training, know-how, or data to implement a treaty provision.	When no reasoning is mentioned for why the treaty may not be implemented.	<p>“1) Specialized units may be desirable but are not feasible in all circumstances, especially rural areas. Multi-sectoral coordination should not depend on specialized units. It should be fundamental to any criminal justice response to VAW.”</p> <p>“Poor states and small states will have a capacity issue re a body and questionnaires.”</p>

<p>Policy/procedure changes</p>	<p>States will need to change procedures in law enforcement or judicial or health sectors or other sectors, but legislation is not required.</p>	<p>When states may need to change a policy or procedure that does not require legislative approval.</p>	<p>When states will need to make changes to laws or the legal system to implement the treaty (use 'changes in legislation').</p>	<p>“b) in order to prevent crimes, the state should create help-lines and record all calls reporting violence against girls/women.”</p> <p>“While I understand data collection is necessary to hold states accountable, I am concerned about the privacy of and risk for survivors. While this section calls for confidentiality, what if a data analyst for the state is an abuser and gains information that can be used to cause harm? Are there other measures that can be put in place to ensure this doesn't happen?”</p>
---------------------------------	--	---	--	---

^[1] See Appendix I: Qualitative Findings on the 26 Articles for detailed findings.

^[2] See Appendix II: Qualitative Findings on the Final Feedback Questions for detailed findings.