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Executive Summary

Assessment overview

The objectives of this rapid assessment were twofold. First, it was a summative assignment in that it sought to document the EEA and Norway Grants’ efforts to promote gender equality (GE), reduce domestic violence (DV), and reduce gender-based violence (GBV) in the seven focus countries. Second, it was formative and forward-looking. It was formative in that it aimed to generate lessons learned based on an assessment of relevant achievements; it aimed to help improve the design, planning, organisation, and implementation of future interventions. It was also forward-looking in that it provided a context-based set of ideas on how things might be done in the future; it aimed to consider current contextual changes that may not have been reflected in the earlier programme experience.

The assessment addressed two aspects of gender – first, mainstreaming GE and promoting work-life balance (WLB), and second, addressing DV and GBV – in seven countries: Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, and Spain. Not all countries reviewed have programmes addressing both aspects supported by the EEA and Norway Grants.

The assessment focused on the following three lines of inquiry:

1. **Relevance** of the programme and projects therein.
2. **Effectiveness** of the programme and projects therein.
3. **The bilateral dimension**, focusing specifically on the execution of programme and project partnerships involving the Council of Europe (CoE) and other expert organisations (primarily based in Norway).

Approach and methodology

A team of nine evaluators, seven of whom were based in the countries studied, conducted the assignment. The assessment focused on a sample of eight cases (programmes) from each of the seven countries. Five of the eight cases in each country were studied through literature review only, while three were examined in more depth and included interview and focus group data collection. A series of online questionnaires were fielded in order to collect additional data from programme operators, project promoters, donor programme partners (DPPs), and donor project partners (dpps).

Main findings

Here we turn our attention to the main findings of this rapid assessment which focus on relevance, effectiveness, and the bilateral dimension. The highlights of these include that relevance of the interventions is high, levels of effectiveness are dependent on how project interventions are combined, and the bilateral dimension is highly valuable, but has been, at times, underutilized due to an unclear understanding of its potential. More details of this are provided below.

Relevance

Both the GE, focusing specifically on Work Life Balance (WLB) and the Gender Based Violence and Domestic Violence programmes are well aligned with relevant European and national-level priorities. All countries included in the assessment have national gender strategies and national action plans, and all are required to follow the European Union’s *Strategic Engagement for Gender Equality 2016-2019*. However, not all programme documents or programme representatives make this explicit.

The majority of interventions focus on women who have experienced discrimination and female victims of DV and GBV; these programmes clearly deal with challenging fields that require additional support in the countries reviewed. It was noted that 2/3 of project operators mentioned that they did not believe they would have been able to secure funding from other sources. From this perspective, it is clear that the efforts funded by the EEA and Norway Grants have met existing needs. However, it is important to underscore that the complexities of the fields being supported mean that the degree to which a single programme is able to address all needs of a beneficiary group is limited. Still, the contribution made by the
EEA and Norway Grants should not be overlooked or undermined. As regards the role of the EU, some countries, notably Bulgaria and Poland, were pursuing funding for activities in the field of DV/GBV, however they highlighted that shelters and other forms of direct support to victims were not included in future funding packages. Romania, too, is to gain EU support to work with Roma populations, but this will be exclusively focused on economic integration and not include any aspect of DV/GBV. Estonia and Spain noted that the main focus of the EU would be on GE generally and that efforts to mainstream the issue were underway. Mainstreaming, respondents added, endangered the targeted and specific focus that GE in these countries still requires.

It terms of programme and project design, a clear shortcoming has been the lack of consistent inclusion of all relevant stakeholders, particularly CSOs and beneficiary groups – not least because context is a key factor to ensuring success and hence working with organisations or individuals who have solid field-level experience is important to ensure that interventions are best able to respond to existing needs.

**Effectiveness**

The assessment found that the interventions that led to the most significant results in DV/GBV and GE/WLB varied. One emerging trend, however, is that success is more likely when several types of activities are combined in the same programme. More often than not, specific combinations of activities perform better than a single (type of) activity. Tied to this, while the intervention logic at the programme level was well aligned with the portfolio objectives and able to achieve its goals, at the project level, intervention logic sometimes overlooked the importance of combined interventions.

Political will and funding availability were additional key contributors to the effectiveness and sustainability of activities in both GE/WLB and GBV/DV. Still, from a technical perspective, replicating interventions is possible. There was limited visible improvement in programme operators’ capacity to work on policy issues. However, at the project level, local authorities often improved their ability to develop and implement local-level policy.

Overall the grants have highlighted the importance of addressing DV/GBV and GE issues. In some cases, the grant focused attention on DV/GBV at the national level; in others, the increase in attention happened primarily at the local level. The degree to which this new attention has led to meaningful political discussion has varied. The national actors informing discussions have not consistently capitalised on existing knowledge amongst civil society organisations (CSOs). There is no evidence that the EEA and Norway Grants funding has led to increased funding from the government.

**Bilateral dimension**

Interviewees from both DPPs and dpps noted that they were most often seen as service providers rather than partners. The DPP and dpp attributed this to a limited understanding on part of the programme operators and project promoters of what partnerships could be. This limited the gains that could be made from the DPP and dpp perspective. Despite this shortcoming, the DPPs and dpps consulted for this assessment (bar one or two exceptions) agreed that the partnership has been useful to them and that as the relationship developed, the partnership’s potential increased. Hence although the potential added value was not always capitalised on, the role played by DPPs and dpps led to new perspectives and improved results.

Both programme operators and project promoters noted that securing funding (from other donors) for partnerships of this type is virtually impossible. Therefore, they emphasised the importance and uniqueness of the EEA and Norway Grants.

**Main recommendations**

Based on its findings, the assessment team provides the following key recommendations for the EEA and Norway Grants

- The EEA and Norway Grants should support WLB as part of GE efforts, and they should support GBV/DV specifically rather than mainstream gender issues into broader funding portfolios.
There is a danger that inadequate attention would be given to WLB and GBV/DV if funding were mainstreamed.

- **Working with government structures** – as the EEA and Norway Grants do – means that funding is subject to local administrative processes, which are often time-consuming and bureaucratic. This, combined with the modalities of project promoters, means that often there are considerable delays from the time funding is secured from the EEA to the time the intervention starts. These delays can have serious implications for implementation periods; therefore, this should be taken into consideration when choosing interventions.

- **The parameters dictating how DPPs and dpps are engaged should be stricter.** This would ensure that partnerships maximise their impact not only for the interventions, but also for partners.

- **Programmes and projects should be designed with clear complementary objectives** – that is, taking into account all of the interventions within a programme to see how they build on each other. This should follow a clear and systematic assessment of what combination of activities works best where.

- **The CoE’s knowledge and capacity should be used more actively to support a better understanding of European Union priorities and to highlight links between national and European policies.**

- **All stakeholders with knowledge and experience in the field should be invited to participate in the design of projects and programmes.** This will ensure that knowledge gained is capitalised on.

- **Interventions should take a gendered approach and, whilst focusing on the needs of women, not overlook the fact that boys and men can also be victims of DV. Likewise, in the field of GE (and WLB specifically), the challenge should be seen as one that affects society as a whole, not only women.**

- **Ensure that non-predefined projects (those selected through open calls) are well aligned with the overall intervention logic and complement other programme interventions.**
1 Introduction

The objectives of this rapid assessment were twofold. First, it was a summative assignment in that it sought to document the EEA and Norway Grants’ efforts to promote gender equality (GE), particularly focusing on Work Life Balance (WLB) and reduce Domestic Violence (DV) and Gender Based Violence (GBV) in the seven focus countries. Second, it was formative and forward-looking. It was formative in that it aimed to generate lessons learned based on an assessment of relevant achievements; it aimed to help improve the design, planning, organisation, and implementation of future interventions. It was forward-looking in that it provided a context-based set of ideas on how things might be done in the future; it aimed to consider current contextual changes that may not have been reflected in the earlier programme experience.

The assessment addressed two different aspects of gender. Although intertwined, they each require individual attention as well. These are:

- Mainstreaming GE and promoting WLB.
- Addressing DV and GBV.

The assessment focused on seven countries: Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, and Spain. Importantly, not all countries reviewed have programmes in both fields supported by the EEA and Norway Grants (see table 1).

### Table 1: Programmes in each country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mainstreaming gender equality and promoting work-life balance</th>
<th>Domestic and gender-based violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Donor programme partners by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Donor programme partners (DPPs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Council of Europe (CoE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Norwegian Directorate for Children, Youth, and Family Affairs (work-life balance programme); Norwegian Directorate of Health (domestic violence/gender-based violence programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>CoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Norwegian Police Directorate and CoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Norwegian Directorate of Health and CoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Norwegian Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Officially the CoE was a DPP in Poland, but in reality, their involvement was largely focused on the project rather than programme level.

In its pursuit of both summative and formative findings, the assessment focused on three lines of inquiry. These are:

- Effectiveness
- Relevance
- Bilateral dimensions

This report includes seven chapters:

- Chapter 1 is an introduction
- Chapter 2 presents the key findings and responds to each question presented in the terms of reference. The chapter is based on data collected at the country level (literature, interviews, and questionnaire data). The team analysed the data qualitatively and quantitatively as appropriate. Findings from the qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) are also included here.
• Chapter 3 presents the general findings, and Chapter 4 the lessons learned.
• Chapter 5 focuses on recommendations.
• Chapter 6 presents brief stand-alone documents for each of the countries included in this rapid assessment. These briefs focus on key aspects related to relevance and effectiveness and also include two or three specific cases that the team felt provided important context to understand the experiences in the country in question, as well as enrich understanding of the other country experiences.

It is important to keep in mind that Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5 can be read as the main findings applicable across the seven countries, while individual subsections of chapter 6 may be read both as part of the main report or as individual stand-alone briefs. Chapter 7 provides a detailed description of the methodology.

2 General Findings

This section is divided into three main subsections covering relevance, effectiveness, and the bilateral dimension, and it looks at each of the questions proposed in the terms of reference. The findings in this section represent the collective knowledge gained through the assessment of all seven countries; where relevant, distinctions among countries are made to either highlight or illustrate specific issues. Moreover, since this rapid assessment includes two distinct, albeit complementary, portfolios – DV/GBV and GE with a focus on WLB – findings that pertain specifically to one or the other are presented separately.

2.1 Relevance

This subsection responds to five main questions presented in the terms of reference:

1. Are the programmes and projects responding to national and European priorities in the field of GE and the eradication of GBV and DV?
2. Did the grants fill a funding gap at the time they were awarded? What was the gap? What funding gaps exist currently/are likely to exist in the upcoming period (especially in relation to European Union funding)?
3. Are the programmes and projects responding to the needs of the target groups?
4. How were relevant stakeholders/target groups involved in the design of the programmes and projects? This includes DPPs and dpps.
5. How should the future programmes/projects respond to opposing movements or actors in society?

2.1.1 National and European priorities

The programmes on DV, GBV, and GE are well aligned with relevant European- and national-level priorities, as are the WLB-focused programmes. All of the examined countries have national gender strategies and national action plans. Additionally, all have to follow the European Union’s Strategic Engagement for Gender Equality 2016-2019. However, this is not made explicit by all programme documents or representatives and does not mean that all of the relevant principles are consistently implemented.

In relation to DV and GBV, the following are either mentioned in documents or were discussed during interviews as relevant to the programmes in the different countries:

• The Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence, also known as the Istanbul Convention. This document is seminal in that it establishes a common understanding of key aspects of DV.
• The CoE Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings.
The efforts below highlight the European priorities on GE relevant to WLB specifically during the funding period (2009-2014). They were mentioned either in documents or during interviews:

- **The European Commission Strategy for Equality between Women and Men 2010-2015**, which includes the following specific priority areas: increasing female labour market participation and equal economic independence; reducing the gender pay, earnings, and pension gaps and therein addressing poverty among women; and promoting equality between women and men in decision-making.

- **The European Pact for Gender Equality 2011-2020**, which stresses the importance of promoting a better WLB for women and men throughout their life as a means of enhancing equality between women and men.

- The **Europe 2020** strategy, which aims to promote capacity development and therein facilitate integration into the labour market, which was negatively affected by the financial crisis in Europe.

- **The European Employment Strategy**, which aims to increase and improve the job market throughout the European Union. One of its fundamental pillars was equal opportunity as a basic tenant to achieve the Lisbon Strategy to increase the employment rate for women and to promote equal opportunities for women and men.

- **The Council of Europe Strategy for Gender Equality 2014-2017**, which includes among its objective combating gender stereotypes and sexism in different fields.

- **An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020**, which stresses the necessity of further efforts to achieve Roma inclusion.

However, it is important to highlight that programmes aligning with European and national policies do not necessarily translate into a specific implementation mechanism. The disparity among programmes on the degree to which they understand, align with, or consistently implement European priorities can be explained by their varying levels of commitment to the issues at hand and varying understanding of what constitutes DV, GBV, GE, and WLB (as well as the dynamics that govern each). The data suggests that the programme operator is not the sole factor in aligning a programme with relevant policies; instead, one must consider the broader climate in the country.

### 2.1.2 Responding to needs: Filling gaps

The degree to which the EEA and Norway grants funded activities which were not funded by other donors or the government itself varied. At least two thirds of the interventions explored appeared to not be able to secure funding from other sources. In an effort to fill gaps, the EEA and Norway Grants responded to existing needs in three specific ways: what they funded, how they funded, and the amount they funded. These three elements are interconnected, and this means the interventions largely performed well in terms of filling existing gaps. A key concern in funding is the mainstreaming gender by European Social Funds. Respondents generally found that countries have not reached a level of maturity regarding how to treat gender issues and hence these could come to be overlooked all together if mainstreamed. It was also noted that the EU focuses primarily on GE rather than on GBV/DV.

EEA and Norway Grants largely funded activities which were not funded by others, but there are exceptions. In Poland, for example, the interventions funded by the EEA and Norway grants are part of a much larger programme that counts with government and other third party support. In this case the EEA and Norway Grants funding is part of an existing funding pool, rather than supporting efforts which gain no other support. In other cases EEA and Norway Grants have funded initiatives that were not part of a larger programme or which did not have other funding sources. Examples of this include the work with the Roma, and support for shelter facilities for victims with disabilities. While there are other efforts to work with Roma, those funded were not ones that had received other funding previously. As regards shelters, these generally have other funding opportunities, but it was consistently noted that securing funding for facilities in rural areas and facilities that were handicap accessible was difficult. In this way it would be incorrect to say that EEA and Norway Grants is funding an intervention type which is not

---

1 A newer version of this document exists and is entitled Strategic Engagement for Gender Equality 2016-2019.
otherwise funded. However, their funding package has by and large funded interventions which were complementary to existing efforts and which were hard to secure funding for. Amongst the 29 project promoter respondents to the survey, 10 noted that the project for which they received funding from the EEA and Norway Grants could be funded by other donors. That is to say that identifying other donors was not inconceivable, but not very easy either. Amongst potential donors, the EU was only sighted as a potential contributor by four project operators, two in Estonia, and two in Spain. Moreover, interviewees, with the exception of Spain and Estonia, at both the project and programme level consistently claimed to be unaware of the EU funding platform for DV/GBV.

Additional research revealed that in Bulgaria, there will be an effort to secure funding from the European Commission under the Daphne III Funding Programme. This programme focuses on protection from all forms of violence and targets children, young people and women. Likewise, in Poland, it appears that EU funding will support a wide range of activities in the GE, and WLB, as well as DV/GBV fields. However, it is not expected that the funding will cover shelters or homes for DV victims, measures to support the social inclusions of DV/GBV victims, or psychosocial support to the victims. In Romania it was found that the EU will fund efforts to support the economic inclusion of the Roma, but efforts are not to include any DV/GBV component.

Amongst the parties interviewed and surveyed in Estonia and Spain, the only two countries that mentioned the EU as a potential donor, interviewees noted that the funding would primarily focus on GE and that efforts would be mainstreamed. Concern was raised regarding mainstreaming of gender because it was highlighted that countries had not reached a sufficient understanding of what gender means. Therefore, mainstreaming could translate into overlooking the issue altogether.

Second, in terms of ‘what they fund’, the key question is not only how much funding is available, but also where it goes. Although some interventions were less expensive than others, higher expense does not necessarily mean greater necessity; therefore, even when funding is limited, the programme or project may fill an important gap. In some cases, funding was provided to initiatives that would otherwise find it difficult to secure funding – for example, in Slovakia, funding to adapt facilities to be handicap-accessible might not be a top global priority, but may be profound for victims with disabilities. Funding was also provided to initiatives that have proven successful, but lacked funding to continue – for example, in Estonia, the EEA and Norway Grants funded the production of booklets explaining legislation to the public on issues related to equal treatment, and discrimination by category (e.g., women, elderly, disabled, etc.); this effort used grant funding to apply a successful model to the GE issue specifically. Funding also enabled the expansion of work into certain geographical areas or support for specific target groups that had been underfunded or overlooked; in multiple countries, projects reached out to unlikely beneficiary groups (such as ethnic minorities or rural areas).

In addition, funding does not consider a single intervention or activity, but also how initiatives and activities interact. Indeed, combining interventions has proven highly beneficial, while in other cases not combining activities well has resulted in less-than-optimal results. Consider, for example, the need to have shelters that are adequately furnished and staffed. In Romania, shelters for victims of DV had been refurbished and furnished, although sufficient staff with adequate training was not always in place to run the shelters. In other cases, due to delays, there was not enough time left in the project cycle to open the shelters and offer services to the intended beneficiaries. Therefore, some of the shelters are now in good condition, but remain unused. While this could be seen as a missed opportunity in funding allocation, it is also true that going through the process of developing infrastructure can have a catalytic effect and serve to highlight the need for service provision.

Third, how projects and programmes were structured also impacted the degree to which efforts filled a gap. Interview respondents amongst both programme operators and project promoters highlighted the value of having DPPs and dpps support their work, but said that few if any donors other than the EEA and Norway Grants would be willing to assume the costs of a similar arrangement. To this end it is important to underscore that the EEA and Norway Grants funding is not only filling gaps in terms of what they fund,

but also in terms of how the projects are structured. Arguably the relationship between the programme operators and DPPs, and between project promoters and dpps, was not always a two-way partnership, and in many cases could be improved. However, the benefit to the beneficiary programmes is undeniable, clearly filling a gap and creating value that would last after the intervention ends.

Lastly, in terms of monetary value specifically, the assessment team found no evidence that interventions were being duplicated. However, it is possible that similar initiatives are funded through other means. Indeed, in some cases the EEA and Norway Grants funding constitutes only a small fraction of the total available funds for DV/GBV and GE; in Poland, for example, the amount of funding provided by the EEA and Norway Grants is 10% of the funding available on these themes at the national level. Only 10 (n=29) of the project operators surveyed as part of this rapid assessment had other donors for similar work, and 15 respondents said they encounter difficulties funding this type of intervention. Nine respondents noted they sometimes encounter difficulties securing funding.

2.1.3 Beneficiary needs

Broadly speaking, the programmes respond to beneficiary needs. As they focus on women who have experienced discrimination and female victims of DV and GBV, these programmes clearly deal with challenging fields that require support. There are multiple complex, intertwined needs in each field; thus, the degree to which any one programme is able to address the needs of the beneficiary group is not only a testament to the programme itself, but also to how the programme relates to other efforts and to the success of individual interventions.

None of the interventions examined were superfluous. All seven respondents to the questionnaire of programme operators considered their programmes relevant to the target population. Six said they had conducted a needs assessment prior to launching the programme, and five had evaluated how well the programme was responding to beneficiary needs. At the project level, 33 of 35 project promoters that responded to the questionnaire claimed they had done a needs assessment ahead of their intervention, and 30 said that they had evaluated how beneficiaries responded to the intervention. Thirty said their assessments revealed that their efforts responded to beneficiary needs.

The documentation reviewed and interviews conducted generally attested to the level of programme relevance, although there were varying degrees of substantiating evidence. Estonia, for example, relied heavily on gender-equality statistics to demonstrate the programme’s relevance and importance. Similarly, for DV/GBV, Estonia conducted a survey to map progress for awareness-raising; the conclusion, however, was that the programme was too short to measure progress. On the other hand, some programmes focusing on DV/GBV relied on more generic, overarching approaches to show relevance – for example, citing the need for standard processes believed to be important to the target group (e.g., increase visibility of the issue, provide training to police and the judiciary, or make shelters available).

One element noted generally, but especially in Bulgaria and Estonia, is the need to also target men as victims of GBV. The programmes and project interventions consistently overlooked this area, and individual experts highlighted this issue as prevalent and of concern. To this end, it is important to underscore that although GBV affects women disproportionately, it does not exclusively target them. Indeed, multiple key respondents mentioned GBV against men and boys as a challenge requiring attention, particularly in connection with human trafficking. Moreover, the need to look at potential and actual male perpetrators is important and was highlighted in Estonia as an issue requiring attention. Of the programmes reviewed, Poland was the only case that included male perpetrators as a target group.

---

1 The funding is proportionally even less when one considers local government budget allocations.
4 Importantly, responding to beneficiary needs does not mean that all, or even most, beneficiary needs are covered. Rather, ‘beneficiary needs’ here focuses on the degree to which the work done is relevant to the beneficiary group. Focusing on the whole range of support required would shift the focus of this report towards the state of play in each country rather than the programme in question.
5 Quantifying the proportion of male victims is difficult because domestic violence (DV) and gender-based violence (GBV) are routinely underreported, and it is generally agreed that proportionately male victims report even less than female victims do.
6 There are questions, however, on the degree to which the men-focused Polish intervention accounted for victims’ needs.
While both male and female respondents regarded individual interventions as relevant, it is important to consider that both DV/GBV and GE are complex subjects and that achieving a single objective is often tied to multiple contextual issues, as well as the implementation of complementary interventions. In some cases, single interventions are rendered irrelevant and/or ineffective because they have not been coupled with the right combination of complementary interventions or because contextual factors truncate the effort undertaken. In short, the eradication of DV/GBV requires many activities (see figures 2-6), which provides a simplified look at potential activities and combinations of activities.

WLB can be envisaged as an issue that pertains more to a society’s work culture and GE, bearing no link to DV/GBV; however, the assessment team found a direct relationship between WLB and DV/GBV. This can be illustrated by the following scenario, which is commonplace in Slovakia and illustrative of conditions found elsewhere:

A couple decides to have a child. Once the child is born, the mother is entitled to lengthy maternal leave. She has to take leave because there are not sufficient childcare facilities, so she stops earning a salary. Now the family has a child, which incurs additional expenses; in terms of income, they have one salary and a state stipend, which does not compensate for the lack of a second salary. In time, the family experiences financial restrictions due to the reduced income and an increasing lack of equity between the parents as one becomes the sole breadwinner. This imbalance can increase the likelihood of DV/GBV.

While the above scenario is hypothetical, discussions with experts in the field recounted this type of scenario as an accurate description of some of the dynamics that govern DV/GBV and the relationship it has with WLB conditions. This scenario illustrates the need to respond to DV, GBV, and GE in a multifaceted way. Unsurprisingly, some programmes and projects have been more able than others to respond to the needs of beneficiary groups in the long term.

2.1.4 Stakeholder involvement

Key project and programme stakeholders could have been involved more adeptly and inclusively in the design and development of interventions. Some interventions were not actively and sufficiently engaging with beneficiaries or CSOs with previous experience or with partner organisations.

When asked about programme design, all but one programme operator said a number of parties were involved in the process. However, none included beneficiaries in the programme design (see table 4).

Table 3: Organisations that participated in programme design (n=8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type</th>
<th>Programme operators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government authority</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society organisation</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government ministries</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent gender expert</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic institutions</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importantly, how inclusion into programme design materialised is unclear. While programme operators...
claimed to have included a variety of stakeholders, limited data existed to validate these claims; for example, in Bulgaria, there was no documented evidence to demonstrate involvement. In Poland, Estonia, Slovakia, and Portugal, some level of consultation with end users and/or expert civil society was documented. These varied from baseline survey-type efforts to consultation meetings. In Romania, it was reported that DPPs were involved in programme design, though no DPP interviewees felt they had been actively engaged in programme or project design. This is supported by the questionnaire conducted by the assessment team, which showed that only four of 17 DPP and dpp respondents felt they were in any way involved in the design of the programme or project (see section 3.3).

Although programme documents discussed engagement, interviews with subject matter experts in Poland, Romania, and Slovakia found discord between the needs of beneficiaries and the services provided. This is not to say that there was a consistent mismatch, but rather that programmes and interventions could be better able to respond to beneficiary needs through more active inclusion. Similarly, experts from both civil society and government mentioned in interviews that the knowledge gained by civil society was not adequately used in programme development. So while government efforts to become responsible on DV/GBV issues are commendable and important, the extensive knowledge gained by civil society through their many years of work in this field must not be lost.

### 2.1.5 Opposing movements

Context is an important element in securing success, although the right combination of activities can overcome the challenges presented by a hostile environment.

In two of the cases (countries) studied, there is a risk that actions supported by the government – either conservative itself or influenced by conservative groups – could oppose some of the work done in the DV/GBV field. In both cases, the programme and project documentation did not address how political changes could influence their future. In one of the countries, interview respondents specifically noted that they had not yet experienced any changes; in both countries, CSOs had started responding to the gaps in services created, or fostered by, the government’s position. It is important to also note that changes in government do not necessarily mean less funding or attention is paid to a subject, but rather changes in perspective (for example, what constitutes DV or GBV). In these types of environments, two factors deserve special mention as pertains to interventions:

- **The role of international standards:** The role played by the international community, particularly international documents and guidelines, is important. The Istanbul Convention and similar efforts can, for example, play an important role in ensuring that regression in programming slows or stops. Essentially, (external) insistence on international standards can nudge governments to actually comply with international standards and norms. This issue was highlighted numerous times during interviews with experts, who noted that while international norms and standards have this effect in all cases, difficult contexts stand to benefit even more.

- **The role of combining interventions:** The importance of how interventions are combined is also worth highlighting in the context of changing political environments. QCA analysis, based on all the projects reviewed, showed that it was possible to offset the impact of a conservative government and have successful outcomes in some cases. The findings illustrated in figures 1 and 2 suggest that existing legislation, rather than the government’s inclination, is a key factor. These findings are also aligned with interview data, which suggests that when legislation exists, the police and judiciary do not necessarily know how to implement it; therefore, the legislation has little operational value. In this context, knowing what activities need to be combined to increase police and judiciary capacity is central to success.

### 2.2 Effectiveness

---

8 None of the countries where gender equality, particularly work-life balance (WLB), interventions were implemented had a conservative-leaning government. Therefore, it is not possible to know how a shift in government would affect interventions in this field.

8 Eight projects per country were included in the QCA analysis.
This subsection responds to seven main questions presented in the terms of reference.

1. What are the most significant results on GE; what are the most significant results on the prevention/reduction of DV and GBV?
2. What types of interventions for GE were most/least effective and why? What types of interventions have the highest degree of replicability?
3. What types of interventions for the reduction/prevention of DV and GBV were most/least effective and why? What types of interventions have the highest degree of replicability?
4. Is there a coherence of intervention logic at the programme and project level?
5. To what extent did the programmes and projects contribute to building capacity to work on gender issues among the programme operators, including their capacity to work on gender/GBV at the policy level?
6. Have the grants contributed to increased political prioritisation of gender issues? Have the programmes garnered political support for additional (national) funding on gender issues?
7. What is the relationship between the programme operators’ knowledge of the gender/GBV sectors and the achievement of results? In cases where the programme operator is not well suited to operate gender programmes, what are the alternatives in terms of identifying better-suited programme operators?

### 2.2.1 Most significant results in DV/GBV and GE/WLB

The assessment found that the interventions that led to the most significant results in DV/GBV and GE/WLB varied. One emerging trend, however, is that success is more likely when several types of activities are combined. This is supported by the QCA findings presented (see figure 1-3). These clearly note that, more often than not, specific combinations of activities perform better than a single (type of) activity.

Overall for DV/GBV, the vast majority of interventions filled an existing gap in programming. It is unclear to what level these interventions achieved outcomes, however.\(^\text{10}\) Not least because the quantification of results is difficult to obtain. Opportunities to discuss project outcomes with direct beneficiaries were limited in some cases because they could not be targeted and in some cases because they could be negatively affected by the assessment questions.\(^\text{11,12}\) It is also important to underscore that the real impact of these interventions cannot yet be measured because of their short duration to date and because such measurements would require an impact assessment with a different scope than this study. Therefore, this assessment focused not on interventions’ specific impact, but rather how it was designed to achieve a particular outcomes and impacts.

Despite these shortcomings, the following outcomes stand out as most significant:

**Improved knowledge of DV/GBV through research:** In Estonia, research was important in generating a better understanding of how violence against women is understood by different service providers and other professionals. In Estonia, there were 12 different research efforts led by the project promoters and two pieces of research supported by the programme coordinator directly. These covered the following topics: health of the victims of DV/GBV, attitude and awareness of 17-20-year-old-youth on human trafficking, prostitution and working or studying abroad, attitude and awareness on sexual violence, overview of research on prevalence and attitude on sexual violence, DV through the eyes of lawyers, health

\(^{10}\) Because this was a rapid assessment and not a project or intervention evaluation, it was not possible to determine in great detail the degree to which reported successes were as positive as presented. To this end, the findings presented in this report reflect the perceptions of respondents and relevant reports.

\(^{11}\) In some cases – particularly on WLB, for which the intervention targeted large groups of the general population – designing a sampling strategy that would yield credible results requires resources far exceeding the scope of this assignment. Here, alternative mechanisms to explore the questions of outcome and impact were used, such as expert interviews with third parties not directly involved in the interventions.

\(^{12}\) In cases of DV/GBV, direct beneficiaries could not be included in the respondent group because discussions with project promoters determined that the type of questions to be asked would make individuals who already felt vulnerable feel more vulnerable and/or lead to inaccurate responses (particularly since the projects were ongoing). Therefore, other mechanisms, such as in-depth interviews with service provider staff, were used to explore outcome and impact. Similarly, expert interviews with third parties not directly involved in any of the interventions were also used to collect information on outcomes and impact.
care workers, social workers, and police officers, awareness of the assistance available to DV/GBV victims, client feedback on the assistance received through DV/GBV hotline, awareness of the population of DV/GBV, the shelters and the hotline, general awareness of the area of GBV and human trafficking. Some of these were conducted in order to feed into other efforts to support increased knowledge and awareness, while others focused on exploring the success of interventions. Overall, the respondents highlighted that this research sparked media attention on DV/GBV, which in turn led to a better-informed public. The respondents believe that the interventions led to an increased understanding of what constitutes DV/GBV.

In Bulgaria, there are very clear expectations from the research that has been conducted, which focused on prevalence and preventative measures of DV/GBV and has a specific focus on Roma populations. However, at this time, it is impossible to know how the study will be received in the long term, since it has only very recently been made public.  

In Slovakia, the studies on violence against women and domestic violence were directly tied to the activities performed by the Coordinating Methodical Centre for Gender-based and Domestic Violence. In this way it can be argued that their outcome was the development of other interventions. Overall, although the existence of research speaks to increased available knowledge, it is not possible to quantify the outcome of research outputs without extensive further work.

**Victims of DV/GBV benefitted from direct support provided:** These interventions had good results in some cases (Poland and Estonia, for example), but less in other cases (such as Romania). Significantly, providing support in the form of infrastructure and equipment/furnishings (for shelters, for example) can be significant in countries where the provision of these kind of services is very limited, but well established and sustainable. To this end, the effort funded by the EEA and Norway Grants can only complement existing efforts. In Romania, for example, one intervention that included furnishing shelters supported shelters that did not have the necessary staff; therefore they remained completely or largely unused. Infrastructure purchased with EEA and Norway Grant funds belongs to the state, and hence when the programme finishes there is no way to ensure these assets remain used as intended. This means that this kind of support is only valuable when there is an existing effective operating system.

More specific outcomes included the hosting of eight individuals at one of the shelters built (Bulgaria). Another shelter, not yet complete, is expected to host 18 people. Interviewees notes that results of other efforts are very favourable, however statistical data was not shared with the assessment team. In Estonia, 4904 women received assistance from the shelters during the project period. The hotline which was established with EEA and Norway Grants funding was called 2096 occasions (this statistic includes repeat calls). In addition, rehabilitation services to victims of sexual violence was offered on 56 occasions (this number may also include repeat clients). In Slovakia, 1893 individuals were provided with counselling services at either shelters or counselling centres. While in Poland, 1059 individual received support. Support included psychological support and parent training. In addition, a parallel project provided 120 hours of individual or group counselling to victims of domestic violence. This effort focused on providing victims with communication skills, supporting their self-steam, information on how they may respond to violence, etc. A further 500 victims too part in a variety of activities related to violence and the provision of information about violence and what it entails at psycho-educational meetings. However the number of direct beneficiaries is not known. Data collected by implementing partners suggests that participants in the meeting claim to benefit by having a better understanding of what constitutes violence.

**Increased local government awareness of DV/GBV:** Interventions also led to increased awareness at the local government level and a clearer commitment by local authorities to combat DV/GBV. In many cases, interventions targeted local communities or municipalities. The interview data suggest that small, targeted interventions in which a relationship can be built with local authorities can lead to notable outcomes. Local authorities can have considerable influence on the way community members and service providers respond to a problem; engaging local authorities can thus yield excellent outcomes when they are inspired by the programme intervention.

---

In Bulgaria increased awareness is hard to quantify, but respondents highlighted that local governments are now willing to host events, advertise for events using their own PR systems, are more supportive of the interventions, and have regularly requested additional information. Similarly, in Estonia multiple efforts to increase knowledge were conducted and these have been perceived as successful, but their effect cannot be quantified. Indeed, their successful outcome is derived solely from the perception of those interviewed. Similarly, in Slovakia the results are expected to be positive, but delays in the program mean that efforts to raise awareness at the local government will not be concluded until the first quarter of 2017.

**Increased understanding of DV/GBV amongst the Roma population:** The experience of Roma populations in Romania and Bulgaria is consistent in that ensuring their access to relevant goods and services is particularly difficult. In these two countries, where interventions focused on DV/GBV, the team found Roma populations had more difficulty than other segments of the populations in accessing services. Indeed, even discussing DV/GBV with Roma populations is difficult. Therefore interventions in both countries aimed to support Roma population in their ability to understand DV and the rights they enjoy through different forms of engagement. In Bulgaria workshops/gatherings where art was used as a way to open discussions on DV/GBV was found to be useful. This approach was regarded as an innovative way to start a dialogue that could lead to the identification and activation of mitigation mechanisms. In Bulgaria, there were 1,200 Roma beneficiaries from the EEA and Norway Grants. In Romania a more standard workshop setting was used to share information with Roma women. In addition general services for victims are to be extended to Roma populations. The number of beneficiaries in Romania, however, was unclear; the reviewed project that focused exclusively on Roma individuals targeted 300 people, but other projects that could provide support to Roma populations did not disaggregate data. In Slovakia counselling centres in remote areas with Roma populations are instructed to focus special attention on this target group, however there is no disaggregated data, and hence the exact number of Roma beneficiaries is not known. In both Romania and Bulgaria, interviewees noted that Roma who participated in the intervention appeared more open and willing to discuss DV/GBV. However this findings is subjective as there is no available data on increased reporting of DV/GBV by Roma or an increased used to services by this population group.

**Increased capacity of professionals to provide rehabilitation services to perpetrators:** Poland was the only case in which the team reviewed work with perpetrators. Working with perpetrators on behaviour changes is important, although these training minimising violence in an effort to keep the family together at all costs. Therefore, work with perpetrators – while important and often overlooked – should be extremely careful to not compromise the welfare of the victims. In Estonia, the need to look at potential and actual perpetrators was also highlighted.

As pertains to specific outputs, in Poland 170 professionals were trained on how to work with perpetrators. The trained professionals were also instructed on how to collaborate with prisons. At the moment there are 80 prisons in Poland where some form of corrective training/work with perpetrators is implemented, 20 of these collaborate with EEA and Norway Grants funded entities. There is no available information on how many perpetrators are included in the programme and how many, if any, of these have benefitted from the effort. However this has been mentioned here because training individuals to work with perpetrators and engaging prisons in the first place is regarded as a notable result, albeit a first step.

**Intervention models adopted:** Spain has invested considerably in identifying good practices and developing guidelines based on these practices that can be used to replicate small-scale interventions elsewhere in Spain. These guidelines target a diverse array of actors and activities – for example, the private sector, local government, and unions. A new intervention model, identified in Spain, included the establishment of networks that linked municipalities, the private sector and civil society. This intervention model was used during the project intervention (Equilibrio – Balance ES-04-0002). It is unclear if it will be replicated in future, however. In Portugal new intervention models have been implemented in the textile industry, as well as some municipalities that chose to implement new approaches to human resource

---

14 The same is true for WLB programmes, which also paid special attention to the Roma in Spain.
15 Examples of preventative work that focuses on men exist. In some cases, the focus has been on viewing violence as a disease or condition and placing responsibility on the perpetrator to seek help. See, for example, [http://menengage.org](http://menengage.org).
management as well as management of activities. The number of direct beneficiaries of the new efforts are not known.

**Knowledge on existing legislation/rights improved**: Providing information that makes people aware of their rights was another significant result. In Estonia, brochures highlighting issues of concern to vulnerable groups were published. The EEA and Norway Grants also funded a publication providing key information on individuals’ rights related to workplace discrimination, which was made available in Estonian public libraries. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the document has been widely used and facilitated compliance with existing legislation by improving understating of regulations.

However, the degree to which this has led to an actual improvement in knowledge is almost impossible to quantify particularly so soon after the end of the project. Indeed, noting real behavioural changes will take some time. Portugal has quantified the improved knowledge by listing the number of people who have been provided knowledge building support (70 individuals) and number of institutions where knowledge building was supported (5 institutions), the number of scientific publications which means more knowledge available (3 publications), the number of white papers published (1 white paper), and lastly, the number of companies that are now facilitating the participation of women in their boards (3 companies). However, as is the case in Estonia real changes in knowledge move beyond who has been provided with information, to what has been learned. This is not possible to determine at this time, given the limited scope of this rapid assessment.

**Improved understanding of discrimination and its implications**: Making policymakers and the general public aware of workplace discrimination’s negative implications requires a sound understanding of the realities on the ground. Therefore, research interventions are central to efforts to raise awareness. The QCA analysis found it was difficult to achieve policies that promote equitable work environments without supporting policy efforts with research? However, the chances of success are improved if policymakers have a solid understanding of why policies must change before other efforts are launched to support policy changes (such as campaigns). In short, while not essential, research can help create a favourable environment for change. However, mapping the interaction between different interventions and measuring improved understanding cannot be quantified at this stage. Indeed, the findings here are based on perceptions of achievements made. In Estonia, for example, it is assumed that there is an improved understanding because material was made available in public libraries and libraries consistently report that the material is used often. However, this information cannot be verified without a detailed survey of the actual check out of material and interviews of end users. Similarly, in Portugal and Spain, efforts to work with business and local governments are assumed to have led to an increased understanding of the implications of discrimination. The willingness of parties, companies and unions, for example, to engage in practices aimed at reducing discrimination points to an increased level of awareness. However, the actual outcome of these efforts cannot be quantified at this stage.

**Number of women entrepreneurs increased**: In Spain, strategies to improve or increase the number of female entrepreneurs appear successful. However, the long-term sustainability of these efforts once external funding is no longer available remains to be seen. It is worth mentioning that for 2016 and 2017, there is specific state funding already allocated to promote female entrepreneurship. As pertains to the actual increase in female entrepreneurship, it is possible to report that according to the Observatory of female entrepreneurship16 there were more than 650,000 female entrepreneurs in Spain in 2015. The Total Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA)17 among women has stabilized after the economic crisis which was seen as responsible for a temporary reduction. The gap between women and men entrepreneurs in Spain has decreased by 30% over the last 10 years. In 2015 women accounted for 43.8% of TEA. It should be noted that the increase in female entrepreneurs is not solely tied to the EEA and Norway Grants funded intervention.

---


17 TEA is calculated as the Percentage of population age 18-64 who are either a nascent entrepreneur or owner-manager of a new business.
The Spanish experience shows that empowering individuals in Roma populations is important. The work with the Roma in Spain focused considerably on training, which was intended to empower women and used employability not only as a means of gaining income, but also as a mechanism to support social inclusion. In total, 282 participants of the awareness training that focused on the importance of training and employment to ensure social inclusion. Of these 95 women have put in place a plan to join the labour force; 53 have received training to improve their personal competences; 44 women have received training in professional skills and 17 women have found work. Thus it can be argued that the women who have initiated their plans to join the workforce, as well as those that have received some form of capacity development, and those who found work have been empowered to do so, at least in part, by the initial awareness building activity they participated in. Clearly these statistics serve as proxies to measure empowerment, as any real measurement would have to identify indicators and survey changes in behaviour over time.

### Supporting the financial independence of DV/GBV victims

Complementary support to ensure that victims of DV/GBV are financially independent was a common gap found by the assessment team. This support can include access to housing subsidies, help with job placement, and capacity development related to accessing employment opportunities. The value of linking DV/GBV with GE interventions is evident; if victims of DV are financially independent, they are much more likely to reject the situation of violence. However, only two countries (Estonia and Spain) had both DV/GBV and WLB projects. Estonia has interventions in both portfolios, while Spain included DV as a key issue in their WLB portfolio. This meant even in cases in which individual interventions aimed to support financial independence for individual DV/GBV victims, this work is not supported by a broad programme supporting GE at a structural level. From the cases reviewed it is not possible to know if increased financial independence gained through project interventions helped reduce the likelihood of DV/GBV. However, in Slovakia, personnel at shelters noted that financial dependence was a key contributor to staying in violent environment. The same respondents added that victims of DV/GBV at shelters had few opportunities to rebuild their lives because they lacked viable avenues to secure their financial independence.

For GE/WLB interventions, the team found a number of successes, as well as some important caveats. A key issue noted consistently was how to address the complementary needs and challenges of achieving GE in the workplace, or WLB.

### Most replicable GE/WLB interventions

The assessment’s scope focused mainly on women and how to improve their opportunities in the labour market (i.e., workplaces and hiring procedures). Still, it is notable that the majority of the interventions conducted under the programme on WLB – a key element of GE – appeared to be highly effective and replicable. However, implementation requires both political will and funding.

Intervention categories that most often yielded replicable results include:

- **Curricula development and training**: This type of intervention was widely used, and in all cases – irrespective of the target audiences or format – developing materials and using these, or simply conducting capacity development efforts, led to perceived positive effects. In Spain the development of curricula included the development of specific methodologies to create and implement gender based education models. These models were geared specifically for use in rural areas. In the 2013-2014 school year these models were used in 812 educational centres and targeted a total of 66 223 pupils. Other trainings where curricula was already existing included trainings led by the Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner (EE09-0001) in Estonia. The aforementioned examples from the different countries serve to show how widely this type of interventions can be utilized and thereby highlight their potential for replicability.

- **Developing and sharing guidelines to promote replication**: Documenting best practices is important to ensuring results can be shared with potential users and replicated more broadly. Indeed, guidelines on best practices are often designed as a mechanism to expand or replicate interventions that have worked well.
In Spain, for example, guidelines on best practices were developed as a way to share experiences and expand the project interventions to other parts of the country.

**Provision of services:** Interventions such as the provision of childcare can also be easily replicated and in most cases fill an important gap in support services. Models that are successful in one location can be easily replicated, as needs are typically consistent across geographical areas when targeting the same beneficiary group. Of course, contextual factors must be considered. There are ample examples of this in the previous sections.

**Mobilisation of businesswomen:** One of the projects in Spain focused extensively on helping women access better positions in the labour market. This effort led to the establishment of an organisation that has served as a multiplier by mobilising and supporting businesswomen. The system worked as both support and a business network that multiplies its impact as membership grows. The model is interesting and clearly replicable, although the fact that it focuses almost exclusively on women may change women’s approach to work rather than how the work environment and recruitment processes can be more inclusive.

The activities listed above share common characteristics that have aided their effectiveness. The majority improved knowledge, understanding, and opportunities for responding to the GE challenge, and they appear to have been effective because they were able to appeal to the general public. In short, the activities increased awareness and, in doing so, made the need for interventions clear. Their potential for replication can be generally attributed to a clear targeting strategy in which the end beneficiary was well defined.

As regards ineffective interventions we did not find any intervention which was fruitless overall. However, the findings show that if combinations of interventions are not adequate the outcome is unlikely to be achieved, even if individual interventions are executed well. This means that it is not the intervention as such which is effective or not, but whether the combination of interventions is appropriate to a given context.

When we turn our attention to GE, and particularly to WLB interventions that aim to increase policies that promote equal work situations, we found that combining activities is also important. This is exemplified by the different project factors described below and in figure 1.18

- First, the data showed that in all countries (recent EU Member States and older ones), research interventions alone were able to influence new policy.
- However, efforts to influence new policy without research interventions were more successful in recent EU Member States than in other countries.
- Second, as the figure below shows, curriculum development alone does not lead to the increase in policies that promote equal work.

![Figure 1 Curriculum development is not sufficient for successful outcomes](image)

---

18 The figures in this chapter are based on QCA analysis. This analytical process was based on information from the 8 projects which were reviewed in each of the 7 countries (a total of 56).
Most replicable DV/GBV interventions

The majority of the interventions conducted under the programme on DV/GBV appear to be highly replicable. As with interventions on GE, political will and funding are key constraints to sustainability and replicability. Levels of effectiveness are often determined by how project interventions are combined or complement each other.

Intervention categories that most often yielded replicable results include:

- **Provision of services:** Services for victims of DV/GBV (such as shelters) that include psychological support, safe living environments, help finding employment, and other activities are important and can be replicated with limited need for adaptation; there are ample examples of their effectiveness as opportunities to enable individuals to leave abusive environments. However, their success is dependent on three key factors:
  - **Ease of access.** While services may be available and of good quality, the ease with which victims can attain the service is an important parameter for success. For example, in Romania, accessing a spot in a shelter can be a lengthy, cumbersome process that may include authorisation from local leadership; victims of DV/GBV do not receive support if they go directly to a government-run shelter.
  - **The degree to which shelters are able to provide long-term alternatives for support.** Their success depends on factors such as how long victims of violence can stay and how much support they have at the shelter. If victims of violence can only stay at shelters for limited periods of time, the shelter will not be used to escape regular episodes of DV/GBV, but rather only extreme cases such as when victims fear for their life.
  - **The need for a long-term funding commitment to ensure sustainability.** For service provision to be effective, it must be trusted, and trust requires long-term interventions. In addition, victims often require long-term support. Therefore, the sustainability of the intervention is a key to both its success and replicability. While over time the importance of these services may decrease, none of the countries with on-going DV/GBV interventions are now able to meet current demand for these types of services.

- **Data collection:** Collecting information on DV/GBV helps with the development of service provision plans, as well as highlights the magnitude of the problem (and, in doing so, highlights its importance to the general population and specific groups such as social services, the police, and the judiciary). In short, information collection is a foundation for campaigning.
- **Capacity development**: Developing capacity amongst service providers and potential victims, as was done with Roma populations in Bulgaria, are important components of DV/GBV programming. Similarly, capacity development amongst the police and judiciary is important and sometimes even a key contributor to progress. What the data show is that it is essential to have a police force and judiciary with policies, laws, and mechanisms to support victims and with knowledge on how to effectively use them. Given this, it is unsurprising that reporting increases when the policy environment is conducive (see figures 2 and 3), but more importantly, when the police and judiciary respond adeptly to the needs of victims.

- **Awareness Raising**: Efforts to educate the population on what DV/GBV is and the resources available to victims, are particularly relevant in countries where DV/GBV is still widely accepted as normal and common.

Taken from the QCA analysis, Figures 2-4 illustrate the need to do multiple things simultaneously and the importance of getting the combination of interventions right given the context.

**Figure 2: Increasing capacity amongst the police/judiciary: Combinations of interventions and outcomes**

- **Leads to** an increase in capacity on domestic and gender-based violence (DV/GBV) among police and judiciary
- **Does not lead** to an increase in capacity on DV/GBV among police and judiciary
Figure 3: Increased reporting of domestic and gender-based violence: Combinations of interventions and the resulting outcomes

Figure 4: Reduced acceptance of domestic and gender-based violence: Combinations of interventions

Leads to the increased reporting of DV/GBV

Leads to the reduced acceptance of domestic and gender-based violence (DV/GBV)

Leads to the reduced acceptance of DV/GBV

Is sufficient to reduce acceptance of DV/GBV
These findings show:

1. That context is a key determinant in deciding the combination of activities needed.
2. That activities may be important to a specific outcome even when they do not appear directly connected.

The QCA analysis findings further showed that working to decrease popular acceptance of DV/GBV requires a multi-method approach. As shown in figures 2 and 4, unfavourable legislation can be overcome through activities. Combining campaigns and capacity development can ensure a higher degree of success even when contextual factors are hostile. Additionally, even under favourable conditions, reducing activities has a negative effect. Examining the likelihood of success is important because it is also true that success may be achieved through the implementation of a single intervention, but the level of success is not the same as when interventions are combined (see also figure 5).

**Figure 5: Reducing acceptance of DV/GBV – comparison of contexts and interventions based on the projects reviewed**

Reduced acceptance of domestic and gender-based violence (DV/GBV) in 64% of projects

Reduced acceptance of DV/GBV in 15% of projects

**Figure 6: How to Increase reporting of DV/GBV in unfavourable environments**

Leads to increased domestic and gender-based violence reporting
Lastly, the needs of male victims of DV/GBV,¹⁹ as well as the victimisation of children and the elderly through DV, were generally overlooked. These issues could be incorporated into future programming. While most often women are the known targets of DV/GBV, there is evidence in the rapid-assessment countries that notable levels of DV are directed at children, the elderly, and – increasingly – men. Moreover, it is important to underscore that living in an environment in which DV is common is highly injurious even if the individual is not the direct target of the violence. This is especially true for children who witness such violence.

### 2.2.4 Coherence of intervention logic at the programme and project levels

Exploring the intervention logic of DV/GBV projects found that efforts appeared highly coherent. However, the QCA analysis revealed that the intervention logic of single interventions is often insufficient to secure a successful outcome.

Overall, the assessment team found that the programmes were consistent in their intervention logic. Individual projects responded to single or multiple outcomes and one or more outputs. However, one of the main challenges has been that the problem far exceeds available support. Therefore, even well delineated programme-level intervention logic is limited in scope (for example, related to more thorough attention for perpetrators and for victims of DV/GBV such as the elderly, girls, and boys).

In the majority of cases, the intervention logic was highly linear and predictable – for example, the presumption that capacity development would build capacity and in turn improve service provision. However, the team found that intervention logic not only pertains to individual projects and activities, but must also be cognisant of contextual issues and other interventions to improve the likelihood of success. Numerous examples of this are detailed in earlier sections presenting the QCA analysis findings (see figures 2 to 6). Hence, it is important for interventions to be far more nuanced in their intervention logic and explore how interventions are influenced by other activities or conditions on the ground.

Some individual projects had challenges regarding intervention logic (see chapter 3). Projects that focused on providing materials, for example, tended to be overly simplistic – the presumption being that furnishing shelters, for example, would lead to more shelter space for victims. The team found that this kind of support requires an intervention logic that accounts for the long-term sustainability of efforts and supports existing efforts that work well – for example, upgrading existing locations or expanding services. A successful example was found in Slovakia, where a shelter was provided with infrastructural support to build and furnish rooms for clients with disabilities. A less-successful intervention was found in Romania, where the furnished shelters did not have the staff or budget to become operational.

Another key factor in determining the accuracy of the intervention logic is timing. In fact, timing was one of the main complaints amongst project promoters and other actors, such as dpps. The team often found that programme operators had complex and cumbersome administrative mechanisms, which seriously hampered the timely delivery of funding and the provision of support to project promoters. This in turn delayed (no-cost extension) activities or led to their non-completion.

Open calls for proposal occurred once programmes were approved. Urgency to start with implementation, and time used in calling tenders and general administration of the grant prior to publicising open calls, can lead to short review periods. Short review periods can lead to the approval of projects which are not fully aligned with the programmes intervention logic.

**GE projects focused on WLB tended to have a clear and coherent intervention logic, although open calls for project interventions limited programmes’ ability to ensure that individual interventions were fully complementary in support of the programme intervention logic. Predefined projects support consistency within a programme and hence contribute to stronger programme-level intervention logic.**

**GE projects focused on WLB tended to be linear; hence there is a chance that interventions do not take adequate account of the context in which they operate.²⁰** Some of the programme-level intervention logic was more detailed

---

¹⁹ Each country has different definitions of GBV and DV, and hence other fields may cover violence against men; it is mentioned here because most support in this sector excludes men.

²⁰ Although some QCA analysis was done for the WLB portfolio, the number of cases was limited and many had to be excluded because delays in implementation meant that outcomes were not yet known. Therefore, while there were indications that activities needed to be cognizant of contextual factors and might benefit from complementarity among projects, further research would be necessary to establish this with more certainty.
than others, with Spain and Estonia having a higher degree of clarity throughout than Portugal. Additionally, it is important to note the importance of predefined projects to promote consistency and thus strengthen programme-level intervention logic. The Portuguese experience highlights the importance of predefined projects; they anchored the intervention at the programme level and thus ensured that even if other projects did not fully support the programme-level intervention logic, it did not greatly affect the overall programme. Efforts have been made to confront the challenges faced by funding projects that were not predefined – for example, programme operators encouraging collaboration between project promoters, as well as providing support to project applicants during the application process (as done in Estonia). However, it is difficult to ensure that all interventions are adequately aligned with the programme logic, in addition to their project logic, when calls for proposals are open. In short how open calls are managed, and the degree to which they are strict in their enforcement of aligning with the programme level intervention logic varied. Therefore there were some projects which were only loosely aligned with the overall programme level intervention logic, while others were clear drivers of the intervention logic.

2.2.5 Changes in capacity to work on policy development amongst programme operators

There was limited visible improvement to programme operators’ capacity to work on policy issues. However, at the project level, local authorities often improved their ability to develop and implement local-level policy.

It is important to underscore that in some of the countries examined (Estonia, for example) policy progress was made, although it is impossible to determine the extent to which the EEA and Norway Grants contributed because many other efforts were taking place at the same time. Moreover, there are questions regarding the ability of interventions such as those funded by the EEA and Norway Grants to impact policy-level decisions given that the programme cycle is relatively short and that interventions are often delayed due to complex and cumbersome administrative procedures required by the programme operators.

In some countries (such as Bulgaria and Portugal), policy progress that resulted from the EEA and Norway Grants-funded interventions was visible at the local level, but not at the national level. In Slovakia, progress was visible both at the local level and at the national level, with the Coordinating Methodical Centre incorporated into the national action plan, demonstrating national-level policy changes. This was mainly manifested in municipal government-driven policies, which may at some point be replicated in other areas and lead to the development of national policies. Similarly efforts in Spain and Estonia has both local and national level impact.

Additionally, the CoE’s influence on policy was notable. While it is not possible to attribute its influence directly to the programmes, there is some evidence to suggest that the CoE presence as DPP or dpp influenced national governments in terms of their efforts to support international legislation. In other words, a side effect of the interventions having the CoE on hand promoted the drafting of policy supporting compliance with the Istanbul Convention.

While it is difficult to demonstrate they influence policy, the programmes did call attention to DV/GBV and GE-related issues. In Spain, for example, there were multiple claims in documents and interviews that the programme had been a key component in highlighting and supporting the development of Spanish policy on GE issues. Similarly, in other countries, DV/GBV interventions gained considerable recognition and media attention, leading to greater general awareness, at least in part due to the EEA and Norway Grants-funded interventions. Therefore, although they alone may not lead to changes in policy, the programmes have played a considerable role in changing local dynamics and perspectives. Tied to this, it is important to highlight that policy changes are difficult to attain.

2.2.6 Grants and political prioritisation/political support

The grants have highlighted the importance of addressing DV/GBV and GE issues. In some cases, this has been at the national level; in others, it has only occurred at the local level. The degree to which this new attention has led to meaningful political discussion has varied. The national actors informing discussions have not consistently capitalised on existing knowledge amongst CSOs. There is no evidence that the EEA and Norway Grants funding has led to increased funding from the government.

There are a number of examples of cases in which the interventions were able to highlight the problem at the local level – in Bulgaria and Spain, for example – because interventions targeted specific municipalities and hence visibility was limited to certain geographical areas. However, in some cases (e.g., Spain), there has been discussion about replicating the intervention model in other municipalities or even around the country.
One of the challenges with having a meaningful political discussion at the national level has been lack of adequate knowledge by politicians. In Estonia, for example, the level of knowledge and political will amongst politicians was found to be insufficient to ensure meaningful change. In Slovakia, experts said that the government is not using the knowledge amassed by CSOs. Similarly, in Romania, efforts by CSOs to engage in a discussion at the policy or even operational level with government actors have proven difficult. In some cases, this is directly due to lack of knowledge amongst government counterparts. In short, government entities do not realise the importance of the issue or perhaps do not want to engage and then appear less knowledgeable than civil society actors. This is not to say that programme operators do not have adequate knowledge, but rather that often knowledge is limited to the department or individuals involved in the programme. Still, there were cases (e.g., Portugal) in which project interventions were specifically designed to inform policy development. There were also cases (e.g., Estonia) in which political will and knowledge existed but were questioned by implementers and researchers on the ground; however, the likelihood of a sound discussion was much greater since the issues were now firmly on the agenda (see footnote 30).

Moreover, as discussed in section 3.2.5, CoE has also influenced policy changes and dialogue. CoE’s direct engagement may not have included explicit support for policy development, but it can be understood as a positive side effect resulting from its engagement as DPP or dpp. CoE staff generally agreed that programme operators and project promoters capitalised on CoE’s expansive subject matter expertise. The importance of this role played by the CoE – particularly its support for implementation of the Istanbul Convention – was noted (for example) in Poland, where the degree of attention and policy-level importance placed on gender issues declined following the change in government. Indeed, interventions are now packaged with a much stronger family than gender perspective, which means that efforts can be tilted towards ensuring the family stays together rather than ensuring that no one in the family is victimised. In this context, being able to consistently highlight the value of the Istanbul Convention and the responsibilities of the state towards its implementation is even more important.

Sustainability is a challenge, however. Many of the interventions require long-term funding to achieve results such as changes in attitudes and establishing a mechanism to ensure consistent capacity development. In some cases, the reliance on the EEA and Norway Grants is limited (as in Poland), while in others it is substantial (as in Portugal and Spain). While Spain has been able to secure additional funding now that the EEA and Norway Grants will no longer fund this programme, ensuring sustainability may still be difficult. In Estonia some interventions also suffered funding cuts. For example, the WLB programme included an effort funding legal support to victims of workplace discrimination; although in Estonia political support is high for this kind of intervention, the position(s) of lawyers to support victims have not been funded and there is no expectation that they will be in the near future.

In some countries funding has increased, as is the case in Poland. This is attributed to their commitment to the Istanbul Convention, not directly attributable to the funding from EEA and Norway Grants. In other cases, such as Estonia, DV and GBV are more firmly included in policy documents, but it is not clear if this will lead to increased funding or not or the degree to which these inclusions can be attributed to the EEA and Norway Grants. In none of the countries included in this rapid assessment there was any evidence that the EEA and Norway Grants contribution led to increased financial commitments by the national government.

2.2.7 Programme operators' suitability and knowledge of relevant gender issues

Levels of knowledge and skill amongst programme operators varied from country to country, with most having a basic, sufficient level of understanding. Most damaging to the intervention has been the highly bureaucratic nature of the programme operator institutions. This has had negative impacts on the implementation of activities and in the relationship with DPPs and dpps.

Complex, cumbersome administrative systems – including financial, administrative, and procedural issues – often led to delays in project implementation. At the extreme, project promoters, DPPs, and dpps noted that their ability to conduct the projects was severely hampered because accessing funds was a complex, lengthy process. In some

21 The Annual Report 2015 lists a number of efforts that show progress made in reporting and prioritization on DV; however, these views do not coincide with that of the head of the Estonian Women’s Shelters Union, who clearly noted that in Estonia DV and violence against women have low political priority. The union head further note that while politicians “like to talk about [DV/GBV]... they still do not have in-depth understanding.” (Estonian Women’s Shelters Union, 2016c: 13). In its report, the union further substantiates its position. Also, the Estonian Institute for Open Society has no evidence that political prioritisation had actually increased beyond giving public speeches on the topic. The Estonian Sexual Health Association also struggled significantly to ensure follow-up funding for its activities, lobbying the Ministry of Social Affairs and at least one political party (Social Democrats) extensively.
of the countries, securing funds to conduct activities took many months.

The complexity of the administrative process included how financial reporting was conducted. In some cases, even though budgets were approved, implementing partners were expected to show proof of expenditure before they could access donor funds. This is particular problematic since in some cases project promoters do not have the necessary liquidity to charge for work conducted and require operational advances. Similarly, DPPs and dpps have their own financial systems that interviewees said could lead to administrative challenges, as programme operators had difficulty complying with DPP and dpp needs. Delays in funding allocation were problematic even when project promoters were not expected to start working before receiving funds because delays impacted the number of activities that could be conducted and thus impact.

In terms of subject matter expertise, some programme operators are better versed on the issues than others, but generally speaking none stood out as completely unable to perform their basic duties. In Slovakia, for example, finances are handled separately from programme activities and the programme operator is aware of its limitations and defers to project promoters for any subject matter question. In other cases, such as Spain, the programme operator had a clear mandate that is totally aligned with the programme objectives.

In most cases, programme operators are institutions that have a much broader mandate than what is covered by these interventions, and that the number of staff focused on DV/GBV and/or GE within the institutions is limited. Moreover, there is no evidence to suggest that programme implementation led to increased awareness of the subject matter within the institutions.

2.3 Bilateral dimension

This subsection responds to five main questions presented in the terms of reference. These are:

1. What is the extent and nature of partnerships between project promoters/programme operators and DPPs/dpps?
2. What has been the added value of DPPs and dpps, including the CoE?
3. What, if any, interest is there among partners in continuing cooperation following the completion of the programmes/projects?
4. Has bilateral cooperation had wider effects beyond the programme and project partnerships?
5. Has the cooperation between programme operators and DPPs provided the programmes with added value?
   What value?

2.3.1 Extent and nature of partnerships

Most often, partnerships were service provision-type relationships rather than actual partnerships that sought to benefit both parties throughout the engagement.

Two types of partnerships used in the programme/project design were included in this rapid assessment: programme-level partners (DPPs) and project-level partners (dpps). A single organisation may be both a DPP and a dpp (e.g., the CoE). Partnerships generally involve an organisation with expertise in a specific field relevant to the programme or project in question. There are two main categories of partners: the CoE on one hand, and on the other agencies, institutions, or organisations from the donor countries (either CSOs or government actors, such as the police or ministerial bodies).

The CoE has a standing relationship with the EEA and Norway Grants and can be a DPP, a dpp, or both as agreed with the donor countries. The other DPPs are mostly public bodies with national mandates within the field and with extensive national experience. The DPPs are designated by the donor countries. Regarding the DPPs and dpps, other than the CoE, the partner organisation may be approached directly by either the programme or the project. This contact may be a result of personal knowledge or identification from a list provided by the DPP to the programme operator.

DPPs and dpps engage in a variety of activities, as noted in chart 1. Eighteen (n=31) project promoters across the seven countries who responded to the online questionnaire noted that their dpp had been part of the project’s design phase. However, interviewed DPP and dpp representatives, with few exceptions, consistently noted that their level of involvement in the design phase, of the overall programme or project respectively, had been limited. Crucially, this meant that DPPs and dpps were in some cases not able to adequately share their information and experience; the CoE experienced this in some cases. Overall, this has created some serious implications on the partnerships’ value-add for all parties involved (see section 3.3.2).
In cases in which the partner organisation was more intimately involved with the project or programme, the relationship between the programme operator or project promoter and the respective partner had been long-standing and trust had been established.

Programme operators and project promoters generally did not understand the degree to which partnerships could be avenues to share knowledge, strengthen interventions, and expand their perspective on DV/GBV and GE. They often saw partnerships as a way of securing funding rather than as a mechanism to strengthen the intervention or their general understanding of the field. This does not mean they thought they would get more funding, but rather the consensus was that having a partner increased the likelihood of getting funded. While this is not the case across the board – and there were some clear successes and real engagement, such as with the Norwegian Health Directorate in Estonia – the vast majority appeared less able to capitalise on the partnership opportunity.22

Partners consistently credited the lack of clear and thorough engagement by DPPs and dpps in programme design to the lax regulations by the EEA and Norway Grants. With the exception of the CoE, representatives from partner organisations said during interviews that their only engagement during the proposal phase was a letter of agreement. In some cases, this letter was drafted before the partner organisation saw the project proposal or budget. Indeed, in multiple cases, it was not until the project or programme was approved that representatives from the dpps were provided with any information regarding what their engagement would entail. In some cases, the funding allocation was so limited that little engagement was possible, and multiple dpps noted that they had difficulty accessing information about the project. This limited dpps’ sense of ownership.

Another challenge was securing project partners in the first place. Multiple project promoter respondents across the seven countries mentioned that they often had difficulties finding a dpp because multiple projects were seeking the support of the same entities in Norway or elsewhere.

However, despite the aforementioned challenges, overall experiences were not negative. Most DPP and dpp respondents noted multiple areas that could be improved (see the lessons learned in section 4), and most felt that their involvement – however limited – was positive and added value (see sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.5).

2.3.2 Added value of project partners

Overall the role played by DPPs and dpps led to new perspectives and improved results, although the potential for value-add was often not sufficiently capitalised on. Although not a precondition, knowing each other and building relationships were noted as promoting success. Above all, a transparent and inclusive approach to the partnership was consistently seen as fundamental to success.

In terms of programme partners’ value-add, 16 (n=17) dpp and DPP questionnaire respondents felt DPP and dpp had added value to the intervention. Eleven felt that their added value was manifested through new perspectives, while six said that they had improved results. Amongst project promoters, 20 (n=31) said the participation of a partner organisation improved project outcomes. However, only four respondents noted that the partner was able to contribute new perspectives. Amongst programme operators, three of three respondents felt that the partnerships added value, and all noted that this value was in the provision of new perspectives.

The previous section highlighted a number of issues with how partnerships

22 It is not possible to confirm this finding across the board since the response rate to the online questionnaire and interviews was limited (see annex 2). However, the consistency of responses – meaning that the same challenges were described by respondents from different institutions and in different countries – makes it likely that a wider respondent pool would have generated the same results.
were understood and conceived. However, as the questionnaire responses and interviews show, partnerships were viewed as having positive outcomes despite the challenges. Therefore, the question is not if a partnership can have a positive impact, but rather the extent to which this impact can be capitalised on or maximised. Interview respondents consistently felt that their opportunities were limited in terms of actively supporting programme and project development or the fields of DV/GBV and GE more broadly.

In short, much more could have been accomplished by programme- and project-level partnerships if these had been envisaged differently from the start. Generally, DPP and dpp interviewees felt that the initial partnership, even if not fully successful, was a good foundation to develop a better relationship and partnership in the future. This approach is likely to be a workable one since in almost all cases in which partnerships were positive and included both entities’ clear engagement, the partners previously knew each other. This suggests that once trust is built, there is a greater likelihood of fully engaged partnerships that capitalise on the knowledge and skills of all involved.

The partnerships’ overall success should not obscure the cases that appear to have not worked at all. Such cases, although seemingly few, can identify key lessons learned. Examples of cases in which partnerships proved unsuccessful often involved limited funding available to partners (and thus limited involvement). Overall, though, the most pressing factors related to failure for both DPPs and dpps were:

- A lack of transparency regarding what was being done and by whom;
- Unclear plans; and
- Unrealistic expectations of what could be accomplished by local partners.

In some cases, efforts to reduce the costs of DPPs and dpps led to initially limiting their activities, only to later find that the local actors could not execute the task or activity on their own.

A final issue worth mentioning is the development of materials by dpps. It is clear that in cases where curricula or training materials were included in the intervention plan, such materials were needed; however, the local capacity to develop them was often limited. The CoE was involved in the development of training materials in a number of cases. However, often at the national level, the capacity or will to fine-tune the materials to local needs was absent. Additionally, materials were not necessarily used even in cases in which they were designed by CoE experts who knew the context well and could develop materials relevant to the local situation. Some of the interviewees involved in the development of materials had serious doubts about their subsequent use. While this was not often the case, it does call attention to the need to follow up on interventions.

### 2.3.3 Potential for continuing partnerships

Partnerships, despite their shortcomings, have real potential and hence should be built upon. Opportunities to secure the funding from other donors for partnerships appear limited, however.

When asked if they would consider engaging in future collaborations, seven (n=17) DPP and dpp questionnaire respondents noted that future collaboration was very likely; eight noted it was somewhat likely, and two said they would not engage with the same partner again. This suggests that amongst DPPs and dpps, despite the challenges, the overall experience was a positive one. Amongst project promoters, 21 (n=37) said future partnership was very likely; seven said it was somewhat likely, and the remainder did not respond to the question. None responded that they would not engage again.

Amongst DPP and dpp respondents who said they intend to collaborate in future, the vast majority (15) said that they would like to collaborate within the EEA and Norway Grants. Four said they would consider securing funding from another donor. Amongst project promoters, all those who responded to the question (n=18) noted that they would want to collaborate with funding from the same donor. Amongst programme operators, three noted that they would pursue funding from the same donor, while one said that funding from other donors would be pursued as well. Interviews with programme operators and project promoters highlighted that the costs associated with including a DPP or dpp were very high, particularly when involving Norwegian partners. Therefore, they felt that few donors would be willing to cover the costs incurred. The EEA and Norway Grants were singled out as willing.

---

22 Data from DPPs and dpps is limited, as the response rate was limited (see annex 2); therefore, it is not appropriate to identify key partners, as this would suggest that those unnamed have generated better results. Still, the finding is important because it highlight challenges that may be experienced by other partnerships.

24 Due to low response by DPPs to the survey, the data was combined.
and able to take on the costs incurred by including partnerships.

Amongst DPPs and dpps, the principal reason provided for interest in continued collaboration was the improvement of the programme. However, project promoters were evenly divided among improving the project, enabling funding, and enabling access to larger amounts of funding. Amongst programme operators, three (n=3) respondents said it opened up funding opportunities. Enabling larger projects, improving the work overall, and improving the programme specifically were only cited by one respondent each among the groups.

The emphasis on partnerships as a mechanism to access more funding – either for the same intervention in the future or for expanded interventions – confirms that partnerships are beneficial when trying to secure funding. DPP and dpp respondents consistently highlighted the link that programme operators and project promoters made in terms of engaging partners and securing funding. However, they also noted that as partnerships become more solid and include wider engagement between parties, the value to the programme, project, and overall field becomes more apparent. The CoE noted, for example, that often their wide knowledge base was not capitalised upon, but that they had the potential to influence the sector deeply and that in cases where partnerships worked better, their value was both understood and highly regarded by programme operators and project promoters.

### 2.3.4 Wider impact of collaboration

Successful partnerships can have clear implications for how the DV/GBV and GE fields develop in each country. As noted earlier, a number of partnerships have been limited in their perspective, as they have been directly tied to specific activities. However, in some cases, once the partnership was initiated, those involved identified additional areas in which the DPP or dpp could help the overall project. Interviews with representatives from DPPs and dpps suggest that expanding activities was most often possible when partnering with the CoE. There were cases, for example, in which programme operators and/or project promoters saw their ability to conduct activities as greater than what proved possible. In such cases, CoE experts stepped in to take on a wider range of responsibilities than originally envisaged. Curriculum development, for example, often started with the project promoters expecting that they would take a leading role and ended with them having a supporting role (if any active role at all). Expansion of activities with other partners was very limited because any expansion had considerable funding implications, which were not accounted for.

The most notable broader impact relates to structural changes resulting from the partnerships. This involves two main models. The first is when a particular intervention model is shared by a dpp or DPP, implemented in a pilot form, and later becomes streamlined as part of the new way of working within the country. This is illustrated by the Estonia case, in which the ‘sexual assault unit’ model used in Norway has been implemented in four hospitals in Estonia. Over time, the success of this intervention could lead to wider use of the model across the country, as in Norway. The introduction of this model is a direct result of collaboration with a Norwegian partner.

A second model relates specifically to the CoE. The CoE, unlike the majority of other partners, has a wide range of experience and subject matter expertise from multiple contexts. It also has a mandate to support the implementation of relevant legal agreements such as the Istanbul Convention. Therefore, it has considerable ability to influence the DV/GBV and GE arenas. If its engagement as a partner is understood as a resource rather than only a service provider, the CoE is in a position to support not only individual activities, but also how the whole sector develops. While the team cannot assume that CoE involvement as a DPP or dpp has led to a wider understanding or compliance with the Istanbul Convention, it is likely that its involvement has, in some cases, been able to influence local understanding and perspectives on its key elements. Arguably, this has led to a better understanding of the convention, including how it can and should be implemented.

### 2.3.5 Added value of cooperation

Improved knowledge and trust amongst the organisations involved in the partnership is the principal added value of cooperation.

In terms of the partnership’s value to the organisations involved, DPPs and dpps felt that improved knowledge within the partner organisation, improved trust between organisations and improved institutional knowledge were the most common manifestations of value (see chart 2). A similar trend is visible amongst programme operators and project promoters (see chart 3), in which improved trust between partners and improved

---

25 This model includes providing services to victims of sexual assault that are centralised and coordinated. This allows the victim to receive care (psychological and physical), as well as respond to the investigative and legal implications of the assault, in one central place.
knowledge within their own organisation were cited by the majority of respondents as the key value to themselves as organisations emerging from the partnerships. The questionnaires show programme operators and project promoters felt they experienced greater benefit, although DPPs and dpps also saw added value from the partnerships.

Chart 2: Institutional value gained from partnership (according to donor programme partners/donor project partners) (Count number of respondents. Multiple responses possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>improved my institutional knowledge</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved knowledge of the partner</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved design of other projects</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved trust between organizations</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 3: Institutional value gained from donor programme partners/donor project partners (according to programme operators and project promoters) (Count number of respondents. Multiple responses possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>improved my institutional knowledge</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved knowledge of the partner</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved design of other projects</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved trust between organizations</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One important benefit from the partnerships highlighted by all questionnaire respondents was improved trust. This is of particular importance because the assessment found that partners that had an existing relationship had a better chance of maximising the benefits of partnership. For partners that did not have an existing relationship prior to the interventions in this funding cycle, the chances for improved outcomes resulting from partnership is increased for the next cycle. This generally means that there is value to not switching partners and thus solidifying relationships over time.
## General Conclusions

This section includes all of the findings identified throughout the rapid assessment (which are highlighted in section 2), supplementing them with relevant conclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Emerging conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>The programmes on DV, GBV, and GE are well aligned with relevant European- and national-level priorities, as are the WLB-focused programmes. All of the examined countries have national gender strategies and national action plans. Additionally, all have to follow the European Union’s <em>Strategic Engagement for Gender Equality 2016-2019</em>. However, this is not made explicit by all programme documents or representatives and does not mean that all of the relevant principles are consistently implemented.</td>
<td>In some countries, knowledge of all relevant documents at the local level is inconsistent. Aligning efforts with relevant national and European priorities is important in calling attention to the relevant issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>The degree to which the EEA and Norway grants funded activities which were not funded by other donors or the government itself varied. At least two thirds of the interventions explored appeared to not be able to secure funding from other sources. In an effort to fill gaps, the EEA and Norway Grants responded to existing needs in three specific ways: what they funded, how they funded, and the amount they funded. These three elements are interconnected, and this means the interventions largely performed well in terms of filling existing gaps. A key concern in funding is the mainstreaming gender by European Social Funds. Respondents generally found that countries have not reached a level of maturity regarding how to treat gender issues and hence these could come to be overlooked all together if mainstreamed. It was also noted that the EU focuses primarily on GE rather than on GBV/DV.</td>
<td>It is important that the support provided is not considered in isolation, but rather is envisaged as one of multiple efforts in the sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Broadly speaking, the programmes respond to beneficiary needs. As they focus on women who have experienced discrimination and female victims of DV and GBV, these programmes clearly deal with challenging fields that require support. There are multiple complex, intertwined needs in each field; thus, the degree to which any one programme is able to address the needs of the beneficiary group is not only a testament to the programme itself, but also to how the programme relates to other efforts and to the success of individual interventions.</td>
<td>It is essential to better understand how different interventions relate to each other and to their context. A more in-depth, nuanced understanding of these dynamics will be central to securing broader success in the long term. Additionally, it will be relevant to more widely explore the different needs of a broader beneficiary group (i.e., also including men, older adults, and children who are victims of DV/GBV). This may at times require that services expand beyond the confines of the national definition of what constitutes DV/GBV. Indeed, a wider understanding of discrimination will also be important. While campaigns targeting whole populations have done this, by and large the focus has been on women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>Key project and programme stakeholders could have been involved more adeptly and inclusively in the design and development of interventions. Some interventions</td>
<td>There is considerable knowledge available on DV/GBV and WLB; however, it is not always utilised to its full capacity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were not actively and sufficiently engaging with beneficiaries or CSOs with previous experience or with partner organisations.

| 2.1.5 | Context is an important element in securing success, although the right combination of activities can overcome the challenges presented by a hostile environment. | Unfavourable contextual conditions should not be seen as predetermining a bad outcome. However, difficult conditions mean that more attention must be paid to how interventions are combined and complemented. |
| 2.2.1 | The assessment found that the interventions that led to the most significant results in DV/GBV and GE/WLB varied. One emerging trend, however, is that success is more likely when several types of activities are combined. This is supported by the QCA findings presented in figures 2-6. These clearly note that, more often than not, specific combinations of activities perform better than a single (type of) activity. | Combining and complementing activities is not only useful when contextual environments are unfavourable. Indeed, the linear cause-and-effect presumption that many projects make is incorrect, as numerous interventions appear to only be successful when combined with what can sometimes appear to be unrelated interventions. |
| 2.2.2 | The assessment’s scope focused mainly on women and how to improve their opportunities in the labour market (i.e., workplaces and hiring procedures). Still, it is notable that the majority of the interventions conducted under the programme on WLB – a key element of GE – appeared to be highly effective and replicable. However, implementation requires both political will and funding. | In the long term, efforts to improve GE will depend on a clear political position by individual governments that is backed by adequate funding. Funding from the EEA and Norway Grants could highlight the importance and value of equitable work environments. |
| 2.2.3 | The majority of the interventions conducted under the programme on DV/GBV appear to be highly replicable. As with interventions on GE, political will and funding are key constraints to sustainability and replicability. Levels of effectiveness are often determined by how project interventions are combined or complement each other. | See 3.2.2. |
| 2.2.4 | Exploring the intervention logic of DV/GBV projects found that efforts appeared highly coherent. However, the QCA analysis revealed that the intervention logic of single interventions is often insufficient to secure a successful outcome. GE projects focused on WLB tended to have a clear and coherent intervention logic, although open calls for project interventions limited programmes’ ability to ensure that individual interventions were fully complementary in support of the programme intervention logic. Predefined projects support consistency within a programme and hence contribute to stronger programme-level intervention logic. | The process of developing intervention logic must include a far better understanding of factors external to the individual intervention. This should include both context and the impact of other interventions. While there is value in having a wide range of projects, and there is a good reason why not all projects should be predefined, programme operators need to invest considerable energy into ensuring that the projects that are not predefined align well with the overall intervention logic of the programme. |
| 2.2.5 | There was limited visible improvement to programme operators’ capacity to work on policy issues. However, at the project level, local authorities often improved their ability to develop and implement local-level policy. | Generally, promoting policy changes is complex. However, supporting policy changes at the local level is far more accessible than national efforts. These opportunities should not be overlooked, as they can be catalytic in supporting wider-reaching policy changes later on. |
| 2.2.6 | The grants have highlighted the importance of addressing DV/GBV and GE issues. In some cases, this | In most cases, a crucial foundation to change is recognising the importance of |
has been at the national level; in others, it has only occurred at the local level. The degree to which this new attention has led to meaningful political discussion has varied. The national actors informing discussions have not consistently capitalised on existing knowledge amongst CSOs. There is no evidence that the EEA and Norway Grants funding has led to increased funding from the government.

**2.2.7** Levels of knowledge and skill amongst programme operators varied from country to country, with most having a basic, sufficient level of understanding. Most damaging to the intervention has been the highly bureaucratic nature of the programme operator institutions. This has had negative impacts on the implementation of activities and in the relationship with DPPs and dpps.

The bureaucracy faced by project promoters, DPPs, and dpps has often been crippling in terms of timely implementation of projects. This is an issue that, combined with the short timeframe for projects, can (and has, at times) lead to negative outcomes because projects were not completed.

**2.3.1** Most often, partnerships were service provision-type relationships rather than actual partnerships that sought to benefit both parties throughout the engagement. Programme operators and project promoters generally did not understand the degree to which partnerships could be avenues to share knowledge, strengthen interventions, and expand their perspective on DV/GBV and GE.

There is a limited understanding amongst programme operators, project promoters, and dpps about what constitutes a partnership and how partnerships can be beneficial to all parties involved. Service provision by DPPs and dpps was useful in most cases, but it fell short of what could have been accomplished.

**2.3.2** Overall the role played by DPPs and dpps led to new perspectives and improved results, although the potential for value-add was often not sufficiently capitalised on. Although not a precondition, knowing each other and building relationships were noted as promoting success. Above all, a transparent and inclusive approach to the partnership was consistently seen as fundamental to success.

Existing relationships between partners appear to be a key contributor to more successful partnerships. Building relationships takes time; therefore if the same entities partner again in the future, the benefit of the relationship likely will increase.

**2.3.3** Partnerships, despite their shortcomings, have real potential and hence should be built upon. Opportunities to secure the funding from other donors for partnerships appear limited, however.

There are challenges for DPPs and dpps in forming partnerships. Generally, funding the participation of DPPs and dpps is comparatively expensive. Thus programme operators and project promoters feel that they have few opportunities to engage with partners other than through EEA and Norway Grants-funded programmes, as few other organisations are willing to provide this high level of funding.

**2.3.4** Successful partnerships can have clear implications for how the DV/GBV and GE fields develop in each country.

See above.

**2.3.5** Improved knowledge and trust amongst the organisations involved in the partnership is the principal added value of cooperation.

See above.
In addition to the specific conclusions listed above, there are some overarching conclusions that deserve attention:

- **DV/GBV and WLB are areas that still require considerable attention in the countries included in this study.** The only country that appears to be able to move forward on WLB without substantial future external support may be Spain. While Estonia has made considerable progress, respondents said funding is limited to continue interventions if and when funding is halted. This is a result of both resources and collective will.\(^\text{26}\)

- **Taking this into consideration, it is important that DV/GBV and WLB are not streamlined into general efforts under other areas**, as this could obscure their importance and the sector-related investment. Whether these portfolios keep the same names is not necessarily important, provided that a gender perspective is used and that funding targets the type of intervention funded during the 2009 to 2014 timeframe.

- **Governments’ efforts to take on the challenges of responding to DV/GBV and WLB are commendable.** Indeed, it is important that government, not civil society, is responsible for the welfare of all of its citizens; this clearly includes protecting individuals of all genders from violence and ensuring equitable work environments. However, in all of the cases examined, CSOs are the actors with considerable experience on these issues. Therefore it is important that as government agencies become more committed, they capitalise on existing knowledge and existing capacity.

\(^{26}\) In Spain, there are examples of institutions, movements, and organisations taking on the issue.
4 Lessons Learned

This section focuses on the key lessons learned that emerged from the rapid assessment. Since most overlap with specific questions in the terms of reference, lessons are divided here into three subsections: relevance, effectiveness, and the bilateral dimension.

Relevance: The interviews and QCA analysis found that the relevance of individual interventions depends not only on their individual merit, but also – and more importantly – on their relationship to other activities. Overall, it is essential to understand that DV/GBV and WLB are complex and multifaceted, and thus require a response that is equally complex and multifaceted. In addition, having a larger number of interventions does not necessarily guarantee success. Outcomes appear to result from the combination – rather than volume – of certain interventions.

While the programmes have accomplished much in terms of calling attention to the issues, there are some groups that remain in relative obscurity – for example, male victims of GBV, the elderly, and child victims of DV. Moreover, not all communities are affected equally. For example, DV/GBV affects rural areas and particular groups such as the Roma more. This is not necessarily because there is more violence in these groups, but rather because the existence of knowledge, awareness, and services is more limited.

Effectiveness: Activities meant to be sustainable, such as the provision of services, must be designed in a manner that ensures that services will continue upon the completion of the project. Otherwise, the investment might very well be wasted. Additionally, intervention plans must consider the administrative difficulties encountered by programme promoters, DPPs, and dpps when working with programme operators. Projects must, for example, be able to function within the constraints imposed by the FMO and programme operators’ bureaucracy, which can often be stifling.

Bilateral dimension: In some cases, programme operators, project promoters, and some partners from the donor countries appear to have a limited understanding of what partnership entails. It is important that all parties be better aware of what the expectations and benefits of partnership are to ensure the best possible outcome for all parties. It is notable that the relationships between partners improved over time or were initially better when partners had previous experience collaborating.
This section includes recommendations derived from the findings, conclusions, and lessons learned. Although not all findings have their own recommendations (as this could be repetitive), the recommendations are presented in tabular format to enable the reader to directly link relevant information to specific recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Emerging conclusion</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>In some countries, knowledge of all relevant documents at the local level is inconsistent. Aligning efforts with relevant national and European priorities is important in calling attention to the relevant issues.</td>
<td>The EEA and Norway Grants should ensure that CoE’s knowledge is actively used to promote a better understanding of European priorities at the national level. CoE expertise can support the identification of links between European and national policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>It is important that the support provided is not considered in isolation, but rather is envisaged as one of multiple efforts in the sector.</td>
<td>The EEA and Norway Grants should ensure that negotiation and application processes are rooted in a clear understanding/explanation of how proposed programmes and predefined projects complement other activities not receiving EEA and Norway Grants support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>It is essential to better understand how different interventions relate to each other and to their context. A more in-depth, nuanced understanding of these dynamics will be central to securing broader success in the long term. Additionally, it will be relevant to more widely explore the different needs of a broader beneficiary group (i.e., also including men, older adults, and children who are victims of DV/GBV). This may at times require that services expand beyond the confines of the national definition of what constitutes DV/GBV. Indeed, a wider understanding of discrimination will also be important. While campaigns targeting whole populations have done this, by and large the focus has been on women.</td>
<td>The EEA and Norway Grants should support or encourage in-depth assessments using a combined methodology that includes QCA or similar analysis at the national or regional level. They should be conducted to provide clear and verifiable information on how interventions should be complemented and how intervention logic should be envisaged. Any such assessment should make use of the ample existing data. The EEA and Norway Grants should ensure that their programmes clearly include a gendered approach to DV/GBV, and pay particular attention to the needs of women victims of violence in accordance with the Istanbul Convention while not overlooking the fact that violence affects men and boys as well. Along the same lines, it is recommended that stakeholders and organisations with ample experience be actively included in the programme design phase to ensure that existing knowledge is capitalised upon and lessons learned previously are not overlooked. Similarly, WLB should also be more systematically understood as an issue with implications that affect women, men, girls, and boys. It not only relates to women changing their approaches for entering and moving within the workforce, but also how the work environment is improved and the recruitment processes adequately gendered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>There is considerable knowledge available on DV/GBV and WLB; however, it is not always utilised to its full capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5</td>
<td>Unfavourable contextual conditions should not be seen as predetermining a bad outcome. However, difficult conditions mean that more attention must be paid to how interventions are combined and complemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Combining and complementing activities is not only useful when contextual environments are unfavourable. Indeed, the linear cause-and-effect presumption that many projects make is incorrect, as numerous interventions appear to only be successful when combined with what can sometimes appear to be unrelated interventions.</td>
<td>Similarly, WLB should also be more systematically understood as an issue with implications that affect women, men, girls, and boys. It not only relates to women changing their approaches for entering and moving within the workforce, but also how the work environment is improved and the recruitment processes adequately gendered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>In the long term, efforts to improve GE will depend on a clear political position by individual governments that is backed by adequate funding. Funding from the EEA and Norway Grants could highlight the importance and value of equitable work environments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>See 3.2.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>The process of developing intervention logic must include a far better understanding of factors external to the individual intervention. This should include both context and the impact of other interventions. While there is value in having a wide range of projects, and there is a good reason why not all projects should be predefined, programme operators need to invest considerable energy into ensuring that the projects that are not predefined align well with the overall intervention logic of the programme. Projects that are not predefined should still be scrutinised to ensure that they respond to the intervention logic and complement other activities. Therefore, a mechanism to adequately vet non-predefined projects should be developed and be made public. This type of tool could be developed by the EEA and Norway Grants as a set of supporting guidelines for programme operators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5</td>
<td>Generally, promoting policy changes is complex. However, supporting policy changes at the local level is far more accessible than national efforts. These opportunities should not be overlooked, as they can be catalytic in supporting wider-reaching policy changes later on. Efforts that can achieve policy changes at the local level should be supported through EEA and Norway Grants funding as these can, if combined with other relevant interventions, over time lead to larger policy changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6</td>
<td>In most cases, a crucial foundation to change is recognising the importance of understanding DV/GBV and WLB inequity as problems. Hence, even if in some cases political discussion is elusive, putting the issue on the agenda is important. The leap between putting the issue on the agenda and making a more solid financial commitment to it is a second step. Where it has happened, this shift cannot be attributed to the EEA and Norway Grants; still, it is possible that the EEA and Norway Grants can indirectly contribute to changes here. The EEA and Norway Grants should continue to support these areas of work as independent, not streamlined, fields of intervention because streamlining them can easily lead to their being obscured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.7</td>
<td>The bureaucracy faced by project promoters, DPPs, and dpps has often been crippling in terms of timely implementation of projects. This is an issue that, combined with the short timeframe for projects, can (and has, at times) lead to negative outcomes because projects were not completed. The EEA and Norway Grants should be aware of bureaucratic constraints and ensure that funding negotiations and funded programmes are designed in a manner that is cognisant of the delays they will face. Otherwise, an alternative funding mechanism that is more efficient and timely is needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>There is a limited understanding amongst programme operators, project promoters, and dpps about what constitutes a partnership and how partnerships can be beneficial to all parties involved. Service provision by DPPs and dpps was useful in most cases, but it fell short of what could have been accomplished. The EEA and Norway Funds should be much stricter about how and when DPPs and dpps are engaged during the programme development process. The current approach has few imposed requirements, allowing programme operators and project promoters to not engage DPPs or dpps during the design phase. This has detrimental effects for the level of ownership, identification of realistic expectations, and adequate use of partners’ knowledge and skills. It also limits the degree to which partners can benefit from the engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>Existing relationships between partners appear to be a key contributor to more successful partnerships. Building relationships takes time; therefore if the same entities partner again in the future, the benefit of the relationship likely will increase.</td>
<td>The EEA and Norway Grants should commend long-term partnerships when they demonstrate their value (i.e., the knowledge partners offer remains relevant).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>There are challenges for DPPs and dpps in forming partnerships. Generally, funding the participation of DPPs and dpps is comparatively expensive. Thus programme operators and project promoters feel that they have few opportunities to engage with partners other than through EEA and Norway Grants-funded programmes, as few other organisations are willing to provide this high level of funding.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4</td>
<td>See above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.5</td>
<td>See above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II

6 Country Experiences

In this section, we briefly examine the experiences in each country with a focus on the eight programmes assessed in each of the seven countries. The scope and length of the section does not allow for an in-depth examination of every question; hence the section provides a short summary of the context, the relevance, what was done, and some issues regarding effectiveness. This section also includes boxes with experiences or cases from individual countries that may have value to other countries or serve to illustrate a specific challenge or complexity.

6.1 Bulgaria

6.1.1 Context

Bulgaria pursues a consistent policy of promoting GE in compliance with international regulations on human rights. The legal framework and political foundation are stable and proactive. In the Sustainable Development Programme of Bulgaria (2014-2018), the Council of Ministers sets out concrete commitments to support the equality between women and men. The recently renewed National Strategy for Promotion of Gender Equality (2009-2015), along with an annual action plan detailing its implementation, also testify to commitment to the issue.

The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy leads policy-level coordination on GE. The economic empowerment of women is a clear requisite to attain GE, and it has not yet been achieved in Bulgaria. Indeed, women in Bulgaria have a 22.6% change of falling below the poverty line, compared with 20.9% for men. A considerable challenge is reducing segregation in the labour market, including the gender gap in pay. DV and GBV are widespread in the country, with rural areas and specific groups (such as the Roma and victims of trafficking – both men and women) being more likely to become victims but having the least amount of support.

6.1.2 The programme and its relevance

In Bulgaria, the programme operator is the Ministry of Interior and the DPP is the CoE. The programme aims to reduce DV/GBV through the implementation of one predefined project, and one open call for proposals led to the identification of five additional intervention areas. The subjects covered by each intervention include:

Pre-defined project: ‘Improvement of the national legal framework to bring it in line with the CoE standards and strengthening the capacity of competent institutions involved in cases of DV and GBV’.

- **Measure 1:** Call for proposals: ‘Support services for victims of domestic violence and GBV’;
- **Measure 2:** Call for proposals: ‘Awareness-raising activities with a special focus on Roma and other vulnerable communities (“projects targeting Roma inclusion”)’;
- **Measure 3:** Call for proposals: ‘Research and data collection’;

---

28 The statement came as a conclusion during the key interviews with the team of Association Centre for Education, Culture and Ecology 21. This view is also found in the conclusion of the 2014 World Bank report: Gender Dimensions of Roma Inclusion: perspectives from four Roma communities in Bulgaria. Available also in Bulgarian: http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/document/eca/Bulgaria/Roma_Gender-BG.pdf
● **Measure 4:** Small grants scheme: ‘Support services for victims of domestic violence’; and
● **Measure 5:** Small grant scheme: ‘Awareness- and sensibility-raising campaigns’.

This effort led to the contracting and execution of 18 projects (two contracts under measure 1, six under measure 2, one under measure 3, six under measure 4, and three under measure 5). Project budgets ranged from approximately EUR 16,000 to EUR 685,000.

Respondents said the programme provided the perfect opportunity to highlight DV/GBV issues within the Bulgarian context. Sixteen of the projects are being managed by non-governmental organisations (NGOs), which has the added value of developing the NGO sector further. The programme is important to the Bulgarian context, and a number of interventions have highlighted the issues at hand and provided services to victims of DV/GBV. However, there is no indication that the programme has been able to impact the national policy sector or attract additional funding.

The degree to which the programme operator is the most relevant agency to lead the programme is also unclear, with the programme operator office noting that it was more of an administrative burden than part of their standard responsibilities. Unsurprisingly, a proposal to change the programme operator was raised by both the programme operator and by project promoters. However, since the ministry does work on other relevant issues (i.e., other types of crime), it is doubtful that the programme operator responsibility will be transferred elsewhere. This dynamic does, however, highlight that the relevant issues (DV/GBV) may not be widely understood or supported within the institution.

**Participatory art and domestic and gender-based violence**

The ‘Life without Violence’ project conducted information campaigns to help reduce domestic violence through increasing awareness and knowledge among the Roma population and other vulnerable groups. The project used art for both therapeutic and information-sharing purposes. Art relies on emotional intelligence and provides a safe space in which professional artists, educators, and social workers meet target groups and are able to engage on a more level playing field. Respondents interviewed during this rapid assessment noted that the Forum Theatre, where performing arts were used as a tool, was the most successful method to share information on domestic and gender-based violence with a particular focus on protection and support. Roma populations, as well as other extremely vulnerable groups, were targeted specifically. (BG12-0013).

**Protecting men from domestic and gender-based violence**

In Bulgaria, there is no legal definition of gender-based violence. Both the police and judiciary note that within the context of domestic and gender-based violence, attention is focused on crimes of a sexual nature against women. Sexual violence against men is considered a homosexual act and not prosecuted. In addition, the number of crisis centres in Bulgaria serving men is very limited. In short, there is a void of service provision for men, although it is known that they are victims of gender-based violence (particularly in connection with trafficking). For more information, see [http://www.csd.bg/artShow.php?id=17581](http://www.csd.bg/artShow.php?id=17581).
6.1.3 General findings

The box below includes the general findings from the eight projects examined during this rapid assessment.

Table 4: General project overview: Bulgaria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Overview</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Bilateral dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0015 – Crisis centre in the territory of Ruse Municipality for victims of domestic and gender-based violence and the provision of services</td>
<td>The project aimed to reduce DV/GBV by increasing and improving support services for victims, including creating a crisis centre for the Municipality of Ruse.</td>
<td>The project fits well with relevant legislation. At the municipal level, key experts were involved in project design.</td>
<td>The project was able to provide new services and has increased awareness of key issues amongst local government staff. These staff said that the programme operator was not well versed on project-related issues.</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0004 – National study on domestic and gender-based violence (DGBV) and elaboration of victims support model (VSM)</td>
<td>The project aimed to build knowledge and experience on the current state of DV/GBV to let key stakeholders, including the Bulgarian government, access robust independent data to support policy decisions. This included a nationwide quantitative and qualitative assessment, with particular attention to Roma populations. A model for victim support would be developed and tested.</td>
<td>This project fits well within the national legislative frameworks and its aims fill a clear knowledge gap.</td>
<td>The current environment is one in which national policies are not well implemented and services are limited. This project is instrumental and educating key actors to strengthen practical responses to the problem. The effort has been designed in a manner than can be replicated both at the national level at predefined intervals, as well as elsewhere.</td>
<td>The partner organisation in Norway, the Human Rights Academy, stands to gain less because its knowledge base is well established. However, according to the Bulgarian counterparts, they were a key contributor to the programme as they had extensive experience to share.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0013 – Life without Violence – Information campaigns for the reduction of domestic violence through increasing the awareness and the knowledge among Roma</td>
<td>The project aimed to organise campaigns and initiatives informing DV/GBV victims about their rights to protection and access services. It focused on areas predominantly inhabited by Roma and other vulnerable</td>
<td>The project is well aligned with national policies and legislative frameworks. It aims to fill a clear gap in information dissemination, since until recently the field</td>
<td>For the majority of beneficiaries, the activities were the first of their kind. Hence, although there was hesitation to credit sustainable impact to this project because changing perceptions requires longer-term</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 The first three projects correspond to those in which full case studies were conducted, the latter five to cases in which only documents were reviewed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0022 -</td>
<td>Support for Life</td>
<td>The project aimed to rebuild, equip, and establish a crisis centre for victims of DV. The intervention included activities to train and select a team to staff the facility. The centre in Aksakovo is well aligned with national legislative and policy priorities. Support for this kind of facility is key, as it is under-supported nationally. The centre provided the only facility of its kind in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0016 –</td>
<td>United against</td>
<td>The project aimed to strengthen the protection of victims of DV, especially women in Sofia and Haskovo. The most notable documented results have been the opening of mobile centres to support victims. As a result, the services may be funded through the municipal budget in future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0020 –</td>
<td>Break the Silence</td>
<td>Specific activities included identifying the teams to implement the project activities, developing an interactive website, raising awareness about DV/GBV through information days and art exhibits, improving coordination and information exchange among sectors on DV, developing and implementing an information and publicity plan, and conducting a national radio and television campaign. The project is well aligned with the main objective of the national programme for the prevention of and protection against DV, which focuses on raising awareness. There is also a clear need to further support each of the project objective areas. There were 10 roundtables at the municipal level, which have increased collaboration among sectors, a central achievement of the project. This was in addition to the public information campaign, although it is too early to know the campaign’s impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0005 –</td>
<td>Counselling centre for</td>
<td>The main objective of the project has been to provide protection and support services to victims of DV. The project intervention is well aligned with the national programme for the prevention of and protection against DV. Activities included a centre to provide psychological, social, and legal support to DV victims in specified geographical areas and to perpetrators,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No dpp.
The most effective interventions provided direct services to victims of violence. In addition, research on DV/GBV amongst Roma populations and interventions working with Roma populations to highlight DV/GBV as a problem also generated positive results. Awareness-raising campaigns – particularly with Roma populations – were also successful, although their success appears limited to the direct beneficiary group (meaning that the general population or those not specifically targeted by the intervention did not benefit). The media campaigns generated substantial attention, particularly in smaller towns, but it is not yet possible to know if this attention has changed perceptions, attitudes, or practices.

**6.2 Estonia**

In Estonia, two programmes are being implemented: one on DV/GBV and another on mainstreaming GE and promoting WLB. Context, effectiveness, and general findings for each are presented below.

**6.2.1 Context: Gender equality**

Considerable progress has been made on mainstreaming GE and promoting WLB. Indeed, women’s total employment rate is one of the highest in Europe, although this should not obscure some persistent challenges with inequality in the labour market and household labour. Indeed, despite its achievements, Estonia has one of the highest gender pay gaps in the European Union and a high degree of horizontal and vertical segregation in the labour market. Part-time employment is not very common, but more women than men work part time. Women disproportionately engage in unpaid household and child-rearing work. Additionally, ethnicity and language have a noticeable impact on a person’s status in the labour market. Non-ethnic Estonians experience higher levels of unemployment and lower salaries than ethnic Estonians. Russian-speaking minorities, particularly women, are especially vulnerable. It is notable that while there is both legislation and an institutional mechanism to ensure...
the implementation of gender-mainstreaming policies, the lack of political will and government funding renders these efforts largely mute.

6.2.2 The programme and its relevance: Gender equality

The objective of programme EE09, ‘Mainstreaming GE and promoting work-life balance’, was to mainstream GE and promote WLB through raising awareness and promoting research on gender issues, as well as strengthening the capacity of NGOs and networks. The programme target groups included civil servants and public administration staff (increasing their capacity to implement gender mainstreaming and promoting better knowledge of statistics), students, the general population, NGOs, and employers interested in implementing WLB-related measures. This programme included two predefined projects, four large projects selected through two open calls for proposals, and 11 smaller projects in two small-grant-scheme calls for proposals (initially one, with a second added at a later stage).

Development of bilateral relations was one of the major activities throughout, as was encouraging cooperation between the organisations in Estonia (project promoters) and dpps from Norway. The programme operator organised conferences and information seminars, as well as advertised calls for proposals in national media outlets to increase interests in the programmes amongst national organisations. The DPP for the WLB programme was initially the Norwegian Ministry of Children, Equality, and Social Inclusion (BLD) and later the Norwegian Directorate for Children, Youth, and Family Affairs (Bufdir).

6.2.3 General findings: Gender equality

Table 5: General project overview (GE): Estonia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Overview</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Bilateral dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE09-0018 – TegelASTE tuba – Children’s Room</td>
<td>The project aimed to help employees reconcile their work- and family-related obligations, decreasing the associated stress and thus also increasing productivity. The central activity was opening the Children’s Room for school-age children in three of the four towns where the project promoter has offices.</td>
<td>Generally, the project was regarded as highly relevant as it responded to a clear gap in services. However, it was highlighted that future iterations should pay closer attention to supporting children and their needs.</td>
<td>The project appeared to be an efficient way to challenge gender roles and the role of fathers in the areas where the project was implemented.</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE09-0001 – Promoting gender equality through empowerment and mainstreaming</td>
<td>This project is well aligned with European Union regulations, as it supports the Office of the Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner.</td>
<td>The project supported the publication of manuals that can guide the general public in the application of the law, as well as provided staff that could support individuals pursuing legal action. In addition, the project</td>
<td>The commissioner has been active in the media, bringing attention to key issues. There is anecdotal data that the use of the manual produced has been effective. However, the support provided to individuals seeking legal redress has not been sustainable; hence cases that were</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

21 EEA and Norway Grants 2009-2014. EE09: Mainstreaming Gender Equality and Promoting work-family Balance’, 2016: 4
22 The first two case studies were full case studies; the latter were desk reviews.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE09-0005 – GOAL - Integrating Gender into Teacher Education and Training</td>
<td>The general objective of the project is to ‘promote GE through integrating the gender perspective into teacher education and training, raising gender awareness of teacher educators and practicing teachers, and developing a comprehensive system of support to achieve the objective’. The project is well aligned with relevant legislation and responds to needs that have been previously identified through research. The project has laid a foundation for gender being considered in teacher education, which has a wider impact on society since the future teachers will be more gender-sensitive. The project reviewed and modified universities’ teacher training curricula, student guidelines for academic research, and four new courses on gender and education (three of which to be permanently offered every year). Overall, all activities served the intervention’s objective. The partnership with the Gender Equality Centre, as well as other partners, was limited and mostly one-sided, benefitting the project promoter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE09-0002 – Increased availability of gender pay gap statistics (Norbalt)</td>
<td>This project aimed to develop a new strategy (including proposals for new methodology and data sources) for the more efficient collection of gender-divided pay statistics in Estonia. This is meant to alleviate facilitate the administrative burden of data respondents, database managers, and analysts, as well as ensure faster publication of the gender pay gap statistics. The project responds to national and European needs by enabling the collection of reliable data on gender pay gap disparity. Activities fall into four categories: developing a new strategy for gender pay gap statistics; comparing available data sets for gender pay gap indicators and publishing findings; updating and regularly publishing updates on the online database; and assessing and improving current indicators. The project has been successful in enabling the collection of reliable data and highlighting its importance. No dpp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.4 Effectiveness: Gender equality

The projects conducted under the GE interventions have brought attention to gender issues more broadly. This kind of attention is an important precursor to any political change. During the three years of programme implementation, media attention on gender has increased. For example, the pre-defined Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner project included specific activities targeting the media as a mechanism to build awareness. In addition, better data and examples of service provision that facilitate GE in the workplace have all helped generate new perspectives. However, respondents said the context is still highly sexist, and hence efforts to achieve change must continue and be understood as part of a long-term effort. Importantly, interventions that

---

33 Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner, 2013
provide legal services are not yet sustainable nationally, as the national-budget funding allocations for these kinds of activities are insufficient.

6.2.5 Context: DV/GBV

The prevalence of DV/GBV is not regularly or systematically measured in Estonia with the exception of crimes reported to the police, which are reflected in the police statistics and client statistics from the shelters. There are some indications that awareness of DV/GBV has increased, as has the provision of services for victims. \(^{34}\) The number of reported cases is steadily increasing, as is the number of people who seek help from the state Victim Support Service. \(^{35}\) As pertains to human trafficking, Estonia is primarily a country of origin rather than destination or even transit. The majority of victims of trafficking are women, although some are men. For women, the most common reason for trafficking is sexual exploitation and prostitution; for men, it is labour exploitation. Estonia has ratified the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings and signed the Istanbul Convention.

6.2.6 The programme and its relevance: DV/GBV

Like the programme on GE, the work on DV/GBV has also raised awareness. The services available for victims have improved considerably over the last 10 years. As a result of the funding provided by the EEA and Norway Grants, the number of shelters has increased from 12 to 13 and their services have been improved, a hotline for GBV victims extended its working hours, and the hotline for preventing human trafficking improved its data collection. \(^{36}\) Interventions included work by the NGO Oma Tuba to create and maintain an online media outlet to strategically and vocally discuss feminism and explore current issues through a feminist perspective. The project

---


Effective hiring and communications strategy

The Office of the Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner hired a communications specialist for the duration of the project. This decision led to a noticeable increase in media coverage throughout the project. The project’s interim reports list all the articles, interviews, and comments on or by the commissioner, clearly demonstrating extensive coverage. The communications specialist was needed, and her work was effective; indeed, once she left the position, media coverage on the commissioner’s office decreased significantly. This shows how relevant a communications specialist and strategy can be in bringing the general public’s attention to GE issues. The interviewees felt there is still a need to continue making the issue visible to ensure changes are sufficiently engrained in society and they become fully sustainable (EE-09-001).

As with the GE portfolio, developing bilateral relations was one of the major activities throughout DV/GBV programmes – as well as encouraging cooperation between the organisations in Estonia (project promoters) and dpps from Norway. The role of the partnership was akin to the GE programme, and there was no evidence of major discrepancies between the ways the different DPPs worked with the respective portfolios. The DPP for the DV/GBV programme was the Norwegian Directorate of Health. Some of the projects had their own dpps.

While there is a considerable level of awareness locally, Estonia still requires support to bring both attention and resources to DV/GBV and GE. The country is small, and interventions can have clear impact. The environment is welcoming of interventions, even if politically and culturally there are still some clear challenges. In Estonia, both programmes are relevant and implementing them together demonstrates how the issues are interlinked.


39 Ministry of Social Affairs of the Republic of Estonia, 2016d: 13, 15

### 6.2.7 General findings: DV/GBV

#### Table 6: General project overview (DV/GBV): Estonia\(^{41}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Overview</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Bilateral Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE11-0001 – Developing services for victims of domestic violence, strengthening co-operation between different institutions, and raising awareness among victims and the general public</td>
<td>The objective of the project is to reduce DV/GBV in Estonia through activities to improve the services provided to victims, cooperation among professionals, and the knowledge of professionals (including shelter staff) and (potential) victims.</td>
<td>The project is aligned with the new national <em>Strategy for Preventing Violence for 2015-2020</em>, as well as the Istanbul Convention. The services provided are needed and not readily available otherwise.</td>
<td>The project achieved increased awareness among the general public and specialists likely coming into contact with the victims of violence against women and DV. Activities included a 24-hour hotline providing psychological and legal counselling in all shelters, a unified service description for all the shelters that are members of the Union (the project promoter), and substantial efforts to train staff. The efforts were generally successful, although the hotline was not as well-known and hence not fully successful. Additionally, delays in the start of the intervention may have affected efficiency.</td>
<td>Interviewees noted that the partnership with Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies (NO) was mostly one-sided, benefitting primarily the project promoter. The role of the dpp was to advise and assist with the project. To this end, it was regarded as highly valuable. Interviewees did note that at times it was hard to ensure the dpp’s availability to support activities in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE11-0005 – Building a uniform system for the prevention of intimate partner violence (IPV) in Estonia</td>
<td>The general objective of the project was to develop a unified action model for all specialists dealing with DV/GBV: police, medical professionals, social workers, and legal professionals.</td>
<td>The project’s relevance as tied to national and European objectives is not clearly stated in project documentation. However, judging by the details provided on beneficiaries, the project is highly relevant.</td>
<td>The project conducted activities such as studies to map the DV situation from a variety of angles. These were used as a basis for discussions and to generate training and materials for a wide range of service providers, as well as for general awareness raising. To this end, the most effective element was efforts to change professionals’ perception on how to respond to victims of DV. Legislative recommendations, on the other hand, have been drafted, but have not yet led to any tangible results.</td>
<td>The dpp, the Resource Centre on Violence, Traumatic Stress and Suicide Prevention Region West (RVTS-Vest) (NO), was useful to the project promoter, as it enabled access to new knowledge, including study trips. However, the partnership was mostly one-sided, particularly benefitting the project promoter rather than the dpp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{41}\) The first project was a full case study; the latter three were desk reviews.
EE11-0006 – Creating and enhancing a multisectoral network to help the victims of sexual violence

The project aimed to reduce the prevalence and harmful consequences of sexual violence, including against human trafficking victims, by creating and enhancing pilot services for victims and a multisectoral co-operation network of professionals and organisations. This project ensures a coordinated and sustainable approach to sexual violence in Estonia.

While the project documents do not clearly note the degree to which it aligned to national and European policy, they do specifically mention aligning with the Norway/EEA financial mechanism 2009 to 2014 priorities. The project targeted professionals working with victims of sexual violence in different sectors, as well as the general public. The activities included an overview of existing studies and public campaigns on sexual violence targeting potential victims and potential perpetrators, as well as trainings and support to enable the piloting of integrated services. The rape kit system was seen as the most successful of the interventions, while the online resources were accessed least. The efforts have secured funding to continue.

The Oslo Municipality Health Agency Emergency Department Sexual Assault Centre was the dpp. Other partners included Tartu University Hospital, East Tallinn Central Hospital, Tartu Sexual Health Clinic, and Sexual Health Clinic in Tallinn. The project created piloted, appropriate tools (the rape kit and the accompanying activities) to deal with victims of sexual violence. The partnership was solid and extended beyond the project activities, but was mostly one-sided, with the Norway partner sharing more information than it gained.

EE11-0002 – Supporting victims of trafficking for sexual exploitation through improving the services provided by the rehabilitation centre Atoll and shelter Vega

The project aimed to support female victims of trafficking for sexual exploitation by providing them with rehabilitation services. In addition, it fostered collaboration among entities and support for policy and legislative reform.

The project is aligned with national strategies on GBV, as well as efforts at the national and European levels to combat trafficking. Support included the provision of information to victims, as well as new research, new support services, and training for service providers. While the reports said the piloted interventions yielded good results, there is a lack of documentation to attest to the final result.

No official dpp, but there were some organisations that the programme promoter collaborated with. The value gained through these efforts appears minimal, as reflected in the documentation.

6.2.8 Effectiveness: DV/GBV

Both programmes have brought attention to gender issues, an important element of – and precursor to – any political change. Media attention to gender issues has increased during the three years of programme implementation. For example, the NGO Oma Tuba created and maintained an online-based media outlet with a feminist lens; the project by the Estonian Institute for Open Society garnered media attention for its research on
the attitudes of different professionals towards DV and violence against women, as did the media campaign by the Estonian Sexual Health Association on consent.42

In addition to working through the media, awareness on DV/GBV also increased through courses on DV for relevant professionals.43 Perhaps the most influential has been the establishment of a system to respond to victims’ needs, such as rape kits. This and other pilot systems have been adapted from the Norwegian models of providing support. Although as part of this programme they were pilots, they have since been established as reasonable responses and have been able to secure funding from the government. This demonstrates their ability to become more widely used and remain independently sustainable.

6.3 Poland

6.3.1 Context

In 2015, police registered more than 69,00044 incidents of DV with female victims using the ‘Blue Card’ anti-DV procedure. Victims most often do not receive adequate assistance or respectful treatment during court procedures.45 It must also be noted that official statistics account for a fraction of DV incidents, with common reasons for not reporting including feelings of shame or embarrassment and cultural or societal norms on family and gender roles.

Polish measures to respond to DV are insufficient and in some cases ineffective. Response methods include the Blue Cards procedure, which was developed by the Institute of Psychology of Health and was introduced by the ordinance of the Cabinet of Ministers.46 Police investigations take place if a crime is reported, and families receive social worker support (which may include support in cases of DV). State-funded crisis centres offer psychological and legal assistance to victims of violence. Large NGOs also develop and promote methodologies to curb DV or violence against women and educate the wider public and relevant professionals.

The Polish government ratified the Istanbul Convention in April 2015 after considerable delays caused by a fundamental ideological discord. The position of women’s rights has further deteriorated since the conservative government took power in 2015. Currently, a project supporting a radical anti-abortion law is being promoted, and NGOs supporting victims of DV have lost state funding; feminist programmes are banned from state-held media, and CSOs’ anti-discrimination educational programmes are banned from schools. In response, grassroots protests are growing.

6.3.2 The programme and its relevance

The EEA and Norway Grants-funded programme supports staff training and the provision of assistance to small organisations that respond to victims’ needs. The programme had two main aims: reduce GBV and reduce DV. The specific objectives included:

- Improving the situation of families at risk of DV/GBV;
- Raising public awareness on the consequences of DV/GBV;

---

42 Ministry of Social Affairs of the Republic of Estonia, 2016d: 13, 15
43 Ministry of Social Affairs of the Republic of Estonia, 2016d: 14; see also the projects’ findings
44 The PO notes that other institutions (social workers, representatives of the local committees for solving alcohol related problems, representatives of education and healthcare institutions) also initiate the procedure. According to the Report on implementation of the National Programme for Prevention of Domestic Violence, a total of 99,749 Blue Cards-A were filled by the representatives of the abovementioned institutions in 2015.
46 Rozporządzenie Rady Ministrów z dnia 13 września 2011 r. w sprawie procedury „Niebieskie Karty” oraz wzorów formularzy „Niebieska Karta” (Dz.U. 2011 nr 209 poz. 1245)
Strengthening cooperation between the services involved in combating DV/GBV;
Increasing the assistance to people affected by DV/GBV; and
Improving the quality of services for people affected by DV/GBV.

Within the Polish context, the funding clearly supports relevant initiatives. The funded programme works in many of the areas also addressed by the national programme, and it is compatible with the national act on counteracting violence in family.\(^\text{47}\)

**Improving cooperation between civil society organisation lone mothers’ homes and public centres of social assistance**

The MONAR association runs houses for single mothers who are victims of violence. The houses are not short-term shelters, but places where women engage in an individual programme to reach independence. A woman’s placement in such a house depends on the house’s cooperation with the local centre of social assistance. This centre in turn must cooperate with a similar centre in the place of the woman’s origin (if she comes from a different community); the latter centre provides funding for the woman’s subsistence in the house. The rules of cooperation, developed by teams of experts from the association and the centres, describe the responsibilities of the house and the local centre. In particular, if the centre of the woman’s location of origin decides to suddenly relocate her, both the house and local centre help the woman advocate to continue her programme in MONAR. The rules also describe activities by both parties if a woman leaves the house before finishing her programme (PL14-0015).

### 6.3.3 General findings

**Table 7: General project overview: Poland**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project overview</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Bilateral dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL14-0001 – Polish Family – Free from Violence</td>
<td>The project has three key elements: research on family violence and GBV; a social awareness media campaign; and training for interdisciplinary teams performing the Blue Card procedure. It also includes two deliverables: one report from a survey on DV and one benchmark report prepared by CoE on legal measures to counteract GBV with recommendations for Poland.</td>
<td>The project was, as with the national perspective, more focused on DV than GBV. The project interventions are also aligned with European goals.</td>
<td>The results of the comparative survey on DV were used to promote policy change and to develop and design future interventions by the programme operator. The GBV study has not been widely utilised, if at all. Basic capacity development (training) was provided for professionals. This was useful to individuals with no experience, but not for people who knew the field. The interdisciplinary committees working on the Blue Card system that the training targeted generally include individuals with varied levels of knowledge; hence for this group the training was useful.</td>
<td>CoE conducted desk studies, developed training materials and trainings, and supported study visits. At the project level, CoE’s involvement was positive, but it is unclear how much of the material developed by the CoE experts was used during training or will be used in future. The CoE experts were largely treated as service providers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{47}\) Ustawa z dnia 29 lipca 2005 r. o przeciwdziałaniu przemocy w rodzinie (Dz.U. z dnia 20 września 2005 r., Nr 180, poz. 1493). Term used is not an official translation.
<p>| <strong>PL14-0002 – Strengthening measures to support victims of domestic violence</strong> | The project included a series of trainings to introduce professionals to key issues regarding DV victims and enable them to provide adequate legal, psychological, shelter, and financial support to victims. The project also included educational meetings on victims’ rights and psychoeducational groups. | The project is relevant to existing policies. However, some experts noted that this type of support (although provided by the Ministry of Justice) does not include training for prosecutors and judges, who may not have the knowledge to adequately handle DV cases. This gap in the project reduced its relevance, according to some respondents. | Professionals increased their competence through comprehensive training on key psychological and legal aspects of family violence. The training was introductory and intensive, appropriate for newly employed young professionals starting to work in DV and GBV. The average score given in participant assessments was very good (five out of six). The main concern with the intervention related to omissions (see ‘relevance’). | No dpp. |
| <strong>PL14-0007 – Implementing preventive measures to reduce GBV</strong> | The local centre for social assistance ran the intervention. It provided psychological education and support to women and child victims of DV. The support for women included group and individual psychological and legal counselling and family mediation. The project also included support groups for children and support to members of the interdisciplinary team in the ‘Blue Card’ system. | The project was relevant in that it supported efforts that are well established within the Polish system. To a certain degree, the funding recipient continued providing existing services, but to a larger extent. (For example, legal support normally would have been sought from a different institution, where it was not sufficiently available.) While the project did not generate a drastic change in how victim support is provided, it offered a greater opportunity for empowerment. | This system of providing victim support is generally considered efficient. Psychoeducational groups, as well as individual psychological counselling, helped women to grow stronger and gain independence. Providing legal support helped victims minimise the number of agencies they reached out to while attempting to escape violence and exert their rights more effectively. | No dpp. |
| <strong>PL14-0003 – Stop Violence – Second Chance</strong> | The project consisted of developing a new approach to work with perpetrators, working with prisons to create an environment better suited for work with inmates, and working directly with inmates. | Working with perpetrators to modify their attitudes and behaviour was seen as a very relevant set of activities. Relevant professionals were trained on the new system to work with perpetrators. While the training was seen as effective, it is not known yet how effective the new system is. The intervention did not quantify the impact on | No dpp. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL14-0012 – Power to Help</td>
<td>The project aimed to work with victims through social work, therapy, psychological counselling, family mediation, and crisis intervention facilities, as well as with professionals from interdisciplinary teams to learn to identify the signs of DV. A corrective psychoeducational programme for perpetrators was also part of the project.</td>
<td>This project is well aligned with national policies and legislation. It aims to bridge the knowledge gap and ensure that key professionals are sufficiently trained to implement existing policies. To some extent, the funding recipient continued providing the services that are usually part of their tasks.</td>
<td>The trainings included a variety of target groups and appear to have been valuable for multiple audiences. The important aspect here is that training and support were provided to a wide range of beneficiaries and thereby aimed to tackle the issue from multiple angles.</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL14-0015 – My Home without Violence – Programme of prevention and education measures for victims of domestic violence residing in MONAR shelters for mothers and children</td>
<td>The project aimed to develop mechanisms (e.g., rules for engagement with local government), build capacity among professionals, provide psychosocial support to victims, and improve the infrastructure in the shelters where the programme was implemented.</td>
<td>The project was relevant in that it filled a need and enabled the target shelters to meet the minimum European Union standards for services. These services are part of the Polish support structure, meaning the intervention does not fill a gap by providing a new form of institutional support. However, it is innovative in that it develops standards of cooperation between the shelters and local public social assistance centres. It did delineate more clearly the roles and responsibilities of shelters and local authorities, which either was previously not clear or lacked good practice.</td>
<td>The project provided services to victims and ensured that service providers received adequate training. While the policy and law determine responsibilities, how different entities engage is not clearly prescribed (or the law is not entirely favourable for victims). Therefore, the most efficient element of the project was the delineation of responsibilities amongst relevant stakeholders.</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL14-0019 – Loved Ones Love – Not Hurt</td>
<td>The project provided psychosocial services for victims, as well as services such as</td>
<td>This project, as with others in the Polish context, is well aligned with national priorities</td>
<td>Services provided seemed to be efficient in that they followed the service provisions</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meetings with lawyers, family therapy, and other therapeutic and informational sessions. The project also included corrective psychoeducation for perpetrators, as well as infrastructural support for a homeless shelter where a space for victims with children has been created. and well served to meet the demands of the Polish system. stipulated by the Polish system. As with other cases, the degree to which these services benefit beneficiaries remains an open question because there is no data that would attest to the effectiveness of the interventions.

PL14-0004 – ‘Rich and Beautiful’ Centre
This project focused on providing legal and psychosocial support to victims. It also provided job counselling to help women use their skills, build relationships with other women, and develop financial and entrepreneurial skills. This project, as with others in the Polish context, is well aligned with national priorities and well served to meet the demands of the Polish system. The projects target vulnerable women, some of whom are victims of DV. As with other programmes, it’s not possible to know how efficient the interventions were, as this would require an assessment of beneficiaries. No dpp.

6.3.4 Effectiveness
The programme targets victims, perpetrators, staff in institutions working with both groups, and the wider public. The provision of services falls within the type of activities that Poland is pursuing more widely – that is, the EEA and Norway Grants are not funding interventions that differ from others being conducted in the country or that might lead to clear innovation. However, the efforts do enable the provision of services to individuals that may not have previously had access.

It is difficult to draw conclusions on the effectiveness of individual interventions. While generally respondents regarded trainings as useful – and having better or more information available is a positive step – the provision of direct services to victims is harder to assess. This is particularly true since to protect victims, it was not possible to talk with them about their perceptions of the services they have received. Lastly, the media campaign planned as part of the programme has yet to be carried out, so its impact remains to be seen.

Empowering women in Mińsk Mazowiecki
Participants in the ‘Implementing preventive measures to reduce GBV’ project were victims of violence, mainly from families in which alcoholism is also a problem; many were socially excluded (clients of social assistance). As part of the project, individuals participated in a psychoeducational support group and individual psychological and legal counselling; they also developed parenting skills and participated in family mediation. Interviews with participants and project staff found that women were at different stages of gaining independence and freeing themselves from violence; some had achieved considerable results. The majority of participants still lived with the perpetrators, while some successfully left that environment. (Isolation of the perpetrator is not easy or supported in the Polish law – the need for change has been raised by the Polish ombudsman for civil rights, as well as in the recommendations in this report). Participants have increased their sense of agency, strength, and self-esteem.
6.4 Portugal

6.4.1 Context

Despite making progress, Portugal is still deeply unequal in relation to women’s political and economic participation. Women also continue to disproportionately engage in unpaid activities such as housework and childcare.\[48\] Regarding moral and sexual harassment in the workplace, recent studies (developed with the EEA funds) revealed that 16.7% of women experienced moral harassment\[49\] and 14.4% sexual harassment in the workplace.\[50\] Men experienced 15.9% and 8.6%, respectively.\[51\]

6.4.2 The programme and its relevance

The programme in Portugal focuses on the main GE challenges in Portugal, including sexual and gender-based harassment in the workplace and women’s active participation in decision-making bodies. The programme had a special focus on research and collecting data that could inform policy and decision-makers as they move forward with efforts to reduce gender disparities.

The programme consisted of three pre-defined projects:

- A white paper, ‘Men’s roles in GE perspective’;
- A national survey on time use by men and women; and
- A research study on sexual and moral harassment in the workplace.

In addition, the programme included two open calls for proposals to support the development of tools and methods to promote GE. Additionally, a small grants scheme intended to provide small-scale funding to entities implementing measures focusing on awareness raising and research on gender issues and GE.\[52\]

The programme was relevant because no other funding sources focused on research and data collection to inform policymaking or other interventions, nor has funding been allocated to support work in the private sector that can support measures promoting equality. Additionally, interventions with local government were designed with future replicability in mind. Overall, the programme had a clear programme logic that filled existing gaps.

---

Cultural values: What people know, and what they think

In Portugal, there are regional and sectoral discrepancies in GE issues. The ‘Equality Balance’ project aimed to develop an instrument to help assess the impact of legislative measures on GE across sectors. In this first stage, the instrument focused on assessing the impact of legislative measures on lactation and breastfeeding. During initial fielding, some challenges with the tool were encountered due to lack of trust amongst those in the pilot about how the data was being used. The collected data showed that respondents, particularly those with limited education, have limited knowledge about legislation on lactation, breastfeeding, and paternity rights. It also showed that Portugal still has deeply rooted notions of labour and gender that hinder attaining equity. Overall the project succeeded in developing a tool to identify data on key existing legislation, as well as the role of culture in achieving labour market equity.

---


\[49\] Also known as psychological harassment.

\[50\] With a sample of 1,801 respondents, 558 men and 1,243 women.


\[52\] See [http://eeagrants.org/programme/view/PT07/PA14](http://eeagrants.org/programme/view/PT07/PA14).
### 6.4.3 General findings

Table 8: General project overview: Portugal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project overview</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Bilateral dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT07-0001 – Sexual and moral harassment in the workplace</td>
<td>The principal aim of the project was to update the knowledge base on harassment in the workplace. In turn, this would be used as a foundation for the development of tools to reduce workplace harassment.</td>
<td>The effort is well aligned with Portuguese legislation and policy, as it aims to support equality in the workplace. The value of the information generated was more contentious. Project documentation and respondents felt that the information was important and an added value, while other experts disagreed on its importance given recent Europe-wide studies.</td>
<td>The project led to an updated dataset that was used as a foundation for a series of deliverables to share the information to a varied audience through a variety of means, including a website, booklets, and seminars.</td>
<td>The funding allocated to the dpp, the Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities (KS), was very limited and hence its role was reduced. It was largely regarded as a service provider to support the Portuguese initiative, rather than an effort of mutual benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT07-0007 – National survey on time use by men and women</td>
<td>The project aimed to conduct research on paid versus unpaid work in Portugal and its distribution between men and women. The study’s findings were used to raise awareness and support policy changes to help curb the disparity.</td>
<td>The project was relevant because it called attention to a disparity that had been largely overlooked in the Portuguese context.</td>
<td>The project resulted in a report that led to the drafting of policy briefs and dissemination of information. The findings are also due to be publicised at relevant conferences. The degree to which these have already led to any policy-level discussion or change is not known.</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT07-0006 – Equality Balance</td>
<td>The project aimed to develop an instrument that could be used across different economic sectors to assess legislative measures to promote GE. The findings were to be shared through multiple media.</td>
<td>As with other projects in Portugal, this intervention is well aligned with existing policy and legislation on the labour market. It was noted that legislation exists, but complying with it is often a challenge that is exacerbated by a lack of knowledge about the challenges faced.</td>
<td>The project was deemed (by respondents and in documents) as effective in shedding light on key issues. This was regarded as a foundation to possible policy changes.</td>
<td>Through the dpp, International Development Norway AS (NO), the programme promoter received technical support. The project operator felt that this process was an asset to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT07-0002 – Men’s roles in a gender equality perspective</td>
<td>The project aimed to raise awareness and produce policy-support documents discussing how the project targeted a number of areas, including WLB, sexual and psychological harassment in the workplace.</td>
<td>The project has included considerable data collection through various means, but the final</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT07-0008 – Promotion of gender equality in decision-making positions and reduction of the gender gap in the business sector (Igualdade de Géneros Empresas)</td>
<td>The project was designed to work with private companies and develop a tailor-made mechanism, which would enable companies to ensure GE in decision-making and close the gender pay gap. The project was designed to use a strong feedback loop to permit the improvement of tools and mechanism.</td>
<td>The programme is relevant as it’s in keeping with national policy and legislation and also addresses some of the key (and often overlooked) challenges facing Portugal in terms of achieving GE in decision-making and leadership positions and eliminating the gender pay gap.</td>
<td>The project has been considered effective at generating a set of tools to enable companies to be more aware of (and hence responsive to) their gender disparities. In addition, the project has generated materials highlighting gender disparity in the workplace to companies that would potentially like to pursue policies creating a more gender-equal environment.</td>
<td>The partnership with the Center for Gender Research at the University of Oslo (NO) was designed to enable Portugal to gain information from the Norwegian experience and, where relevant, emulate it. As with other projects, the partnership was largely one-sided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT07-0003 – Local Gender Equality</td>
<td>This project aimed to bring the issue of GE to the municipal level by developing tools that could be used by municipalities to examine how gender-balanced they are in their policies, work, and allocation of funds.</td>
<td>The project is highly relevant because in Portugal, the issue of GE has not quite reached the municipal level yet. This project was both relevant and innovative in that it aimed to provide municipalities with the tools to address question of GE locally.</td>
<td>The project relied on local data collection, as well as the identification of best practices from other countries, as a foundation for creating a capacity development package for municipalities. It is not possible to know how useful the training and tools are because this would require changes at the municipal level, and it is too early to document them. However, the efforts appear to have been well received.</td>
<td>The relationship with the dpp, the Centre for Gender Research at the University of Oslo (NO), focused on the exchange of experience. The details of this experience are not known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT07-0010 – Working</td>
<td>The project aimed to work with</td>
<td>This intervention is well aligned with national As with previous projects in the</td>
<td>There was an exchange visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Genderation – No Trabalho e na Vida

| Companies in the clothing, footwear, and garment industry to support gender-equality policies. | Policies and legislation and relevant because few efforts to work with these actors have been made before. | Programme, the activities have allowed for information sharing and model development; however, the degree to which these will be used in future by the targeted companies and others remains to be seen. In theory, the model should be effective and enable companies to address GE issues independently in future. | With Iceland though the Icelandic dpp, the Icelandic Women’s Rights Association (IS). This was intended to share experiences. |

| The project focused on developing a methodology to collect data on mobility that could show that the mobility chain standard reference should not be based only on the male mobility profile, keeping in mind the disparity between female and male activity levels during the day. | The project is relevant in that it is another means by which gender disparity in the Portuguese context, particularly in relation to paid and unpaid labour, can be addressed. It aims to bridge this gap and suggests a methodological innovation in gender studies. The relevance of the project will drastically increase if it is able to generate data that can be used for policy changes, as is its aim. | The project thus far has focused on methodological development and testing. The tool’s ability to lead to policy changes remains to be seen. | The dpp, the Noroff University College (NUC)(NO), has served primarily as a technical advisor to the project. |

### PT07-0004 – ‘Gender and Mobility: Inequality in Space-Time’ (GenMob)

6.4.4 Effectiveness

Projects in Portugal fall under two main categories: finished and on-going. All of the examined projects were hampered by initial delays; some have been able to make up for lost time, while others haven’t yet. Thus far, completed projects have achieved their planned outputs, and it is expected that on-going projects will also be able to meet their output commitments.\(^5\) The projects generated knowledge and a series of tools and mechanisms to work with companies and government offices to curb gender inequality. While in Portugal all respondents commended the research conducted, external experts questioned the quality and future value of some of the studies (particularly the new database on the state of GE).

There is clearly a need for interventions that support private and public companies in becoming better aware of GE and having the tools to address the challenge. However, it is too early to know if the projects have generated long-term outcomes. Therefore, any assessment of the projects’ effectiveness is speculative at this stage.

---

\(^5\) Three of the eight projects examined during this rapid assessment were not finished at the time of data collection.
6.5 Romania

6.5.1 Context

In Romania, there are laws and regulations on DV and victim protection. However, the laws are not always implemented, and populations such as the Roma have even less access to police and legislative support than other groups. During the first six months of 2016, Romanian police received 8,926 reports of DV. More than half were in an urban environment, and more than half were committed at home. The Country Report WAVE 2010 noted that Romania has six times fewer places in shelters/centres for victims of DV than required under the European standard. Moreover, many Romanians have a passive attitude towards DV and a view that the men in the household have the ‘supreme power’.

DV and human trafficking remains grave challenges in Romania, despite increased attention on both issues. The government, NGOs, and CSOs currently lack the required resources to enact a coordinated response that can effectively and systematically protect victims.

6.5.2 The programme and its relevance

The Norway Grants-funded programme draws on both national legislation and relevant CoE conventions as an inspiration for its priorities. These include:

- Improve support services for victims of trafficking and DV;
- Raise public awareness on the harmful effects of DV;
- Improve law enforcement and prosecutor response to DV; and
- Respond to specific needs of the Roma population in an effort to reduce their vulnerability to DV and trafficking.

Overall, the DV issue is pressing and victim services need to improve. To this end, the programme is relevant and needed. In addition, the programme is well aligned with national strategies and policies.

---

Empowering Roma women in Pitesti

One key outcome of project ‘CONSENS: Awareness-raising campaign on the negative effects of domestic violence in the regions Bucharest-Ilfov and South Muntenia’ for Roma women victims of domestic violence (DV) was to show them that someone cares about their lives. The presentations they received as part of the project marked the first time that they heard that someone cared, and that solutions exist for them and their children when they experience DV. As part of the project, the women were shown a video of a Roma woman sharing her experience with DV. In the days that followed, many Roma women approached the mediator and asked for help from the project. As a result, several Roma victims of DV left their homes and moved with their children into the Pitesti shelter, where they could receive counselling and start a new life. This shows that this kind of intervention can have clear and noticeable impact in a short time. (RO20-0006).

---

54 One place for every 10,000 citizens.
### 6.5.3 General findings

#### Table 9: General project overview: Romania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project overview</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Bilateral dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO20-0007 – JAD – Joint Action against Domestic Violence</td>
<td>The main objective of the project has been to enhance the capacity of the police and judiciary on DV-related issues.</td>
<td>One of the key challenges in Romania is that although policy and legislation exists to protect and support victims of DV, they are often not well understood by key parties or key parties do not know how to implement them. Ensuring that the police and judiciary know what tools exist and what they require is thus highly relevant to the local context.</td>
<td>The project has been delayed, so the final outcome is unknown; however, efforts thus far appear successful. The general campaign has not yielded notable results yet, but the trainings have been well received. Whether they lead to clear changes in practice for the police and judiciary is a question outside the scope of the current assessment.</td>
<td>There were two partners involved in this intervention: the CoE and the National Police Directorate in Norway (POD). Their role was primarily as experts supporting the project. To this end, their capacity was both necessary and well received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO20-0001 – Best practice model for victims of trafficking in human beings assistance – Pilot project</td>
<td>The main objective of the intervention has been creating an integrated system for the provision of assistance to victims of human trafficking.</td>
<td>The issue of trafficking is very relevant in Romania today; hence it is important to examine the current system to respond to human trafficking and ensure that the mechanisms in place are aligned with the national policies. Preventing trafficking and supporting victims of trafficking are also important.</td>
<td>The project has been delayed, so it is not possible to know all that has been achieved. Still, the training of trainers on supporting victims of trafficking appears to have been effective in raising awareness and improving knowledge amongst training target groups.</td>
<td>The CoE was highly valuable to the project in transferring knowledge to the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO20-0006 – CONSENS: Awareness-raising campaign on the negative effects of domestic violence in the regions Bucharest-Ilfov and South Muntenia</td>
<td>The project aimed to raise awareness and conduct an outreach campaign on the negative effects of family violence among the Roma population in the Bucharest-Ilfov and South Muntenia regions.</td>
<td>DV is prevalent generally, but the Roma population has particularly limited access to support. They often self-exclude from accessing services and are suspected to have limited information on what is available.</td>
<td>The effort yielded immediate reactions in some cases, suggesting that the type of interventions used resonated with the target population.</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO20-0015 – Network of support centres for</td>
<td>The project aimed to assist centres that</td>
<td>These efforts created a pool of services supporting centres that respond to victims’</td>
<td>The project included the establishment of support centres for elderly victims of DV.</td>
<td>The transfer of know-how and best practices through the public-private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO20-0002</td>
<td><strong>Integrated solutions for victims of domestic violence</strong></td>
<td>The project aimed to develop a network that also worked to establish a support centre for both victims and perpetrators, which included providing counselling and support for both groups.</td>
<td>In Romania, there was no mechanism or institution aiming to provide services and support for perpetrators. This project therefore filled a gap in services.</td>
<td>The project plans to focus on infrastructural development to support victims and perpetrators and launched awareness-raising campaigns. At the time of this review, the infrastructure had yet to be finished and hence services were provided from other locations (community centres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO20-0003</td>
<td><strong>We Help You to Be Safe – Rehabilitation centre for domestic violence victims Rm. Sărat</strong></td>
<td>The main project aim has been to rehabilitate existing infrastructure (shelters for victims of violence).</td>
<td>The project is highly relevant because the condition of the facilities was low and unusable.</td>
<td>The effort was not particularly effective because it did not consider the need for training staff and operational costs, and hence the facilities remain unused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO20-0008</td>
<td><strong>No Domestic Violence!</strong></td>
<td>The project targeted an underfunded area in the DV sector; therefore this project enabled overlooked regions to catch up and be able to more widely provide services to the target population.</td>
<td>The project aimed to improve the services available, increase the services provided, and make the services provided more widely known to the public in Sibiu County Council, City Hall Tâlmaciu.</td>
<td>The effort aims to change popular perception of DV through campaigning and provide counselling. Due to delays with the infrastructure component of the project, services to victims have not been provided thus far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO20-0010</td>
<td><strong>Emergency centre for victims of domestic violence in Olt County</strong></td>
<td>The project aimed to establish a centre for victims of family violence, provide ongoing training for service providers, and expand these facilities are currently offering services.</td>
<td>There is a shortage of services provided to DV victims in Romania. Therefore, all of these interventions aimed to close the gap between demand and supply for services.</td>
<td>The refurbishment of the shelter took place, but delays in hiring staff mean that the training of said staff has not materialised yet. The only component of the effort that has been completed thus far is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5.4 Effectiveness

According to the programme operator, the General Direction of Social Assistance and Child Protection at the Ministry of Justice – the main project promoter in Romania, hence warranting special attention – has managed the projects relatively well, but had some administrative and procurement challenges, particularly in commissioning infrastructure jobs. Other challenges (also found in other countries) related to the bureaucracy of fund management. Some NGOs encountered financial and contract management issues because they were unfamiliar with the administrative or financial burdens they may have had to incur at the onset. Other challenges related to the limited implementation capacity of project promoters, including on financial management.

The majority of the training activities implemented by both NGOs and public institutions ran smoothly. NGOs had some challenges working with Roma target groups because the community is difficult to access. Complex projects, which included establishing infrastructure and services for victims of DV and engaging perpetrators, did not do as well as expected. This was partly because of delays with infrastructure development, but also because the importance of having specialist staff to work with victims of DV was underestimated.

Overall in Romania, despite clear challenges, the programme made clear headway. Examples of achievements include:

- Capacity development of the judiciary and police. 55
- Development of capacity that supports the use of multidisciplinary teams to respond to DV/GBV cases.
- Engagement with the Roma population. 56
- Awareness raising and minor attitudinal changes on GBV among the general population, police, shelter staff, and the victims themselves.

However it is also worth highlighting that achievements are not yet complete since many efforts have been delayed and are still being implemented (see the table in section 7.5.3)

---

What it means to be a victim of domestic violence in Romania

The bureaucracy is enormous to place a victim of domestic violence (DV) into a shelter and put her through a support programme. As an example: One day a mother of five arrived in Bucharest, having travelled 150 kilometres with her five children after seeing a TV show with information about a shelter in Bucharest and support for DV victims.

To find shelter placement, the woman first had to wait for the Local Council of the Mayoralty of the relevant district in Bucharest to approve her request. This process took several weeks even though the law provides for much quicker response in extreme cases. During the waiting time, the state provided no home, food, or services for either her or her five children; the non-governmental organisation helping her had to find a solution through a private shelter for DV victims.

Shelter placement does not mean safety, however; the woman’s husband found her and the children and beat her on numerous occasions on the street close to the shelter. The police, although aware of the situation, did nothing to the perpetrator. This shows both the way the police see DV and what little recourse the law can provide. As a response to the continued threat of the husband, the women and her children have been moved among private shelters on numerous occasions. Still, to date, the police have not intervened in a manner that secures her and her children’s safety long term. Her case is not exceptional.

---

55 It is too early to know how the training has actually impacted their ability to do their job. Moreover, trainings are not yet complete, so the final number of direct beneficiaries is not yet known. Importantly, the training model is one that will be used more widely, so the intervention itself is only the initial stage of the intervention.

56 It is not possible to know the total Roma population reached, as projects not exclusively targeting Roma do not disaggregate their data by ethnic group. The CONSENS project targeted 300 Roma individuals.
6.6 Slovakia

6.6.1 Context

The situation is difficult in Slovakia on issues related to DV/GBV. Many people do not understand the benefits of human rights protection, which is exacerbated by conservative groups contrasting human rights with traditional values. The impact of politically conservative groups is not trivial when thinking about the role of the government in Slovakia – for example, in considering the lack of support for ratification of the Istanbul Convention. In relation to DV, the situation is even more dangerous for minority groups. However, the fight against GBV/DV has become a relevant public policy issue, primarily as a result of efforts by local NGOs and CSOs.

As a result of multiple efforts, a key strategic policy document (the National Action Plan for the Prevention and Elimination of Violence against Women 2014-2019) was drafted and enacted; additionally, the National Helpline for Women Experiencing Violence was launched in 2015. More recently, the level of government commitment has increased, which is a positive step, but in many cases these efforts have failed to include the knowledge and experience of NGOs and CSOs. This has resulted in slower-than-expected progress and represents a typical case of relearning lessons that are already known.

6.6.2 The programme and its relevance

The programme in Slovakia aimed to support the development of social services for women experiencing or at risk of DV/GBV in intimate partnerships and for survivors of DV. The interventions included support for existing counselling centres, new counselling centres, the development of women’s shelters/safe women’s houses, and centres focused on providing services for people experiencing DV. In addition, the programme supported the development of support services that were gender-sensitive, as well as human rights- and client-oriented. It also supported training professionals tasked with supporting victims of DV/GBV, as well as conducting campaigns, awareness-raising activities, and public events to increase awareness about DV/GBV. In addition, interventions aimed to strengthen networking and institutional cooperation at the local, regional, and national level and cultivate bilateral cooperation.

In Slovakia, needs related to service provision (such as shelters, safe houses, and psychosocial support) far exceed the available resources. Moreover existing resources generally do not meet the minimal standards delineated by the CoE.57 Therefore, the programme interventions undoubtedly filled a gap in the local context. In addition, the government has introduced the Coordinating Methodical Centre as a hub to coordinate DV/GBV response efforts. However, their efforts thus far have not been as well received or inclusive as they could have been. The main challenges relate to institutional collaboration. Clearly, collaboration could be greater and more inclusive, taking advantage of the wealth of knowledge amassed by CSOs over the years.

The Norwegian Centre on Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies has supported the implementation

Building safe houses: An uphill battle

In 2014, the organisation MYMAMY secured funding for a project to build a women’s shelter/safe house in the Prešov region. The project specifically responded to the needs identified within the town and the region, which lacked a safe house for women at risk of or experiencing domestic or gender-based violence. However, from the outset, the project encountered resentment and rejection from the local population and members of the local parliament. Local residents felt the presence of a safe house would increase crime and noise pollution and generally cause disturbances in a residential area. A petition against the safe house managed to secure more than a thousand signatures.

Both the petition and media coverage resulted in the loss of partners, with both the municipality and regional authorities retracting their support. This meant the non-governmental organisation faced costs that far exceeded what was originally anticipated. As a countermeasure to secure the funding to execute the project, MYMAMY launched a public fundraising campaign that ran until the end of the 2015. As a result of the additional efforts by MYMAMY, the women’s safe house in Prešov opened in November 2015. The safe house is the only one of its kind in the region and can accommodate up to 35 people (women and their children). The safe house also provides counselling services and has space for trainings. (SK09-0005).

of the competency model, participated in the exchange of experiences, and supported knowledge and competency building; it has also supported monitoring and evaluation (including the use of quantitative and qualitative research methods), worked on the development of new research methodologies, and focused attention on primary prevention and on working with children who have experienced DV. The partnership has also supported the development of a national system of coordination, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation for GBV/DV-related public policies and measures, as well as supported the monitoring of national plans and strategies on the prevention and elimination of GBV/DV.

Regarding the bilateral dimension, partners plan to continue to work together even after project completion. The Norwegian Centre on Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies has expressed willingness to participate in research, data processing, and other activities to perform comparative analysis of various aspects of GBV/DV in Norway and Slovakia.

6.6.3 Effectiveness

Overall, effectiveness appears to have been high. However, the experience of both partners and other stakeholders seems to be a key factor in how well service provision was received. Additionally, local politics played a central role in service delivery – so much so that one of the organisations that was awarded a contract had to withdraw their proposal because they were unable to execute their project without the support of an experienced service provider and no service provider was willing to engage with them because they were a local ecumenical institution.

The findings suggest that well-established organisations perform better when providing services to victims. The effectiveness of interventions focusing on women and survivors of DV also depends on the quality of experts and professionals participating in face-to-face service provision. Notably, efforts have not only been able to expand service provision in terms of quantity, but also coverage. The Norway Grants specifically, for example, were able make selected shelters wheelchair-accessible.

6.6.4 General findings

Table 10: General project overview: Slovakia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project overview</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Bilateral dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0013 – The Centre PEACE – for the bettering of the protection and support services for victims of violence in the families</td>
<td>The project focuses on improving the situation of women in need who are at risk of violence or experiencing different forms of violence, as well as their children. This includes providing a holistic support package that includes psychosocial support.</td>
<td>The project is relevant because the number of facilities providing residential support and a comprehensive long-term support package are limited.</td>
<td>The project has successfully provided adequate housing for women victims of DV and their children. The support system not only includes the shelter, but also support to enable the victim to start a new life.</td>
<td>The partnerships with Romerike Crisis Centre (NO), Indre-Ostfold Crisis Centre IKS (NO) have fostered the sharing of ideas and experiences, enriching the project and partners substantially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0009 – Coordinating Methodical Centre</td>
<td>This institution has been established by the government and is intended to be a clearinghouse and central point for support, collaboration, research, and the monitoring of policies and their implementation.</td>
<td>Having a one-stop coordinating body for all DV/GBV activities is a positive step. However, in some ways, the Coordinating Methodical Centre has not been fully able to act as a unifier. This reduces its relevance and</td>
<td>The centre has encountered problems related to delays and misunderstanding with other actors, but generally it has been able to provide trainings and support organisations providing direct support to victims.</td>
<td>The relationship with the dpps, Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies (NO), and Council of Europe are strong. The centre has benefited from exchange and sharing experience, seeing the potential for a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>DPP Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0005 – Safe Women’s House</td>
<td>This project aimed to improve the quality of a women’s shelter in Bratislava. This included infrastructural aspects, as well as supporting staff training, enabling additional services such as a helpline, and promoting women-oriented counselling.</td>
<td>In Bratislava, the amount of shelters is insufficient for the needs identified. Additionally, facilities that could respond to the needs of individuals with physical disabilities, for example, did not exist.</td>
<td>Specialised services (such as safe housing for women, counselling, specialised health care services, individual and group psychotherapy, self-help groups, and educational activities) all help improve GE. These kinds of activities demonstrate progress. Equally, the shelter facilities are also welcomed, as they will enable the provision of services to a wider audience. The intervention is not cost-effective, but provides an effective response to the needs of victims of violence.</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0004 – Building new The region does not have many</td>
<td>The project aimed to create the conditions</td>
<td>The provision of basic and specialised social</td>
<td>The aim of the partnership with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SK09-0025    | Improving the quality of counselling for women experiencing violence in intimate partnerships in Kosice region | The project was designed to improve quality and promote accessibility of specific service for women in the Kosice region in eastern Slovakia through cooperation with the regional government.  

The project aimed to provide shelter services to women who did not have access to them. In addition to providing services, the project aimed to support the eradication of DV through campaigning and awareness raising. | Campaigns and public events support a framework for social services, and responsive, decisive multi-institutional cooperation at the regional level proved effective, as did the provision of services and outreach to victims in remote areas. | See above.                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| SK09-0014    | Women's House Trencin                                                       | The aim of the project was to establish a safe house in the Trencin region. The district has limited available services, and this safe house was designed to respond to this need.  

Raising awareness, coupled with an array of support services to victims (including psychosocial and legal services), was seen as a positive way to curb the prevalence of DV. | The project has five partners from various sectors – the local Office of Labour and Social Affairs and Family, a university, an unspecified social service provider, and partners from Norway. Their specific roles were unclear in the documentation. |                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
6.7 Spain

6.7.1 Context

Spain is one of the European countries at the forefront of equality-friendly policies. In recent years, Spain has introduced ground-breaking legislation to combat GBV and uphold principles of GE in private and public life. The Organic Act 3/2007 of 22 March for Effective Equality between Women and Men was a milestone within the Spanish labour law system, highlighting equality between women and men in the labour market and workplace. However, the gender gap remains keenly visible within the labour market. Overall, women are overrepresented in lower-paying sectors of the economy and underrepresented on company boards and other decision-making bodies; efforts to close the pay gap and gain a more balanced distribution of unpaid housework and child-rearing responsibilities have not yet achieved full success.

Strongly linked to gender-based inequalities, violence against women represents a major obstacle to the achievement of full equality between women and men. Spain has progressive legislation on GBV – the Organic Act 1/2004 of 28 December on Integrated Protection Measures against Gender Violence. This legislation establishes a system for providing integrated protection measures to: prevent, punish, and eradicate violence against women; assist victims; and offer an institutional framework for action that is both coordinated and integrated. Despite the substantial advances in helping victims, there are still too many women killed or injured at the hand of intimate partners (or former partners). Hence despite the considerable progress and attention to the issue, many challenges remain and maintaining attention on the issue continues to require support.

6.7.2 The programme and its relevance

The gender equality programme principally aims to support projects that promote effective mechanisms to foment gender equity and to combat GBV. The need for these kinds of interventions has been highlighted in numerous studies and is complemented by statistical data on the situation of women in multiple labour sectors. The main areas that have been identified as requiring attention include:

- Improving balance between work, private, and family life and the share of household and care responsibilities between women and men;
- Improving gender balance in company boards;
- Mainstreaming gender issues into policies and practices;
- Promoting female entrepreneurship; and
- Promoting the inclusion into the labour market of women belonging to vulnerable groups and reducing the gender pay gap.

The programme identified the following groups as key targets for interventions: civil servants/public administration staff, public authorities, entrepreneurs, minorities, the unemployed, the education sector, and companies. Special consideration has been made for vulnerable women, such as immigrants, single mothers, women with disabilities, women from rural areas, Roma women, and women prisoners or victims of intimate-partner violence.

---

**Empowering women to claim equitable roles in the workplace**

The Promociona Project was launched to promote women’s access to top management by identifying and enhancing female talent, involving employers, and increasing awareness among participating companies. The project was merit-based, meaning that candidates had to show proficiency as opposed to being selected simply because they were women. The project included a diverse array of activities, including academic capacity development, executive coaching sessions, and individual mentoring. While all activities are positive, according to beneficiaries the real added value of the initiative has been the personal and professional empowerment of participants. They felt this was a catalytic shift that could enable them to better drive their professional careers and utilise networking in a more efficient and effective manner. Many of the beneficiaries of the project have come together to establish the Spanish Association of Executive and Board Members, which serves as a platform to promote the presence of women in senior management positions and boards of directors. The organisation also is a space to share experiences and knowledge, ultimately creating a multiplier effect for the original intervention. The association includes project beneficiaries, but it is also open to new members (ES04-007).
The programme has funded 70 projects and various bilateral and complementary actions, with a total budget of EUR 11,989,706. Overall, the programme has clearly filled a notable gap by bringing attention and practical solutions to the inequity experienced by women in the Spanish labour market.

### 6.7.3 General findings

#### Table 11: General project overview: Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project overview</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Bilateral dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES04-0007 – Raising awareness, training, professional growth, the development of leadership, and the promotion of women and of women managers in the business community in order to facilitate their access to decision-making positions within their companies (Progres</td>
<td>The aim of the project is to promote women’s access to top management positions and boards of directors in companies.</td>
<td>The effort is highly relevant to the Spanish context because despite clear legislation and policies, there are still clear inequalities between men and women and the positions they tend to hold in the workplace.</td>
<td>The programme provided academic training and coached companies to foster support for women seeking management or senior positions, as well as fostered a network that would enable women to support each other thereafter</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES04-0048 – Access Program Romi (Acceder Romi. Una apuesta por la empleabilidad de las mujeres gitanas)</td>
<td>The project focused on attracting Roma women to the labour market (enabling employment to be a real option), as well as promoting employability, social inclusion, and GE.</td>
<td>In Spain, Roma women suffer multiple forms of discrimination on the basis of gender, ethnicity, and social origin. Supporting their inclusion in the labour market not only aims to counter discrimination, but also to help improve often-precarious economic conditions.</td>
<td>The project identified gaps in the labour force and worked with Roma women to support their ability to fill existing gaps. It was effective because it addressed micro-level conditions where it was implemented rather than simply providing support or vocational training to beneficiaries. In addition, the project worked specifically to promote social inclusion to further facilitate engagement in the labour force.</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es04-0005 – Equality Plans in Schools Project, a practical tool for education based on equality (Plurales) (Predefined</td>
<td>This project aimed to change gender inequality paradigms by introducing new processes of socialisation into</td>
<td>The socialisation of young people is a leading factor in the development of stereotypes, bias, and discrimination. This project aims to</td>
<td>The project served to develop new pedagogical tools to address gender inequality and socialisation around gender roles. It was</td>
<td>No dpp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES04-0004 – Entrepreneur women in selected economic sectors (Predefined project)</strong></td>
<td>The project aimed to promote equal opportunities from a business perspective, strengthening the entrepreneurial potential of women throughout the country, particularly women from disadvantaged groups.</td>
<td>Cultural bias that discourages entrepreneurial women has often cut short their efforts. This project aimed to counter this bias by specifically promoting women’s efforts.</td>
<td>The project was effective, as it supported women entrepreneurs from a variety of angles. This included supporting women to enter emerging sectors and high-potential new market opportunities, promoting the consolidation of existing entrepreneurs in emerging sectors, and creating companies led by women in these sectors. They also included developing training, supporting programmes to promote compliance with the above objectives, and facilitating the access of women entrepreneurs in these sectors to funding for the creation and development of their companies. This multifaceted approach has generated positive outcomes.</td>
<td>There was no official dpp, although there have been meetings with potential Norwegian partners. Locally in Spain, the project was partnered with multiple local entities that aimed to facilitate access to the entrepreneurial sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES04-0018 – Action Equal Pay</strong></td>
<td>The project aimed to understand the factors that contribute to wage gaps and develop and disseminate strategies, mechanisms, and union trade tools to detect and combat the gender wage gap.</td>
<td>The law determines that the pay gap should not exist, but working to ensure it disappears has proven more elusive. Therefore, working directly with unions is a key way by which the Engaging unions as key actors in wage negotiations is an important way to streamline the pay gap issue and ensure that gender is not a defining factor in salary decisions. The project sought first to understand what</td>
<td></td>
<td>The dpp was the Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions. This has enabled sharing of experiences and ideas as to how the issue can be best addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project aimed to generate research on the causes for pay gaps and make information on pay gaps readily available to facilitate trade union negotiations. As above. The project generated informational tools that facilitate the identification of gender pay gaps. Better identification of the factors influencing these gaps, and the gaps themselves, allows for collective bargaining and policies to address them more adequately. This proved to be an effective way of ensuring that pay gaps are reduced and creating greater awareness on the issue.

The project aimed to address the pay gap challenge in rural areas specifically. Rural areas are often last in adopting new social norms. The pay gap is no exception. Therefore, targeting rural areas in Spain on pay gap issues is important. The project addressed the issue by focusing attention on research to explain the gender pay gap in rural areas and responding to the findings with specific proposals to achieve salary GE in this sector. It presented innovative approaches and new dynamics for economic activities in rural areas (for example, introducing sustainable tourism) in which women are key actors for local change.

### 6.7.4 Effectiveness

Clearly, the challenges facing Spain are numerous, and the programme made some headway. According to the programme’s final report, the number of direct beneficiaries exceeded 15,000.

The programme is recognised as having:
● Promoted employment and entrepreneurship for women. These efforts were supported through more than 600 conferences, workshops, and seminars.
● Improved the self-empowerment, self-esteem, and motivation amongst women beneficiaries.
● Served as an agent for cultural transformation by encouraging the abandonment of gender stereotypes, supporting certain groups of women to become entrepreneurs and innovators, and increasing awareness of key issues such as the gender pay gap.
● Generated substantial knowledge on gender issues related to the labour market and workplace, and also identified and refined good practices to achieve true GE.

Social integration through labour market access: Working with the Roma

The Access Romi Project aimed to attract Roma women into the labour market and thereby create opportunities for income-generating work. The project promoted their employability through vocational training, taking into consideration their preferences and the local labour market and improving the perception of the Roma in the general population. The intervention model was based on personalised labour-introduction plans adapted to the needs of Roma women, focusing on integrating guidance, training, and competence identification. In addition, the project tried to raise awareness on the importance of training and employment as a pathway to social inclusion and equal opportunities. As a result of the integrated process, individual empowerment was often identified as the most significant outcome. Empowerment was a result not only of the vocational training, but also of supporting the development of life skills related to appearance, communication skills, and other factors. Additionally, project success must also be partially attributed to its comprehensive approach, which included the families as well.
PART III

7    Approach and Methodology

This section describes the approach and methodology used for this assignment. This reflects the discussions with the representatives from the EEA and Norway Grants in Brussels on June 9, 2016, and comments made to the inception note approved June 30, 2016.

7.1    Underlying concepts

This assignment aimed to specifically address each of the seven countries included in the review, but also facilitate a broader comparison in terms of experiences and recommendations. To this end, the approach and methodology aimed to identify overarching issues, as well as country-specific concerns and realities. The team ensured this through its method for data collection, analysis, and presentation (in this report and other deliverables).

This report’s findings explore both the overall set of interventions across all countries (chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6), as well as a set of summaries that highlight the most relevant findings specific to each country (chapter 7).

While the assessment team recognises that each country has its own individual characteristics, it feels that the approach, tools, and team composition enabled us to identify, understand, and analyse each intervention with adequate country-specific nuance and specificity, as well as identify crosscutting lessons learned.

To adequately meet the demands of this rapid assessment, the team used an overarching approach that considered:

- How the client is engaged.
- How the evaluation is understood.
- How the evaluated are engaged.

In short, the assessment team used an approach inspired by utilisation-focused evaluation and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) definition of key criteria. The team also used a gender- and human rights-centred approach that took the specific needs of human subjects into account. These aspects of the assignment are detailed below.

7.1.1    Utilisation-focused evaluation

A utilisation-focused evaluation approach aims to maximise the use of the assessment findings by key stakeholders. In this case, this has translated into the utility of the findings for the donor countries of the EEA and Norway Grants and their secretariat, the Financial Mechanism Office (FMO), in relation to the countries’ support for gender-focused programmes. In addition, the funding recipients will also be informed of the results of the document, and hence their needs have also been considered during the implementation of the assignment. The application of utilisation-focused evaluation included identifying, organising, and engaging intended users, conducting a situational analysis, and ensuring that the methods used to generate findings adequately supported the generation of useful recommendations. In addition, preliminary findings and emerging lines of inquiry were discussed with experts in all countries visited by the team leader: Slovakia, Romania, and Poland. This too has supported a contextually relevant analysis of the information collected. The findings, how they have been reached, and how they can be used will be discussed directly with the FMO of the EEA and Norway Grants as part of the delivery of this report.

7.1.2    Evaluation criteria

This rapid assessment focused on three specific criteria: effectiveness, relevance, and the bilateral dimension. The OECD DAC defines the former two. The latter is understood as the nature and quality of cooperation

60 Ibid.
between DPPs and dpss – including the CoE – and programme operators and project promoters, respectively. This engagement has taken place at the programme or project level; in some cases, the DDP or dp (including the CoE) has engaged at both levels within a single country. The assessment team collected general and country-specific information. For the bilateral element of the rapid assessment, the team’s focus was on exchanging knowledge and experiences, leading to capacity building, learning, and sustainability. Through its data collection, the team found that the dynamics of engagement were important and required special attention; thus, they were also explored.

Achievements within each criterion were assessed in line with the guidelines noted in the terms of reference. Table 2 presents the data sources and lines of inquiry used.

### Table 2: Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Data source/type</th>
<th>Main line of inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Project and programme documentation, as well as relevant country and European priorities, policies, and guidelines.</td>
<td>To what degree does the effort meet (keeps with) national-level and Europe-wide priorities, policies, and guidelines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Documentation of outcome-level results based on desk and field study work.</td>
<td>What are the demonstrated tangible and notable improvements in GE and the reduction/ prevention of domestic and gender-based violence? What dynamics between interventions, and relative to context, may determine success or failure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral dimensions</td>
<td>Programme and project documents and partnership documentation and interpretation/case materials through interviews and online questionnaire.</td>
<td>What is the relationship between the donor programme and project partners and the respective programme operators and project promoters? (This includes characteristics, added value, capacity building and learning, how the relationship contributes to sustainability, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.1.3 Addressing gender and equity in evaluation

OECD DAC’s human rights- and gender-related norms and standards\(^{62}\) were applied in this rapid assessment. This meant that when the team explored issues of gender inequality, discrimination, and violence, it paid special attention to the needs, manners, and customs of all stakeholders and beneficiaries (including women, men, girls, and boys) and acted with honesty and integrity. It also meant that in the assessment design, the team explored inequalities in resource allocation and strategic approaches to supporting women, men, girls, and boys and how these affected the general objectives of the projects and programmes.\(^{63}\) Hence specific attention was paid to exploring if, when, and how different groups were targeted. This meant that the lines of inquiry did not simply focus on what was achieved, but rather what was achieved for whom specifically. This meant that the assessment team looked beyond whether and to what degree equity for women was achieved, investigating which women had been the benefactors.

The same was done with questions on DV and GBV. This perspective proved important because while a project or programme may have been successful, the picture is incomplete without knowing its targeting limitations. This means, for example, that not all victims of DV have the same characteristics or experience the same dynamics leading to the violence. Thus, although the result – the violence – might be the same, the causal factors can be

---


63 It is important to underscore that little information was available on how funding was distributed between women, men, girls and boys. Indeed it appears that by and large the funds targeted women specifically in efforts such as shelters, or the general population at large in efforts of information dissemination. Also notable is that in most cases there is no specific mention of how individual groups were targeted and provided with support. This in itself shows that in some cases the problem itself, be it GE or GBV/DV, are not seen from multiple perspectives, but rather as efforts where women should be at the centre of the intervention.
quite different and individuals may have different needs in terms of support and protection.  

7.1.4 Working with human subjects

The assessment team used the *Guidance Note for Researchers and Evaluators in Social Science*, which was drafted with European Union-funded projects in mind. In addition, when relevant, the team adhered to the Social Research Association’s *Ethical Guidelines*. In some cases, this meant that it was not possible to safely and responsibly engage with end beneficiaries. In such cases, the team found alternative approaches to collect information that could speak to outputs, outcomes, and potential impact. This included targeting staff working directly with beneficiaries, as well as interviewing external subject matter experts.

7.2 Methodology

This assignment included two distinct lines of inquiry in each country: desk review and case study. The former relied on a review of literature complemented by the use of online questionnaires. The latter employed additional data-collection tools, including case history interviews, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions. These tools are briefly described below, and annex 4 includes protocols for the methods used.

7.2.1 Document review

The document review included project, programme, and grant documents, as well as all relevant policies and strategies at the European and national levels. The team used this information to explore what had been done, what has been achieved, and how activities aligned with relevant guidelines and positions. The document review also provided contextual information.

7.2.2 Case history interviews

A case history interview is guided by broad questions – for example, ‘Could you run through the history and implementation of the programme or project?’ This allows the respondent to detail the programme or project from her or his perspective, highlighting not only what the investigators are interested in, but also potentially elements not focused on in the semi-structured interviews. As part of this rapid assessment, case history interviews were used to establish a broader frame of reference than the information requested by the terms of reference. Case history interviews were conducted with individuals who were then involved, or had been involved, at the programme or project level in each country; these interviews were also conducted with subject matter experts.

7.2.3 Key respondent semi-structured interviews

Questions in the semi-structured interviews were tied more closely to the key questions established by the terms of reference. Thus, the team used this type of interview to respond to specific questions regarding the assessment criteria. This type of interview was used both independently and as a complement to case history interviews.

The assessment team conducted semi-structured interview with experts with knowledge relevant to the projects and programmes included in this rapid assessment, as well as those with expertise on policies or strategies at the national or European level related to DV, GBV, or GE.

7.2.4 Focus group discussions

A focus group discussion, as opposed to an interview, allows for discussion among individuals from similar groups or backgrounds, and can hence add richness to the findings by enabling a more nuanced, contextualised understanding.

This tool was used to collect information from groups that shared common or similar experiences; these joint discussions helped generate more nuanced findings and facilitated learning by creating a feedback loop. The team used this tool with direct and indirect beneficiaries, as well as with staff conducting similar activities. Some groups were mixed-gender, while others were single-gender. The team made determinations on the composition of each

focus group discussion on a case-by-case basis, looking at the goals of the discussions. Determination on focus group composition meant the richest data, different perspectives, and an environment in which participants would feel free to speak. For a full list of focus group discussions conducted and their composition, see annex 2.

7.2.5 Online questionnaires

The assessment team used online questionnaires targeting each of the project promoters for all eight projects assessed in each country, as well as programme operators, DPPs, and dpps. The questionnaires helped generate comparable data across interventions within and between countries, even though in some cases the response rates were low.67

7.3 Sampling

The EEA and Norway Grants fund numerous projects under the two portfolios under review for this assignment. Eight projects per country were selected for review. In each country, the assessment team visited and conducted case studies for three; five were assessed using only literature and the online questionnaire. The projects selected in each country were identified using the following criteria:

For the in-depth case studies:
- Two of the largest projects (in terms of funding).
- At least one predefined project.
- One project with the least amount of funding (the smallest or amongst the smallest).
- One project selected through an open call.
- One project conducted outside the capital city of the country.

For the desk review cases:
- Projects not selected for an in-depth case study.
- The five largest projects (in terms of funding), after the selection of the case study cases.
- At least one project conducted outside of the country’s capital city.

Additional criteria that only applied to some countries:
- At least one Roma-focused project in the total sample for Bulgaria, Romania, and Slovakia.
- At least one shelter project in the total sample for each country with a DV/GBV project.

The above criteria allowed the team to cover a range of activities and hence permitted a relatively large level of representation of different experiences. After the sample was selected, the team made changes in Estonia, Slovakia, and Bulgaria – in the first two countries to remove perceived conflicts of interest with the consultant, and in Bulgaria because the project selected for an in-depth study was unresponsive and hence switched with a case originally selected for a desk study. A full list of the selected cases is in annex 3.

7.4 Data collection

National consultants (subject matter experts) collected all data except for two projects, one in Estonia and one in Slovakia. In these two cases, a perceived conflict of interest led to the decision to have the data collected directly by the team leader. The online questionnaires were fielded using the Survey Monkey online platform and managed centrally by the team leader; the national consultant translated them as needed. The team leader visited three countries – Poland, Slovakia, and Romania – once preliminary analysis had been conducted, but before drafting the final report. The visits focused on having discussions with the programme operators, project implementers, and subject matter experts to verify and discuss preliminary findings in an effort to further contextualise findings and further inform the deliverables, particularly deliverables focusing on the countries visited. The selection of countries to be visited was determined by the consultant and the FMO.

There were some clear challenges with data collection. For example, key interviewees were unresponsive during the holiday season; this led to changes in sampling to ensure that eight cases were reviewed and three projects

67 The low response rate experienced in some cases can be attributed to the summer holiday. Multiple reminders were issued, the questionnaire response option was kept open until mid-August, and all respondents were notified ahead of time that they would receive a questionnaire. Still, some respondents still did not open the invitation email.
visited in each country. Still some of the data could not be collected until late in the study period because respondents were away on holiday for most of the summer. Similarly, there were delays and low levels of response to the online questionnaire.68

Still, although data collection was delayed, the assessment team is confident that the collected data adequately speaks to project and programme experiences. The only major shortcoming concerns the disaggregation of questionnaire data. Some disaggregation is not possible because response rates in individual countries and among respondent types vary, meaning that in some cases they are too low to be representative. Hence, while collectively the data is robust, it is not similarly robust if disaggregated.

7.5 Data processing and analysis

The assessment team processed and analysed data using the robust qualitative data analysis online tool Deedose (www.deedose.com), as well as QCA. Deedose enabled systematic data analysis and facilitated the identification of findings at the project, country, and global (whole EEA and Norway Grants) level.

QCA is a case-oriented comparative approach that allows for the examination of in-depth case study data, transforming it into quantitative data and thus allowing for the identification of patterns.69 Using the QCA method enabled the assessment team to systematically compare cases while simultaneously looking at the wide array of factors affecting each case and examining the configuration of each case. This method, unlike other more judgement-based approaches, has the advantage of providing robust evidence-based explanations for causal patterns. The approach also allows for full transparency since the methodology requires that all data be clearly documented in data tables known as truth tables (i.e., an analysis matrix). The truth tables used in this evaluation were developed in consultation with the EEA and Norway Grants and refined by virtue of the quality of the data available. See annex 5 for both the truth tables and the raw analysis.

7.6 Quality assurance

The assessment team’s approach to quality assurance built on the definition of evaluation quality in the Joint Committee on Standards’ Programme Evaluation Standards.70,71 According to these standards, a high-quality evaluation is characterised by utility, feasibility, propriety, and reliability. The structures and processes used by the assessment team were designed to help achieve those attributes for all of the deliverables submitted to the client. The evaluation’s quality-assurance component focused on three objectives:

- Ensuring that the findings and conclusions would be useful.
- Helping avoid bias in the assessment process.
- Bringing innovative and creative thinking into the process.

The team operationalised the quality-assurance process by using tools developed by Forss et al.72 Indicators captured utility, feasibility, propriety, and reliability, thus going somewhat further than the OECD DAC standards. Each indicator was rated on a scale from one to six, in which three represented a satisfactory approach.

---

68 The response rate for the different questionnaires was: programme promoters questionnaire about the programme (8); programme promoters questionnaire on bilateral experience (5); project operators on project (38); project operators on donor project partner (dpp) experience (34) donor programme partners (DPPs) (2) – given the low rate of response and the fact that a number of DPPs were interviewed, the survey data was joined with dpp responses; and dpps (23).


71 The Joint Committee on Standards first established the standards, which were first published by Sage (1994) and updated in 2010. Under the four main categories identified, there are a number of specific standards. The standards have inspired many other organisations such as the American Evaluation Association, the African Evaluation Association, the European Commission, and the OECD DAC guidelines.

72 This was done as part of a consultancy assignment to review the quality of Sida’s evaluation reports. The format for quality assessment has since been slightly developed so that aspects of utility are further elaborated and some of the descriptive elements are removed. It is thus a shorter and more focused format used for quality control on this evaluation assignment. See Forss, K., Vedung, E., Kruse, S. E., Mwaiselage, A., & Nilsdotter, A. (2008). Are Sida evaluations good enough? Sida Studies in Evaluation: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency.
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  - Project application (07.09.2015).
  - Final Report (07.06.2016)

  - Project Contract no 6.3-17.3/5636 (04.2013)
  - Amendments to the Project Contract no 1 (2014), no 2 (06.2015), and no 3 (2016)
  - Pre-defined project proposal (12.04.2013).
  - Final Report (2016b)

Desk study

  - Project application (2013a).
D Literature used in the Polish case
NORMATIVE/STRATEGIC DOCUMENTS

Europe


Poland

- Ustawa z dnia 29 lipca 2005 r. o przeciwdziałaniu przemocy w rodzinie (Dz.U. z dnia 20 września 2005 r., Nr 180, poz. 1493) (Act on counteracting violence in family)
- Krajowy Program Przeciwdziałania Przemocy w Rodzinie (National Programme on Counteracting Violence in the Family, 2014)
- Sprawozdanie z Realizacji Krajowego Programu Przeciwdziałania Przemocy w Rodzinie za 2014 r. (Report from the realisation of the National Programme on Counteracting Violence in the Family, 2014)

Other funding in Poland

- Human Capital Operational Programme – Programme Complement

Press information about the political context

- [http://wiadomosci.gazeta.pl/wiadomosci/56,114944,20094224,rzad-nie-sfinansuje-tez-centrow-praw-kobiet,8.html]
- [http://www.lex.pl/czytaj/-/artykul/ms-centra-praw-kobiet-nie-dostana-dotacji-z-powodu-niescislosci-w-rozliczeniach]

Contextual research used to assess if the programme addressed needs

- Bedyńska S. et. al. Ewaluacja lokalnego systemu przeciwdziałania przemocy w rodzinie - doświadczenia dotyczące sposobów pomagania i nasilenia stresu pourazowego (PTSD) z perspektywy osób otkniętych przemocą w rodzinie, swps, 2013 (Evaluation of a local programme of counteracting violence in the family, PTSD experience of victims)

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS

PL14: Domestic and Gender-based Violence

- Program Agreement
- Program Overview
- Final Report 2015
- Program website [http://przeciwprzemocy.mpips.gov.pl/]
- EEA website [http://eeagrants.org/programme/view/PL14/PA29]

PROJECT DOCUMENTS

In-depth study

- **PROJECT 1**: PL14-0001 Polish family - free from violence (Predefined project). **Project Promoter**: Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy
  - Project description in the programme agreement
Partnership Agreement between the CoE and the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy

Ramowy program szkolenia dla członków zespołów interdyscyplinarnych w zakresie przeciwdziałania przemocy w rodzinie i przemocy ze względu na płeć. (The programme of training for interdisciplinary teams)

Raport końcowy (podsumowanie realizacji projektu) z realizacji szkoleń o tematyce przeciwdziałania przemocy w rodzinie i przemocy ze względu na płeć dla członków Zespołów Interdyscyplinarnych, realizowanych w ramach projektu predefiniowanego „Rodzina polska – wolna od przemocy” Okres sprawozdawczy: 05.10.2015 roku - 18.03.2016 roku (Report from the training for interdisciplinary teams)

Andrea Krizsan, Eniko Pap: WDRAŻANIE KOMPLEKSOWEJ I SKOORDYNOWANEJ POLITYKI. Ocena działań Polski w obszarze zapobiegania i zwalczania przemocy ze względu na płeć. 2016 (The CoE comparative report on policies counteracting gender based violence)

Contextual research to assess if project meets needs:

Diagnoza dotycząca realizacji zadań wynikających z ustawy o przeciwdziałaniu przemocy w rodzinie wykonywanych przez zespoły interdyscyplinarne/ grupy robocze, a także realizacji procedury „Niebieskie Karty” w oparciu o rozporządzenie w sprawie procedury „Niebieskie Karty” oraz wzorów formularzy „Niebieska Karta”. RAPORT Z BADAŃ ZREALIZOWANYCH NA ZAMÓWIENIE MINISTERSTWA PRACY I POLITYKI SPOŁECZNEJ PRZEZ INSTYTUT BADAWCZY MILLWARD BROWN SMG/KRC, Warszawa, 2012 (Diagnosis of the Blue Card procedure)


● PROJECT 2: PL14-0002 Strengthening measures to support victims of domestic violence (Predefined project). Project Promoter: Ministry of Justice
  o Project contract
  o Project proposal PP2_MS
  o Project Final Report
  o Project website https://www.pomocofiarom.ms.gov.pl/pl/
  o Wzmocnienie działań na rzecz ofiar przemocy w rodzinie (Information leaflet)

● PROJECT 3: PL14-0007 IMPLEMENTING PREVENTIVE MEASURES TO REDUCE GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE
  Project promoter: City of Mińsk Mazowiecki
  o Project contract
  o Angelika Walasek-Stefanowicz: Sprawozdanie z prowadzenia grupy psychoedukacyjnej dla kobiet dotkniętych przemocą z problemem alkoholowym (Report from the psychoeducational group for women)
  o Anna Gruba: Opis działań psychologa w ramach projektu “Podejmowanie działań profilaktycznych w zakresie zmniejszania zjawiska przemocy ze względu na płeć” (Description of the psychologist’s activities in the project)
  o Milena Pyrzanowska: Raport z realizacji zadań wykonywanych na stanowisku psychologa w ramach projektu “Podejmowanie działań profilaktycznych w zakresie zmniejszania zjawiska przemocy ze względu na płeć” (Report from the psychologist’s activities in the project)
  o Marta Majek: Raport z realizacji programu poradnictwa pedagogicznego (Report from pedagogical counselling)
  o Dorota Piątkowska Kancelaria Adwokacka: Raport z przebiegu realizacji zadania (Report from legal counselling)
  o Marek Prejzner: Raport z realizacji superwizji w miejskim ośrodku pomocy społecznej w Mińsku Mazowieckim (Report from supervision)

PHOTOGRAPH FROM TRAINING FOR PROFESSIONALS WORKING WITH VICTIMS
• PROJECT 4: PL14-0003 Stop violence – second chance (Predefined project). **Project Promoter:** Central Board of Prison Service
  o Project proposal
  o Project final report

    o Project presentation - promotional materials
    o Program dla osób stosujących przemoc w rodzinie STOP PRZEMOCY, Niebieska Linia (Programme for perpetrators of violence in the family, Blue Line Association)
    o Protocols of reception of the trainings, including evaluations survey results
    o Sebastian Lizińczyk: Praca ze sprawcami przemocy domowej, Stop przemoc - druga szansa; Forum penitencjarne (Sebastian Lizińczyk: Working with perpetrators of violence in the family. Stop violence – second chance, [in] Penitentiary forum

• PROJECT 5: PL14-0012 Power to help **Project Promoter:** Szysłowiec County
  o Project final report

Photographs from trainings – under the above link.

• PROJECT 6: PL14-0015 My home without violence - programme of prevention and education measures for victims of domestic violence residing in monar shelters for mothers and children **Project Promoter:** MONAR Association
  o Project final report
  o Teresa Sierawska: MÓJ DOM BEZ PRZEMOCY (My home without violence), presentation of the project assumptions
  o Teresa Sierawska: MÓJ DOM BEZ PRZEMOCY (My home without violence), final presentation of the project summary
  o Mariola Raclaw: Problem pozornie jawny - samotne macierzyństwo w polityce społeczne (Seemingly explicit problem of lone motherhood in social policy); conference presentation

  o Zasady współpracy Domów dla Samotnych Matek z Dziećmi - Markot z Ośrodkami Pomocy Społecznej w celu skutecznego wspomagania podopiecznych tych placówek w wyjściu z trudności życiowych. (The rules of cooperation between MARKOT Houses for Lone Mothers with Children and Centres of Social Assistance in order to effectively support the clients (proteges) of these houses in getting out of life’s difficulties)

Pictures:


• PROJECT 7: PL14-0019 LOVED ONES LOVE - NOT HURT **Project Promoter:** Bartoszyce Municipality
  o Project final report

Pictures from trainings, the final seminar and pictures from the shelter are available under the above link.

• PROJECT 8: PL14-0004 “RICH AND BEAUTIFUL” CENTRE **Project Promoter:** Women's Rights Centre
  o Project final report

**Literature used in the Portuguese case**
NORMATIVE/STRATEGIC DOCUMENTS

Europe

- Strategic Engagement for Gender Equality, 2016 - 2019
- Strategy for Equality between Women and Men 2010 - 2015

Portugal

- V National Plan to Prevent and Combat Domestic and Gender-based Violence 2014-2017
- Legislacao Lei 7 2009 Codigo Trabalho

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS

ES04: Gender equality and work-life balance

- Inception Report – Rapid Assessment of EEA and Norway Grants Support to Gender Programmes, June 30st, 2016
- Programme Overview – 15 Programme Overview – EEA and Norway Grants 2009-2014 –
- PT07: Mainstreaming Gender Equality and Promoting Work Life Balance
- Programme Annual Report PT07 Mainstreaming Gender Equality and Promoting Work Life Balance 2015

Enquadramento e ponto de situação a 1 de Agosto de 2016

PROJECT DOCUMENTS

In-depth study

- PROJECT 1: PT07-0006- Equality Balance

Project promoter: Associação de Famílias

- 3º Relatório de Execução Equality Balance Abril, 2016
- Relatório de Execução Associação Familias Setembro de 2015
- AF Form EEA Grants - Candidatura
- Descrição do Projecto Equality Balance
- Presentation E.Balance
- Apresentação Projeto Equality Balance
- Instrument Diretor Equality Balance Project

- PROJECT 2: PT07_007 - National survey on time use by men and women (Predefined project)

Project promoter: CESIS- Centre for Studies for Social Intervention

- INUT Interim Report Fev 12, 2015
- INUT Q1 Interim Report April 13, 2015
- INUT Q1 Interim Report April, 2016
- INUT Q2 Interim Report July, 2015
- INUT Q3 Interim Report October, 2015
- CIG- CESIS Inquerito Nacional Usos do Tempo - Contrato de Projecto
- Policy_Brief_final - OS usos do tempo de Homens e de Mulheres em Portugal

- PROJECT 3: PT07-0001 – Moral and Sexual and Moral Harassment in the Workplace (Predefined project)

Project Promoter: CITE - Comissão para a Igualdade no Trabalho e no Emprego (Commission for Equality in Labour and Employment)

- Project Sexual and Moral Harassment in the Work Place- 1st Quarter Report 2015 - Abril 2015
Project Sexual and Moral Harassment in the Work Place - 1st Quarter Report - June 2014
Project Sexual and Moral Harassment in the Work Place - Relatorio Execucção Fisica - July a Setembro 2015
Project Sexual and Moral Harassment in the Work Place - Annual Report 2014 - Dec 2014
Projeto Assedio no local de trabalho – relatorio de execução fisica Out- Dez 2015
Project Sexual and Moral Harassment in the Work Place - 1st Execution Report March, 2016
Projeto EEA Grants Assedio – relatorio Jan mar 2016
Nota Imprensa- Seminário Internacional - Assédio sexual e moral no local de trabalho
Nota Imprensa Complementar – Seminário Internacional - Project Sexual and Moral Harassment in the Work Place
Seminário Internacional - Project Sexual and Moral Harassment in the Work Place
Seminário Internacional - Men’s Roles in Gender Equality Perspective

Desk study

• PROJECT 4: PT07-0002 - Men’s Roles in a Gender Equality Perspective (Predefined project)

Project Promoter: CITE - Comissão para a Igualdade no Trabalho e no Emprego (Commission for Equality in Labour and Employment)

Men’s Role in Gender Equality – Relatório de Execução Fisica - Setembro, 2015
Men’s Role in Gender Equality – Relatório de Execução Fisica - Julho, 2015
Men’s Role in Gender Equality – Relatório de Execução Fisica – December, 2014
Men’s Role in Gender Equality – Relatório de Execução Fisica - April, 2015
Men’s Role in Gender Equality – Relatório de Execução Fisica - June, 2014
Men’s Role in Gender Equality – Relatório de Execução Fisica - Dezembro, 2015
Policy Brief - Project Men’s Roles in a Gender Equality Perspective

• PROJECT 5: PT07_008 - Promotion of Gender Equality in decision-making positions and reduction of the gender gap in the business sector: from the diagnosis to intervention

Project promoter: ISEG- School of Economics and Management- University of Lisbon

Relatorio de Atividades - Projeto Coord Iseg
Relatorio de progresso_1T2015_final
Relatorio d Progresso_2T2015
Relatorio Execução Fisica IGEmpresas_2015 Final
Relatorio Execução Fisica IGEmpresas_Jan_Mar-2016
Relatorio Execução Fisica IGEmpresas Out_Dz 2015
ISEG Formulário de Candidatura

• PROJECT 6: PT07-0003 - Local Gender Equality.

Project Promoter: CES - Centro de Estudos Sociais (Center for Social Studies, University of Coimbra)

Local Gender Equality – Relatorio Execução Fisica 1
Local Gender Equality – Relatorio Execução Fisica 2
Local Gender Equality – Relatorio Execução Fisica 3
Form_2OC_EEA Grants
LGE_Cultura
LGE_Educação
LGE_Gestão Pessoas
LGE Mobilidade e Transportes Digital
LGE Saude AcaoSocial
LGE Seguranca e Prevenção Digital
LGE Urbanismo habitação ambiente
LGE Violencia
Programa formação e Inscrição – Lagoa
Programa Formação e Inscrição – Pombal
Programa Formação e Inscrição - Povoa de Lanhoso
Programa Formação e Inscrição - Ferreira do Alentejo
Programas Oficinas LGE

● PROJECT 7: PT07_010 - Working Genderation - in work and in life

Project promoter: Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences- University of Porto

- Relatorio Execucao Fisica 3 trimestre, 2015
- Working Genderation – 1 trimestre, 2015
- Working Genderation – 2 trimestre, 2015
- 2 FPCEUP - Application Form - Working Genderation

● PROJECT 8: PT07-0004 - Gender and Mobility: inequality in space-time

Project promoter: Institute of Geography and Spatial Planning (IGOT -UL)

- Form 2OC Application Form - Gender and Mobility: inequality in space-time
- Partner Agreement Amendment
- New Schedule _ Gen Mob Cronograma
- Relatório Científico 2º PP (1)
- Relatório Científico 3ºPP (1)
- Relatório de Execução Financeira (Junho a Agosto 2015)
- Relatório de Execução Fisica 1ºPP
- GenMob Initial Project Notes
- Relatorio Desenho do Interface GenMob
- Relatorio Implementação Dashboard GenMob
- GenMob - Animation Report - 2016

Folheto GenMob
Inquerito GenMob

Termos de Responsabilidade GenMob

- GenMob – Dia do Geografo – May 29, 2016
- Gendering time-space mobilities in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area – May, 2016
- Presentation – Gender and Mobility – European Economic Area Financial Mechanism – Sept 10, 2015
- Presentation – Patterns of Gendered Mobilities: Inequality in Space time – April, 2016, San Francisco
- Presentation – Real Time GIS of Gender – telegeomonitoring system approach
- International Conference – Gendering Smart Cities July 16, 2016

F Literature used in the Romanian case

NORMATIVE/STRATEGIC DOCUMENTS

Europe

- Strategy for Gender Equality 2014-2017 Council of Europe
- Commission Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015
- EU strategy, Europe 2020,
- European Employment Strategy
- Lisbon strategy

Romania

- Law 217/2003 for the prevention and combating of domestic violence, with its revisions and completion, namely the Law 25/9.03.2012 for the modification and completion of Law 217/2003
- Law no 30/2016 for the ratification by Romania of the Convention of the Council of Europe for prevention and combat of the violence against women and domestic violence, Istanbul 2011
- Law 202/2002 regarding equal opportunities and treatment between men and women republished
The National Strategy for prevention and combat of the domestic violence during the period 2013 - 2017 and The Operational Plan for the Implementation of the National Strategy for preventing and combating the domestic violence for the period 2013 - 2017

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS

Programme RO20 „Domestic and Gender-based Violence” Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2009-2014
- Program Agreement
- Program Overview
- Anual Programme Report 2015

PROJECT DOCUMENTS

In-depth study
- PROJECT 1: RO20-0007 - JAD - Joint action against domestic violence. Project Promoter: General Inspectorate of the Romanian Police
  - Project Fiche-project proposal
  - Grant Contract + Addendum+Notification for the contract
  - Partnership agreements with INM and MP
  - Project’s site: [http://eeagrants.org/project-portal/project/RO20-0007](http://eeagrants.org/project-portal/project/RO20-0007)

- PROJECT 2: RO20-0001 - Best practice model on assistance for victims of trafficking in human beings - Pilot project; Project Promoter (PP): National Agency against Trafficking in Persons
  - Application Form
  - Grant contract
  - Quarterly Progress Reports ( 15.05.2015, 15.01.2015, 15.09.2014, 15.01.2016, 21.09.2015)
  - Project’s site: [http://eeagrants.org/project-portal/project/RO20-0001](http://eeagrants.org/project-portal/project/RO20-0001)

- PROJECT 3: RO20-0006 - CONSENS: Awareness raising campaign on the negative effects of domestic violence in the regions Bucharest-Ilfiov and South Muntenia; Project promoter: The Association Club Ecotur Dora D’Istria.
  - Application Form
  - Grant contract
  - Progress Reports ( 10.03.2016, 15.05. 2016)
  - Slides with the presentation of the project and of the results of the research at the final conference
  - Project’s site : [http://eeagrants.org/project-portal/project/RO20-0006](http://eeagrants.org/project-portal/project/RO20-0006)

Desk study

  - Application Form
  - Grant contract + Addendum no 1+Addendum no 2
  - Progress Reports 1, 2 and 3
  - Project’s site: [http://eeagrants.org/project-portal/project/RO20-0015](http://eeagrants.org/project-portal/project/RO20-0015)

- PROJECT 5: RO20-0002 - Integrated solutions for victims of domestic violence. Project Promoter: Public Service of Social Assistance Baia Mare
  - Application Form
  - Grant contract + Addendum no 1
  - Partnership Agreements
  - Progress Reports 1, 2, 3 and 4 (quarterly and 2 months reports)
  - Final Research Report on Domestic Violence done in the project
● PROJECT 6: RO20-0003 - We help you to be safe - Rehabilitation centre for domestic violence victims Rm. Sărat. Project promoter: General Direction of Social Assistance and Child Protection Buzău
  o Application Form
  o Grant contract
  o Progress Reports 1 (15.09.2015), 2 (15.01.2016) and 3 (15.05.2016)
  o Project’s site: http://eeagrants.org/project-portal/project/RO20-0003

● PROJECT 7: RO20-0008 - NO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE! Project promoter: General Directorate of Social Assistance and Child Protection Sibiu
  o Application Form
  o Grant contract
  o Progress Reports 1, 2, 3 and 4 (2 months reports)
  o Project’s site: http://eeagrants.org/project-portal/project/RO20-0008

● PROJECT 8: RO20-0010 - Emergency Centre for victims of domestic violence in Olt County. Project promoter: General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection Olt
  o Application Form
  o Grant contract + Addendum 1
  o Progress Reports 1 (Sept 2015), 2 (January 2016), and 3 (May 2016) quarterly reports + 2 months reports
  o On site monitoring Report by externa monitors
  o Programme Operator monitoring Report
  o Project’s site: http://eeagrants.org/project-portal/project/RO20-0010

G Literature used in the Slovakian case

NORMATIVE/STRATEGIC DOCUMENTS

Europe

● Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (Istanbul Convention)
● Combating violence against women: minimum standards for support services.


● Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)

Slovakia

● National Strategy for Gender Equality in the Slovak Republic 2014 – 2019
● Action Plan on Gender Equality in the Slovak Republic 2014 – 2019

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS

SK09 Domestic and Gender-Based Violence

o Programme Agreement
o Summary of the Programme proposal SK09 Domestic and gender-based violence
o Annual Programme Report (February 2016)
o Programme Overview
o Project Portfolio
o Guidelines for strengthened bilateral relations – EEA and Norway Grants 2009 – 2014
o Project Promoter and Project Partner Guide, version 1.0
o Project Promoter and Project Partner Guide, version 1.1
o Call for submission of project application – DGBV01
o Call for submission of project application – DGV02
o Call for submission of project application – DGV03

PROJECT DOCUMENTS
In-depth study

- PROJECT 1: SK09-0020: Female on the street. Project Promoter: Civic Association PRIMA
  - Project Application
  - Project Agreement
  - Amendment 1 to the project agreement
  - Mid-term report 01
  - Mid-term report 02
  - Mid-term report 03

- PROJECT 2: SK09-0013: Peace Centre – improving protection and support services for victims of family violence – CPSS. Project Promoter: Civic Association Briezdenie
  - Project Application
  - Project Agreement
  - Amendment 1 to the project agreement
  - Mid-term report

- PROJECT 3: SK09-0009: Coordinating methodical Centre for gender-based and domestic violence. (Predefined project). Project promotor: Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs And Family of the Slovak Republic
  - Project Application
  - Project Agreement
  - Amendment 1 to the project agreement
  - Mid-term report 01
  - Mid-term report 02

Desk study

- PROJECT 4: Sk009-0008 Women’s Safe House. Project Promoter: Civic Association DOMOV - DUHA
  - Project Application
  - Project Agreement
  - Amendment 1 to the project agreement
  - Amendment 2 to the project agreement
  - Mid-term report 01
  - Mid-term report 02
  - Mid-term report 03

  - Project Application
  - Project Agreement
  - Amendment 1 to the project agreement
  - Mid-term report 01
  - Mid-term report 02
  - Mid-term report 03
  - https://alianciazien.wordpress.com/https://alianciazien.wordpress.com/

  - Project Application
  - Project Agreement
  - Amendment 1 to the project agreement
● PROJECT 7: SK09-0025: Improving Quality of Counselling for Women Experiencing Gender Based Violence in Intimate Relationships in Kosice Self-governing Region. Project promoter: Kosice Self-governing Region.
  o Project Application
  o Project Agreement
  o Amendment 1 to the project agreement
  o Mid-term report 01
  o Mid-term report 02
  o http://beznasilia.sk
  o http://beznasilia.sk/
  o http://web.vucke.sk

● PROJECT 8: SK009-0014: Shelter for battered women and children Trencin. Project promoter: LUNA
  o Project Application
  o Project Agreement
  o Amendment 1 to the project agreement
  o Mid-term report 01
  o Mid-term report 02

H Litereature used in the Spanish case

NORMATIVE/STRATEGIC DOCUMENTS

Europe
  ● Commission Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015
  ● EU strategy, Europe 2020,
  ● European Employment Strategy
  ● Lisbon strategy
  ● European Youth Pact
  ● Strategy for Gender Equality 2014-2017 Council of Europe
  ● Council Recommendation of 22 April 2013 on establishing a Youth

Spain
  ● Strategic Plan for Equal Opportunities between women and men 2014-2016,
  ● National Roma Integration Strategy 2012-2020

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS

ES04: Gender equality and work-life balance
  o Program Agreement
  o Program Overview
  o Annual reports (2014, 2015)
  o Final Report
  o Report summary (ppt)
  o Program brochure (public call)

PROJECT DOCUMENTS

In-depth study
● PROJECT 1: ES04-0002 EQUILIBRIO-BALANCE continuation project, expanding its external side, with a greater involvement of enterprises and trade unions, having them as direct partner. Project Promoter: Women Institute and for Equal Opportunity
  o Project Contract ES04-0002 EQUILIBRIO-BALANCE
  o Agreement between Women Institute and for Equal Opportunity and Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities (KS)
  o Agreement between Women Institute and for Equal Opportunity and the Spanish Municipalities and Provinces Federation (FEMP).
  o General Report
  o Proyecto “Equilibrio entre la vida personal, familiar y profesional en España y Noruega”, key elements.
  o Balance Measures (21st May 2015)

● PROJECT 2: ES04-0007 Raising awareness, training, professional growth, the development of leadership and the promotion of women and of women managers in the business community in order to facilitate their access to decision-making positions within their companies (PROMOCIONA Project). Project Promoter (PP): Spanish Confederation of Business Organisations (Confederación Española de Organizaciones Empresariales, CEOE).
  o Project contract between Directorate General For Equal Opportunities and CEOE
  o Project contract Addenda between Directorate General For Equal Opportunities and CEOE
  o Project Final Report
  o http://www.proyectopromociona.com

  o Project contract between Directorate General for Equal Opportunities and Roma Secretariat Foundation (3rd December 2014).
  o Memoria explicativa del Proyecto (Explicative Memory of the Project)
  o Memoria técnica acreditativa de la actuación (Project Memory Document)
  o Ficha Informe Final de Ejecución (File of Final Report)
  o https://www.gitanos.org

Desk study

  o Project contract between Directorate General for Equal Opportunities and Women Institute and for Equal Opportunity
  o Project Memory Document
  o Modelo preliminar de intervención
  o Propuesta metodológica sobre coeducación (Methodological proposal about co-education)
  o Good practices
  o Compilación de modelos específicos de intervención de los 9 centros educativos participantes en el proyecto Plurales.
  o http://www.inmujer.gob.es/areasTematicas/educacion/programas/ProyPlurales.htm

  o Project contract between Directorate General For Equal Opportunities and INCYDE
  o Project contract Addenda between Directorate General For Equal Opportunities and INCYDE
  o Agreement of collaboration
  o Memoria explicativa del Proyecto (Explicative Memory of the Project)
  o Project Summary
  o Final Report
  o Press dossier
  o acta de la de la reunión entre la comisión noruega del ODAL NÆRINGSHAGE miembro de
los EGRANTS (estado del espacio económico europeo) y la fundación instituto cameral para la creación y desarrollo de la empresa (INCYDE), para poner en común los proyectos de ambas partes, y ver la posibilidad de colaboración conjunta

- **PROJECT 6: ES04-0018 - ACTION EQUAL PAY. Project promoter: CCOO**
  - Agreement of collaboration between Directorate General For Equal Opportunities and CCOO.
    - Initial Memory of the project
    - The gender pay gap: analysis and union proposals for collective bargaining
    - Report on gender pay gap: impact, collective bargaining and trade union action
    - Final Technical Memory and annexes
    - Ficha Informe Final de Ejecución (File of Final Report)

- **PROJECT 7: ES04-0019 - Tools for tackling the gender pay gap. Project promoter: General Workers' Union of Spain UGT-E**
  - Agreement of collaboration between Directorate General For Equal Opportunities and General Workers' Union of Spain UGT-E
    - Initial Memory of the project
    - Technical Report
    - Ficha Informe Final de Ejecución (File of Final Report)
    - http://www.igualretribucion.es/es

- **PROJECT 8: ES04-0017 - Women, rural tourism and the gender pay gap. A research proposal, actions for increasing and strengthening female entrepreneurship, socio-labour insertion and how to overcome gender pay gap. Project promoter: Universidad de Córdoba**
  - Agreement of collaboration between Directorate General For Equal Opportunities and University of Cordoba (10/12/14)
    - Memoria inicial del Proyecto (Project Initial Memory)
    - Final Technical Memory
    - Supporting Technical Report
    - Ficha informe final de ejecución de proyectos (File of Final Report)
Annex 1  Terms of Reference
Background

EEA Grants and Norway Grants
The EEA Grants and Norway Grants represent the contribution of Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway to reducing economic and social disparities and to strengthening bilateral relations with 16 EU countries in Central and Southern Europe and the Baltics.

The funding is targeted on areas where there are clear needs in the beneficiary countries and that are in line with national priorities and wider European goals.

The EEA Grants and Norway Grants are set up for five to seven-year periods. For the period 2009-2014, €1.798 billion has been set aside under the Grants.

Funding is channelled through 150 programmes in the 16 beneficiary countries. Country allocations are based on population size and GDP per capita, making Poland the largest beneficiary state, followed by Romania, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

Each beneficiary country agrees on a set of programmes with the donor countries, based on national needs and priorities and the scope for cooperation with the donor countries. All programmes must adhere to standards relating to human rights, good governance, sustainable development and gender equality.

Grants are available for non-governmental organisations, research and academic institutions and public and private sector bodies. Projects that are financed under the programmes may be implemented until 2016 or 2017.

Funding for gender equality and tackling gender-based violence
With funding from the EEA and Norway Grants, the donor countries (Norway, Iceland, and Liechtenstein) aim to promote equality between women and men and to combat domestic and gender-based violence, two closely-intertwined objectives. Both the donor countries and the EU recognize gender equality is a fundamental human right and a key enabler of social and economic development.

The previous decades have seen progress towards gender equality as well as a growing body of evidence pointing to the long-term positive effects of women’s equal participation in the labour market and decision-making. Nevertheless, gender inequalities persist and are on the increase in some countries, including in the areas of employment, pay, work-life balance and decision-making.

One of the most serious manifestations of gender inequality is gender-based violence, including domestic violence. Gender-based and domestic violence impose significant and long-lasting burdens not only on the victims and witnesses, but on society as a whole. Despite efforts to counter such violence, recent data from the EU Institute of Fundamental Rights (FRA) show that it remains extensive and under-reported.

Recognizing the need for funding on these issues, the EEA and Norway Grants have provided more than €49 million to promote gender equality and to combat gender-based and domestic violence in 10 out of 16 beneficiary countries in the 2009-2014 Financial Mechanism.

Within programme area—mainstreaming gender equality and promoting work-life balance—the Grants provide €23 million to programmes in six beneficiary countries. The programmes aim not only to strengthen public gender equality institutions and civil society organizations, but also to promote gender equality

http://eeagrants.org/Results-data/Documents/Publications/Brochures/Programme-Areas-2009-2014-brochure
in the private sector. In the upcoming financial mechanism (2014-2021), the focus of this programme area will shift towards work-life balance.

Within programme area 29—domestic and gender-based violence—the Grants provide €27 million to programmes in seven beneficiary countries. The focus of these programmes is largely on victim support services, but also on training of professionals, general awareness raising, and treatment services for perpetrators of gender-based and domestic violence. Gender-based and domestic violence touch upon a range of policy fields, and the Grants aim to support a comprehensive and coordinated approach to tackling both their causes and consequences. The Council of Europe’s 2014 Istanbul Convention serves as a reference and a guideline for the support.

The total allocation of funding to the programmes this assessment will focus on, by programme area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>PA14/28 (gender equality/work-life balance)</th>
<th>PA29 (domestic and gender-based violence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG12</td>
<td></td>
<td>€2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE09</td>
<td>€2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE11</td>
<td></td>
<td>€2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES04</td>
<td>€10,191,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO20</td>
<td></td>
<td>€4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL14</td>
<td></td>
<td>€3,624,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT07</td>
<td>€2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09</td>
<td></td>
<td>€8,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>€14,691,250</td>
<td>€20,064,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objectives

The objectives of this assessment are to:

- Document and assess the results of EEA and Norway Grants’ support to gender equality; document and assess the results of the support to reduce/prevent domestic and gender-based violence in beneficiary countries;
- Identify lessons learned that can contribute to improving the design, planning, organization and implementation of future interventions to promote work-life balance, and of future interventions to reduce/prevent domestic and gender-based violence.

The findings and lessons learned should be translated into recommendations (policy brief) to the Financial Mechanism Office (FMO) regarding interventions to promote work-life balance and of interventions to reduce/prevent domestic and gender-based violence.

Scope

The assessment will cover gender-related programmes and projects funded under the 2009-2014 Financial Mechanism of the Grants. It shall be carried out as a field and desk study in 2016.

76 https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168046031c
77 As Spain will not be a beneficiary country in the new financial mechanism, no forward-looking recommendations for Spain will be needed.
A sample consisting of eight gender programmes will be included in the assessment, some of them with a focus on gender equality/work-life balance, and some with a focus on domestic and gender-based violence. The reviewed programmes operate in the seven following countries: Bulgaria (BG12), Estonia (EE09/11), Poland (PL14), Portugal (PT07), Romania (RO20), Slovakia (SK09), and Spain (ES04). Together, these programmes cover 71% of the funding for gender.

In addition to a desk review covering all the eight programmes, the assessment is to include field visits to a minimum of three projects per country (21 project visits in total), and an in-depth desk review of five additional projects per country (35 projects desk-reviewed in total). The sampling method for the projects will be agreed between the FMO and the consultants at the kick-off meeting.

The FMO, Programme Operators, project promoters and donor partners will make the necessary documents and time available to the team.

**Assessment criteria**

The assessment will evaluate the **effectiveness, relevance**, and **bilateral dimensions** of the Grants’ support to gender equality and the prevention/reduction of domestic and gender-based violence.

Effectiveness will be assessed by documenting results at outcome level, emphasizing tangible improvements for gender equality and for freedom from domestic and gender-based violence.

Relevance will be assessed by looking into whether the support is aligned with national needs and priorities and whether the support is in line with relevant European policies.

Bilateral dimensions will be assessed by documenting the extent, nature and quality of the cooperation between Donor Programme Partners (DPPs)/donor project partners (dpps) and Programme Operators (POs)/project promoters.

**Assessment questions**

The questions below are indicative of the key information needs and can be refined during the inception phase of this assessment. The findings and recommendations should be presented separately for gender equality and domestic and gender-based violence.

**Questions on effectiveness:**

- What are the most significant results on gender equality; what are the most significant results on the prevention/reduction of domestic and gender-based violence?
- What types of interventions for gender equality were most/least effective and why? What types of interventions have the highest degree of replicability?
- What types of interventions for the reduction/prevention of domestic and gender-based violence were most/least effective and why? What types of interventions have the highest degree of replicability?
- Is there a coherence of intervention logic at programme and project level?
- To what extent did the programmes and projects contribute to building capacity to work on gender issues among the Programme Operators, including their capacity to work on gender/gender-based violence at policy level?
- Have the Grants contributed to increased political prioritization of gender issues? Have the programmes garnered political support for additional (national) funding on gender issues?
- What is the relationship between the Programme Operators’ knowledge of the gender/GBV sectors and the achievement of the results? In cases where the PO is not well-suited to operate gender programmes, what are the alternatives in terms of identifying better-suited POs?

**Questions on relevance:**

- Are the programmes and projects responding to national and European priorities in the field of gender equality and the eradication of gender-based and domestic violence?

---

78 For more information on these programmes, please visit our programme portal at [http://eeagrants.org/What-we-do](http://eeagrants.org/What-we-do)
• Did the Grants fill a funding gap at the time they were awarded? What was the gap? What funding gaps exist currently/are likely to exist in the upcoming period (especially in relation to EU funding)?
• Are the programmes and projects responding to the needs of the target groups?
• How were relevant stakeholders/target groups involved in the design of the programmes and project? This includes Donor Programme Partners and donor project partners.
• How should the future programmes/projects respond to opposing movements or actors in society?

**Questions on bilateral dimensions**

- What is the extent and nature of partnerships between project promoters/POs Operators, DPPs/dpps?  
- What has been the value added of DPPs and dpps, including the Council of Europe?
- What, if any, interest is there among partners in continuing cooperation following the completion of the programmes/projects?
- Has bilateral cooperation had wider effects beyond the programme and project partnerships?
- Has the cooperation between POs and DPPs provided the programmes with added value? What value?

**Methodology**

The team should propose methodological approaches that optimize the possibility of producing a robust, evidence-based assessment.

**Deliverables**

The deliverables consist of the following:

Kick-off meeting in Brussels in early June 2016 to discuss the work plan, methodology and sign the contract.

Inception Report not exceeding 10 pages to be delivered by 16 June 2016. The draft inception report shall contain a description of assessment methods and plans, and the planned structure of the Final Report.

First Draft of the Report by 24 August 2016. The FMO shall have the opportunity to make comments and corrections to the draft final report.

Flash reports (3) with forward-looking recommendation for the programmes in Polan, Romania, and Slovakia (1-2 pages each) by 1 September 2016.

Second Draft of the Report by 9 September 2016, addressing the feedback. The FMO, Programme/Fund Operators, donor partners and project promoters shall have the opportunity to make comments and correction to the second draft.

The Final Report not exceeding 60 pages, excluding annexes, to be delivered by 23 September 2016. The report shall cover all objectives and questions described under Objectives and Questions.

A policy brief not exceeding 3 pages, to be delivered at the same time as the final report, with main findings and recommendations for the future.

Presentation of the Final Report at a seminar on 25 November 2016 in a city chosen by the FMO (the cost of the seminar itself is to be borne by the FMO).

**Budget**

The maximum budget for the rapid assessment is €87,000, excluding VAT.

**Team**

---


80 In the programmes to be reviewed, the following donors partners have been involved: Council of Europe, Secretariat of the Shelter Movement (KSS), Norwegian Directorate for Children, Youth and Family Affairs (BUFDIR), Norwegian Directorate of Health (HDIR), Equality and Anti-discrimination Ombud (LDO), and National Police Directorate (POD).
The team shall be composed of one (1) international and seven (7) local consultants, and should include both genders. The following skills and competencies are expected of the team:

- Experience in conducting gender-responsive evaluations
- Extensive knowledge of, and experience in, applying qualitative evaluation methods
- Experience in gender analysis and human-rights based approaches
- A strong record in designing/carrying out/leading (team leader) evaluations
- Data analysis skills
- Ability to communicate with stakeholders
- Process management skills, including facilitation (focus group discussions)
- Excellent written and oral proficiency in English
- Knowledge of local languages in the countries subject to field visits
- Knowledge of EEA and Norway Grants is an advantage
## Annex 2 Respondents

### Annex 2.1 General interviews and meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.06.16 (multiple exchanges thereafter)</td>
<td>Rannveig Gimse</td>
<td>Sector Officer</td>
<td>FMO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Anton.POPIC@efta.int">Anton.POPIC@efta.int</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.06.16 (multiple exchanges thereafter)</td>
<td>Maria Thorsnes</td>
<td>Senior Bilateral Officer</td>
<td>FMO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Maria.THORSNES@efta.int">Maria.THORSNES@efta.int</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.06.16 (multiple exchanges thereafter)</td>
<td>Anton Popic</td>
<td>RMB Officer</td>
<td>FMO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rannveig.GIMSE@efta.int">Rannveig.GIMSE@efta.int</a></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.08.16</td>
<td>Freja Ulvestad Kärki</td>
<td>Project Manager Special in clinical psychology</td>
<td>Department for Mental Health and Substance Abuse</td>
<td>+47 41544616</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.08.16</td>
<td>Ms Pietruchová, Mr Rozborová and Ms Burajová</td>
<td>Representatives from the Coordinating-methodical centre</td>
<td>Coordinating-methodical centre, Bratislava</td>
<td>Kuzmányho 7/A, Bratislava</td>
<td>All Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.08.16</td>
<td>Liss Schanke</td>
<td>KS participation in the gender projects in Spain, Portugal and Slovenia 2009-2014</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:liss.schanke@gmail.com">liss.schanke@gmail.com</a>&gt;</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.08.16</td>
<td>Anna Birgitte Mørck</td>
<td>Research Advisor, Coordinator for research for the EEA and Norway Grants</td>
<td>Council of Europe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.b.morck@nkvts.no">a.b.morck@nkvts.no</a> +47 95105041</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.07.16</td>
<td>Liisa-Ly Pakosta</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Office of the Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner, Estonia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Liisa.Pakosta@svv.ee">Liisa.Pakosta@svv.ee</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.08.16</td>
<td>Taina Riski</td>
<td>Programme Advisor</td>
<td>Department of Equality and Human Dignity Directorate General of Democracy Council of Europe</td>
<td>Tel: 33 (0) 3 9021 4203 Fax: 33 (0) 3 8841 2764</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.08.16</td>
<td>Lillian Hjorth</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Menneskerettighetsakademiet, Human Rights Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.08.16</td>
<td>Funmi Johnson</td>
<td>Council of Europe Expert</td>
<td>Want to beautiful</td>
<td>+44 7973 753105</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.08.16</td>
<td>Marta Becerra</td>
<td>Programme Manager, Violence</td>
<td>Council of Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2.2  Bulgaria interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 of July 2016</td>
<td>Spasimir Dimitrov</td>
<td>Project leader</td>
<td>Ruse municipality</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.dimitrov@ruse-bg.eu">s.dimitrov@ruse-bg.eu</a></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of July 2016</td>
<td>Stefan Markov</td>
<td>Project partner, executive director</td>
<td>Caritas Ruse</td>
<td><a href="mailto:office@caritas-ruse.bg">office@caritas-ruse.bg</a></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of July 2016</td>
<td>Antonia Naydenova</td>
<td>Project partner, PR expert</td>
<td>Caritas Ruse</td>
<td><a href="mailto:office@caritas-ruse.bg">office@caritas-ruse.bg</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of July 2016</td>
<td>Maria Krumova</td>
<td>Project partner, accountant</td>
<td>Caritas Ruse</td>
<td><a href="mailto:office@caritas-ruse.bg">office@caritas-ruse.bg</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 of July 2016</td>
<td>Petya Ivanova</td>
<td>Project leader</td>
<td>Association Centre for education, culture and ecology 21</td>
<td><a href="mailto:centar21varna@gmail.com">centar21varna@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 of July 2016</td>
<td>Dessialva Kraleva</td>
<td>Project coordinator</td>
<td>Association Centre for education, culture and ecology 21</td>
<td><a href="mailto:centar21varna@gmail.com">centar21varna@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 of July 2016</td>
<td>Angel Angelov</td>
<td>Technical secretary</td>
<td>A Primary school, Belgun village</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th August 2016</td>
<td>Komnya Indzhova</td>
<td>Head of Monitoring, Verification and Payments Department International Projects Directorate</td>
<td>Ministry of Interior - Bulgaria</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kindjova.14@mvr.bg">kindjova.14@mvr.bg</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th August 2016</td>
<td>Daniela Kolarova</td>
<td>Executive director, project manager</td>
<td>Partners Bulgaria Foundation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daniela@partnersbg.org">daniela@partnersbg.org</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th August 2016</td>
<td>Slavyanka Ivanova</td>
<td>Project coordinator, Partner organisation</td>
<td>Center for the Study of Democracy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:slavyanka.ivanova@csd.bg">slavyanka.ivanova@csd.bg</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th August 2016</td>
<td>Elmira Nesheva</td>
<td>Expert on the Support model development</td>
<td>Partners Bulgaria Foundation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:office@partnersbg.org">office@partnersbg.org</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th August 2016</td>
<td>Krisitna Petkova</td>
<td>Administrative assistant</td>
<td>Partners Bulgaria Foundation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:office@partnersbg.org">office@partnersbg.org</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus group with: Beneficiaries  
Project: BG12-0004 - National study on domestic and gender based violence (DGBV) and elaboration of victims support model (VSM)  
Location: Sofia
Annex 2.3  Estonia interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2016</td>
<td>Rainer Rohtla</td>
<td>Programme coordinator (EE11)</td>
<td>Department of Equality Policies, Ministry of Social Affairs</td>
<td>EE11 – Domestic and Gender-based Violence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rainer.rohtla@sm.ee">rainer.rohtla@sm.ee</a></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; of July 2016</td>
<td>Eha Reitelmann</td>
<td>Member of the Management Board</td>
<td>Estonian Women’s Shelters Union</td>
<td>EE11-0001 - Developing services for victims of domestic violence, strengthening co-operation between different institutions and raising awareness among victims and the general public</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eha.reitelmann@gmail.com">eha.reitelmann@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; of July 2016</td>
<td>Karel Parve</td>
<td>(former) Programme coordinator (EE09)</td>
<td>Department of Equality Policies, Ministry of Social Affairs</td>
<td>EE09 – Mainstreaming Gender Equality and Promoting work-family Balance</td>
<td>(not working in the PO currently)</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; of July 2016</td>
<td>Virge Suursoo</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td>TREV-2 Group</td>
<td>EE09-0018 - Children’s Room</td>
<td><a href="mailto:virge.suursoo@trev2.ee">virge.suursoo@trev2.ee</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; of July 2016</td>
<td>Grete Kaju</td>
<td>Programme coordinator (EE09)</td>
<td>Department of Equality Policies, Ministry of Social Affairs</td>
<td>EE09 – Mainstreaming Gender Equality and Promoting work-family Balance</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grete.kaju@sm.ee">grete.kaju@sm.ee</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; of August 2016</td>
<td>Kaari Lind</td>
<td>Chief Specialist</td>
<td>Foreign Assistance Implementing Department, Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>EE09 &amp; EE11</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kaari.lind@fin.ee">kaari.lind@fin.ee</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Focus group with: Beneficiaries**

**Project: EE11-0001 - Developing services for victims of domestic violence, strengthening co-operation between different institutions and raising awareness among victims and the general public**

**Location: Tartu, Estonia**

**Date: 5th of August 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astrid Maasing</td>
<td>Member of the Board</td>
<td>Jõgevamaa Naiste Tugikeskus</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riin Palu</td>
<td>Member of the Board</td>
<td>Järvamaa Naiste Tugikeskus</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leili Mutso</td>
<td>Member of the Board</td>
<td>Läänemaa Naiste Tugikeskus</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairi Jakustand</td>
<td>Member of the Board</td>
<td>Valgamaa Naiste Tugikeskus</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marju Tuoppi</td>
<td>Member of the Board</td>
<td>Viljandimaa Naiste Tugikeskus</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Külli Piirisild</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Võrumaa Naiste Tugikeskus</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margit Hiiekivi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tartu Naiste Varjupaik</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pille Tsopp</td>
<td>Member of the Board</td>
<td>Tartu Naiste Varjupaik</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Focus group with: Beneficiaries**

**Project: EE09-0018 - Children’s Room**

**Location: Tallinn, Estonia**
### Annex 2.4  Poland interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 July 2016, triad</td>
<td>Magdalena Falkowska</td>
<td>Programme coordinator</td>
<td>Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy, Department of Social Assistance</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Magdalena.Falkowska@mrvips.gov.pl">Magdalena.Falkowska@mrvips.gov.pl</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elżbieta Przybylszewska-Szczęsny</td>
<td>Project employee, responsible for social campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:elzbieta.przybylszewska-szczesny@mrvips.gov.pl">elzbieta.przybylszewska-szczesny@mrvips.gov.pl</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krzysztof Gasparski</td>
<td>Contact person at the national contact point</td>
<td>Ministry of Development, Department of Assistance Programmes (National contact point)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Krzysztof.Gasparski@mr.gov.pl">Krzysztof.Gasparski@mr.gov.pl</a></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July 2016, diad</td>
<td>Anna Wiecha</td>
<td>Key expert and court clerk, project coordinator</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice, Department of Family and Juvenile Matters</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Wiecha@ms.gov.pl">Wiecha@ms.gov.pl</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magdalena Bochińska</td>
<td>Senior expert</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Magdalena.Bochinska@ms.gov.pl">Magdalena.Bochinska@ms.gov.pl</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 July 2016,</td>
<td>Joanna Łęczycka</td>
<td>Project coordinator</td>
<td>Centre of social assistance in the +48 25 756 32 39</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus group with:
Diad with members of the interdisciplinary team in Warsaw Ursynów

Out of all the representatives of various interdisciplinary teams from the Mazowieckie region (the region around Warsaw) to whom I have got contacts from the project promoter, only two people from one team agreed to come to the meeting. Three other participants whom we were able to contact were interested in talking but refused to come due to the inconveniences of travelling to Warsaw and agreed for individual telephone calls.
During this interview it turned out, that also other Warsaw teams (at least 2) were represented, which shows that the project promoter hasn’t sent me all the contact details from Mazowieckie region.
This interview was with two people from the Warsaw district Ursynów w team, it was organised at their location to spare them travelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 July 2016</td>
<td>Milena Pyrzanowska</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>Centre of social assistance in the city of Mińsk Mazowiecki</td>
<td>+48 664 159 875 <a href="mailto:psycholog@mopsmm.pl">psycholog@mopsmm.pl</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bożena Zagórska</td>
<td>Manager of community</td>
<td>Centre of social assistance in the city of Mińsk Mazowiecki</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kierownik_dps@mopsmm.pl">kierownik_dps@mopsmm.pl</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>+48 25 758 22 24 int. 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 July 2016</td>
<td>Marzena Bartosiewicz</td>
<td>Deputy director</td>
<td>Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy, Department of Social Assistance</td>
<td>+48 22 661-12-77</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus group with:
Telephonic diad with 2 employees of OPOPP’s and telephonic IDI with 1

Project: Strengthening measures to support victims of domestic violence
Location: Telephone. Training participants came from the whole country, because there are around 1 OPOPP per region, so it was impossible to have them travel to Warsaw. Only 3 people agreed to take part in a teleconference. In practice two called at the said hour and one was late, so was interviewed separately later. The diad with the first two (Ilona Motyka and Dorota Synak) worked more like 2 intertwining IDIs, because respondents expected me to ask them one by one (to tell who should speak now), only at they added to what another said. The 3rd person was interviewed separately and the flow of IDI was much better than that of the diad, where one of the respondents wasn’t happy to spend her time on the interview. It seems that if telephone calls must be used, people prefer to talk individually rather than in an
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ilona Motyka</td>
<td>Vice president of the association</td>
<td>“Baba” association for women in the Lubuskie region.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:baba@baba.org.pl">baba@baba.org.pl</a> tel. 604 234 884</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorota Synak</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>“Interios” association, the Pomorskie region therapeutic and legal centre,</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dorotasynak@gmail.com">dorotasynak@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena Ozygala</td>
<td>1st contact person</td>
<td>Currently in the Bona Fides association of the Sielce diocese centre of assistane. Drugging the training employed in “Nowy Horyzont” association for supporting human resources in Rzeszów.</td>
<td>tel. 506-121-035, <a href="mailto:magda.ozygala@onet.pl">magda.ozygala@onet.pl</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Łęczycka</td>
<td>Project promoter</td>
<td>Centre of social assistance in the city of Mińsk Mazowiecki</td>
<td>+48 25 756 32 39</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zofia Zawadzka</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Centre of social assistance in the city of Mińsk Mazowiecki</td>
<td>+48 25 7580046</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luiza Chudzik</td>
<td>Family assistant</td>
<td>Centre of social assistance in the city of Mińsk Mazowiecki</td>
<td>+48 25 7580046</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamila Wawrzyszuk</td>
<td>Family assistant</td>
<td>Centre of social assistance in the city of Mińsk Mazowiecki</td>
<td>+48 25 756 32 39</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janusz Chmielewski</td>
<td>Probation officer in Mińsk, chief of police in a neighbour town</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>+48 788 669 654</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus group with: Members of working groups of the interdisciplinary team

Project: Implementing preventive measures to reduce gender-based violence
Location: Mińsk Mazowiecki
Date: 22 July 2016

Focus group with: Women, participants of the project (with additional participation of 3 employees of the centre)

Project: Implementing preventive measures to reduce gender-based violence
Location: Mińsk Mazowiecki  
Date: 27 July 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 participant women, names not disclosed for privacy protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Łęczycka</td>
<td>Project promoter</td>
<td>Centre of social assistance in the city of Mińsk Mazowiecki</td>
<td>+48 25 756 32 39</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zofia Zawadzka</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Centre of social assistance in the city of Mińsk Mazowiecki</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bożena Zagórska</td>
<td>Manager of community assistance</td>
<td>Centre of social assistance in the city of Mińsk Mazowiecki</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kierownik_dps@mopsmm.pl">kierownik_dps@mopsmm.pl</a>, 25 758 22 24 int. 22</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interviews on policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 august</td>
<td>Marzena Bartosiewicz</td>
<td>Deputy director</td>
<td>Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy, Department of Social Assistance</td>
<td>+48 22 661-12-77 <a href="mailto:Marzena.bartosiewicz@mpips.gov.pl">Marzena.bartosiewicz@mpips.gov.pl</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 august</td>
<td>Małgorzata Zalewska</td>
<td>Deputy director</td>
<td>Ministry of Development, Department of Assistance Programmes (National contact point)</td>
<td>+48 273 78 00 mał<a href="mailto:gorzata.zalewska@mr.gov.pl">gorzata.zalewska@mr.gov.pl</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 august</td>
<td>Mikołaj Pawlak</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice, Department of Family and Juvenile Matters</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Wiecha@ms.gov.pl">Wiecha@ms.gov.pl</a></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Wiecha</td>
<td>Key expert and court clerk, project coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 August</td>
<td>Urszula Nowakowska</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Women’s Rights Centre</td>
<td><a href="mailto:urszula.nowakowska@cpk.org.pl">urszula.nowakowska@cpk.org.pl</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 August</td>
<td>Anna Wiechcińska-Szymańska</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>“Blue Line” Association for Counteracting Violence in the Family</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.wiechcinska@niebieskalinia.org">a.wiechcinska@niebieskalinia.org</a>, +48502179390</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annex 2.5 Portugal interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Contact details</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of August 2016</td>
<td>Anita Sares</td>
<td>Commission for Equality in Labour and Employment</td>
<td>Pt07-0001 - Moral And Sexual Harrassment In The Workplace</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anita.sares@cite.pt">anita.sares@cite.pt</a></td>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of August 2016</td>
<td>Ana Curado</td>
<td>Commission for Equality in Labour and Employment</td>
<td>Pt07-0001 - Moral And Sexual Harrassment In The Workplace</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ana.curado@cite.pt">ana.curado@cite.pt</a></td>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of August 2016</td>
<td>Benedita Aguiar</td>
<td>Psicóloga</td>
<td>Associação Familias</td>
<td>966408291 <a href="mailto:Benedita.aguiar@gmail.com">Benedita.aguiar@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of August 2016</td>
<td>Ana Fátima Marques</td>
<td>Secretária</td>
<td>Associação Familias</td>
<td>253611609 <a href="mailto:Associacao.familias@gmail.com">Associacao.familias@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 of August</td>
<td>Joana Marteleira</td>
<td>Technical Officer</td>
<td>CIG – Commission for Gender Equality</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joana.marteleira@cig.gov.pt">joana.marteleira@cig.gov.pt</a></td>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 of August</td>
<td>Heloísa Perista</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>CESIS – Centro de Estudos para Intervenção Social</td>
<td><a href="mailto:heloisa.perista@cess.org">heloisa.perista@cess.org</a></td>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus group with: Associação Familias  
Project: PT07-0006 - Equality Balance  
Location: Braga  
Date: 3 of August 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herculano Andrade Teixeira</td>
<td>Psicologo/ Adjunto da Presidente</td>
<td>Associação de reformados e Pensionistas do Valdeste</td>
<td>914312281 <a href="mailto:h-teixeira@hotmail.com">h-teixeira@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Sofia Pereira Machado</td>
<td>Técnica pedagógica</td>
<td>Instituto Renacer</td>
<td>912224796 <a href="mailto:Carlamachado.c@gmail.com">Carlamachado.c@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 2.6 Romania interviews

Meeting with the Programme Operator-in the Ministry of Justice- 29.07.2016, 10.00 am-at their office in the Ministry of Justice, Street Apolodor no 17, sector 5, Bucharest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender Male/Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.07.2016</td>
<td>Alexandru OLARU</td>
<td>Head of Unit PO</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>Programme Operator RO 20 - Domestic and Gender-based Violence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alexandru.olaru@just.ro">alexandru.olaru@just.ro</a>; 0372041153</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.07.2016</td>
<td>Andreea Eugenia GURGUTA</td>
<td>Counsellor for European Affaires</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>Programme Operator RO 20 - Domestic and Gender-based Violence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andreea.gurguta@just.ro">andreea.gurguta@just.ro</a>; 0372041164</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting with the National Focal Point (PNC), Ministry of European Funds - 29.07.2016, 1.30 pm-at their office , Bd. Ion Mihalache no 15-17, sector 1, Bucharest

### Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.07.2016</td>
<td>Florentina VARTOSU</td>
<td>Public Manager</td>
<td>PNC</td>
<td>RO20 - Domestic and Gender-based Violence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:florentina.vartosu@fonduri-ue.ro">florentina.vartosu@fonduri-ue.ro</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.07.2016</td>
<td>Mihaela TERCHILA</td>
<td>General Director</td>
<td>PNC</td>
<td>RO20 - Domestic and Gender-based Violence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mihaela.terchila@fonduri-ue.ro">mihaela.terchila@fonduri-ue.ro</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.07.2016</td>
<td>Diana DUMA</td>
<td>Deputy General Director</td>
<td>PNC</td>
<td>RO20 - Domestic and Gender-based Violence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:diana.duma@fonduri-ue.ro">diana.duma@fonduri-ue.ro</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.07.2016</td>
<td>Bogdana SINCA</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>PNC</td>
<td>RO20 - Domestic and Gender-based Violence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bogdana.sinca@fonduri-ue.ro">bogdana.sinca@fonduri-ue.ro</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting with the General Inspectorate of Police in Romania (IGPR) - 27.07.2016, 8.30 am-at their office , Street Mihai Voda no 4-6, sector 5, Bucharest

### Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.07.2016</td>
<td>Dana OBAE</td>
<td>Monitoring Expert</td>
<td>IGPR</td>
<td>RO20-0007 - JAD - Joint action against domestic violence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dana.baciu@politiaromana.ro">dana.baciu@politiaromana.ro</a>; 0746268579</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.07.2016</td>
<td>Zoe Doina Nita</td>
<td>Implementation Expert/psychologist</td>
<td>IGPR</td>
<td>RO20-0007 - JAD - Joint action against</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doina.nita@politiaromana.ro">doina.nita@politiaromana.ro</a>; 0724254797</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of interview</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Contact details</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.07.2016</td>
<td>Anca MARIN GONT</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Association Ecotour</td>
<td>RO20-0006</td>
<td>CONSENS: Awareness raising campaign on the negative effects of domestic violence in the regions Bucharest-Ifov and South Muntenia</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.07.2016</td>
<td>Roxana COZEA</td>
<td>Coordinator on behalf of the Project’s Partner</td>
<td>European Women Association for Social and Economic Development/AFEDES-Project Partner</td>
<td>RO20-0006</td>
<td>CONSENS: Awareness raising campaign on the negative effects of domestic violence in the regions Bucharest-Ifov and South Muntenia</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.07.2016</td>
<td>Nicoleta SAMOILA</td>
<td>Communication Expert</td>
<td>European Women Association for Social and Economic Development/AFEDES-Project Partner</td>
<td>RO20-0006</td>
<td>CONSENS: Awareness raising campaign on the negative effects of domestic violence in the regions Bucharest-Ifov and South Muntenia</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of interview</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Contact details</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.07.2016</td>
<td>Dan CRISTEA</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>ANITP</td>
<td>RO20-0001 - Best practice model on assistance for victims of trafficking in human beings - Pilot project</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dan.cristea.anitp@ma.gov.ro">dan.cristea.anitp@ma.gov.ro</a></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.07.2016</td>
<td>Cristina DRAGOTA</td>
<td>Member in the project’s team</td>
<td>ANITP</td>
<td>RO20-0001 - Best practice model on assistance for victims of trafficking in human beings - Pilot project</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cristina.dragota.anitp@mai.gov.ro">cristina.dragota.anitp@mai.gov.ro</a>; 0723892287</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.07.2016</td>
<td>Gheorghe UNGUR</td>
<td>Member SMEC (Service for monitoring, evaluation and coordination of the victims) in ANITP</td>
<td>ANITP</td>
<td>RO20-0001 - Best practice model on assistance for victims of trafficking in human beings - Pilot project</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anitp.sme@ma.gov.ro">anitp.sme@ma.gov.ro</a></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting with Mrs. Marina Brucher-Senior Adviser, Commission for European Affaires, Chamber of Deputies, Bucharest, Romania, 08.08.2016, 12.00-15.00 hrs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.08.2016</td>
<td>Marina Brucher</td>
<td>Senior Adviser</td>
<td>Commission for European Affaires, Chamber of Deputies, Bucharest, Romania</td>
<td>RO 20- gender and domestic violence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brucherm@gmail.com">brucherm@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting with Mrs. Mariana Armean, Programme Director, Estuar Foundation, Bucharest, Romania, 09.08.2016, 9.00-11.00 hrs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.08.2016</td>
<td>Mariana Armean</td>
<td>Programme Director</td>
<td>Estuar Foundation</td>
<td>RO 20- gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus group with:
Representatives of Roma + Psychologist AFEDES

RO20-0006 - CONSENS: Awareness raising campaign on the negative effects of domestic violence in the regions Bucharest-Ilfov and South Muntenia
Location: Pitesti town, Arges County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 28.07.2016; 3.00-5.00 pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina DELCUESCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela DRAGUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela Gheorghe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus group with:
It was realised by email

Project:
RO20-0001 - Best practice model on assistance for victims of trafficking in human beings - Pilot project
Location: By email

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 28-29 iulie 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farcane Lola Cristina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2.7  Slovakia interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
<td>Barbora Kuchárová</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Civic Association PRIMA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barbora.kucharova@gmail.com">barbora.kucharova@gmail.com</a>; T: +421 903 429 385</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td><a href="http://www.primaoz.sk">http://www.primaoz.sk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
<td>Martin Páleník</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Civic Association PRIMA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td><a href="http://www.primaoz.sk">http://www.primaoz.sk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
<td>Eva Dzurindová</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Linka Detské Istoty (Child Safety Nonstop Line)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ldi@ldi.sk">ldi@ldi.sk</a>; T: +421 2 5292 7518, T: +421 2 5292 7518</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ldi.sk/">http://www.ldi.sk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
<td>Gabriela Krupčíková</td>
<td>Manager Guarrantee</td>
<td>Linka Detské Istoty (Child Safety Nonstop Line)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ldi@ldi.sk">ldi@ldi.sk</a>; T: +421 2 5292 7518, T: +421 2 5292 7518</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ldi.sk/">http://www.ldi.sk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July 2016</td>
<td>Magdaléna Fillová</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Civic Association Brieždenie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fillova.magdalena@gmail.com">fillova.magdalena@gmail.com</a>; T: +421 915 894 941</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td><a href="http://briezdenie.sk/">http://briezdenie.sk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 July 2016</td>
<td>Barbora Kuchárová</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Civic Association PRIMA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barbora.kucharova@gmail.com">barbora.kucharova@gmail.com</a>; +421 903 429 385</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td><a href="http://www.primaoz.sk">http://www.primaoz.sk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 of August 2016</td>
<td>Jana Dacková</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Government Office of the Slovak Republic, Department of EEA and</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jana.dackova@vlada.gov.sk">jana.dackova@vlada.gov.sk</a>; T: +421 2 2092 5555, F: 1421 2 5443 0056</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Contact details</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 August 2016</td>
<td>Petra Kropacsek</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Government Office of the Slovak Republic, Department of EEA and Norway Grants</td>
<td><a href="mailto:petra.kropacsek@vlada.gov.sk">petra.kropacsek@vlada.gov.sk</a></td>
<td>T: +421 2 20925536 F: +421 2 5443 0056</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 August 2016</td>
<td>Zuzana</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>Civic Association Brieždenie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fillova.magdalena@gmail.com">fillova.magdalena@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>T: +421 915 894 941</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 August 2016</td>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>Civic Association Brieždenie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fillova.magdalena@gmail.com">fillova.magdalena@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>T: +421 915 894 941</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 August 2016</td>
<td>Lenka</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>Civic Association Brieždenie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fillova.magdalena@gmail.com">fillova.magdalena@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>T: +421 915 894 941</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 August 2016</td>
<td>Jana Dacková</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Government Office of the Slovak Republic, Department of EEA and Norway Grants</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jana.dackova@vlada.gov.sk">jana.dackova@vlada.gov.sk</a></td>
<td>T: +421 2 2092 5555 F: 1421 2 5443 0056</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 August 2016</td>
<td>Petra Kropacsek</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Government Office of the Slovak Republic, Department of EEA and Norway Grants</td>
<td><a href="mailto:petra.kropacsek@vlada.gov.sk">petra.kropacsek@vlada.gov.sk</a></td>
<td>T: +421 2 20925536 F: +421 2 5443 0056</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 August 2016</td>
<td>Daniela Gáliková</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Civic Association Brána do života</td>
<td></td>
<td>T: +421 915 492 134</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 August 2016</td>
<td>Olga Pietruchová</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Department of Gender Equality and Equal Opportunity of the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family of the Slovak Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annex 2.8 Spain interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19th July 2016</td>
<td>Carmen Pinedo</td>
<td>Project manager (Sestao)</td>
<td>Roma Secretariat Foundation</td>
<td>ES04-0048 - Access Program Romi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carmen.pinedo@gitanos.org">carmen.pinedo@gitanos.org</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th of July 2016</td>
<td>Miriam Fernández</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td>Roma Secretariat Foundation</td>
<td>ES04-0048 - Access Program Romi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:miriam.fernandezibanez@gitanos.org">miriam.fernandezibanez@gitanos.org</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st July 2016</td>
<td>Natalia Martínez</td>
<td>Project Technician</td>
<td>CEOE</td>
<td>ES04-0007 - Raising</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nmartinez@ceoeformacion.es">nmartinez@ceoeformacion.es</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Contact details</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st July 2016</td>
<td>Mª Ángeles Sánchez</td>
<td>Project Technician</td>
<td>Women Institute and for Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>ES04-0002 - Equilibrio-Balance</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmsanchezp@inmujer.es">mmsanchezp@inmujer.es</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st July 2016</td>
<td>Rosa Urbón</td>
<td>General Director, Women Institute and for Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>Women Institute and for Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>National Gender Focal Point</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgralmujer@inmujer.es">dgralmujer@inmujer.es</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd July 2016</td>
<td>Begoña Suárez Suárez</td>
<td>Programme manager, Deputy Director General for Entrepreneurship and Women’s Professional Promotion</td>
<td>Women Institute and for Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>ES04- Program on gender equality and work-life balance</td>
<td>bsuarezsmsssi.es</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd August 2016</td>
<td>Pilar Soler</td>
<td>Executive Director of EEA and Norway Grants</td>
<td>Ministry of Finances and Public Administrations</td>
<td>National Focal Point</td>
<td><a href="mailto:PSoler@sepg.minhap.es">PSoler@sepg.minhap.es</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus group with: Beneficiaries
Project: ES04-0048 - Access Program Romi
Location: Sestao (Vizcaya)
Date: 19th July 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Pérez Berrio</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+34 695646381</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begoña Jiménez Barrul</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+34 680799379</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Jiménez Gabarri</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+34 634875925</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoriache Jiménez</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+34 670479405</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra García</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+34 662493703</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Pinedo Alonso</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>+34 656955836</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus group with: CEOE
Project: ES04-0007 - Raising awareness, training, professional growth, the development of leadership and the promotion of women and of women managers in the
business community in order to facilitate their access to decision-making positions within their companies (Predefined project)

**Location:** Madrid  
**Date:** 21st July 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carla S. Inagaki</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>ESADE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Carla.inagaki@esade.edu">Carla.inagaki@esade.edu</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Allegue</td>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>Skechers</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rosallegue@hotmail.com">rosallegue@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar Santana Rollán</td>
<td>Director Center of Companies</td>
<td>CaixaBank</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marsantaranollan@hotmail.com">marsantaranollan@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta Margarit</td>
<td>General Director</td>
<td>SEDIGAS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmargarit@sedigas.es">mmargarit@sedigas.es</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta Lamas</td>
<td>Employee Engagement, Diversity and Inclusion Lead EMEA &amp; Latam</td>
<td>BT</td>
<td>l簧<a href="mailto:masmorta@yahoo.es">masmorta@yahoo.es</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia Martínez</td>
<td>Project Technician</td>
<td>CEOE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nmartinez@ceoformacion.es">nmartinez@ceoformacion.es</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus group with: Madrid City Council  
**Project:** ES04-0002 - Equilibrio-Balance continuation project, expanding its external side, with a greater involvement of enterprises and trade unions, having them as direct partners  
**Location:** Madrid  
**Date:** 22nd July 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Gómez Rivera</td>
<td>Head of Equality Department (Equilibrio-Balance manager)</td>
<td>Madrid City Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gomezrm@madrid.es">gomezrm@madrid.es</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatriz Miralles Tortosa</td>
<td>Project Technician (Equilibrio Balance)</td>
<td>Madrid City Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mirallestb@madrid.es">mirallestb@madrid.es</a></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3    The Sampling Cases

This annex presents the narrative selected sample based on the criteria, which is presented in the inception note, section 2.3. The sample projects can be found in the annex entitled “Annex country selection”. The criteria followed were discussed with the client.

The tables are marked using the following codes:

- **Red** – small or smallest project (in-depth study)
- **Green** – large project (in-depth study)
- **Yellow** – desk study
- **Star (*)** – project outside the capital

Bulgaria

Bulgaria only has one programme and therefore all projects selected come from the single programme.

One of the in-depth study projects (BG12-022) was moved to the desk review list in order to ensure that there were projects outside the capital on both lists.

It is important to note that no conflict of interest with any of the selected projects was found between the consultant and the selected tasks. The consultant confirmed this.

Additionally, in Bulgaria due to unresponsiveness of a project promoter due to be part of an in-depth study, two projects were switched. This ensured that desk studies were conducted on all 8 projects and that 3 projects were visited.

Estonia

Estonia has two programmes, therefore four projects have been selected from one and four from the other. All the rules mentioned above were applied in the selection process. Following the selecting process, the two lists were combined.

Of the cases selected, one of those selected for in-depth study has implementation sites around the country, hence it meets the demands of the selection process.

Additionally, the smallest project had to be switched for a slightly larger one because the national subject area expert had a conflict of interest with the smallest assignment previously selected.

Poland

Poland only has one programme, hence all projects have been selected from the same programme.

In Poland the smallest project is also outside the capital of the country.

Portugal

In Portugal, there are is only one programme. Hence, all the projects were selected from the one.

Based on additional information from the client, PT07-0006 was selected as a project carried out outside Lisbon.
Romania

In Romania, there is only one programme; hence, all the projects were selected from the one. The smallest project (red) is outside the capital. Hence, this requirement is met. Most of the desk review cases are also outside the capital. Since most of the projects are implemented outside the capital, this selection is deemed appropriate.

Slovakia

In Slovakia, there is only one programme; hence, all the projects were selected from the one.

A project meeting selection criteria (SK09-005) had to be replaced with another one close in value because the consultant had been involved with an organization that provided support to the project promoter for the mentioned project. Conflict of interest issues arose also for the next eligible project (SK09-006). For these reasons, SK09-014 was chosen to replace the two problematic projects.

Spain

In Spain there is only one programme hence all the projects were selected from the one.

The Women’s institute for equal opportunity is a national institution and as such it has offices in multiple places around the country. Therefore a location can be selected in order to ensure coverage that goes beyond the capital of the country.
Annex 4  Data Collection Protocols

This annex is presented in Excel format until the report is accepted and prepared for completion.
Annex 5  QCA Truth Tables and Data Analysis Results

Annex 5.1  WLB truth table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case code</th>
<th>Condition Code</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>CUR</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>RES</th>
<th>CAM</th>
<th>POL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT07-0006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES04-0002</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES04-0007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES04-0048</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES04-0005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES04-0018</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES04-0019</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES04-0017</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE09-0001</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE09-0002</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE09-0005</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE09-0018</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES: Spain; EE: Estonia; PT: Portugal
Annex 5.2  DV/GBV: QCA truth table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case code</th>
<th>Condition Code</th>
<th>GOVCON</th>
<th>GBVLAW</th>
<th>RES</th>
<th>CAM</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>NEWPOL</th>
<th>PJCAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO20-001</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO20-006</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO 20-007</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO20-0015</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO 20-002</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO 20-003</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO 20-010</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0013</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0022</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0020</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0016</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0005</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0018</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0020</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0013</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0009</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0008</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0010</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0004</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0025</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0014</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE11-0005</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE11-0006</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE11-0002</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE11-0001</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ro: Romania; BG: Bulgaria; SK: Slovakia; EE: Estonia
Annex 5.3  DV/GBV: QCA truth table 2 (reduced conditions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case code</th>
<th>Condition Code</th>
<th>GOVCON</th>
<th>GBVLAW</th>
<th>RES</th>
<th>CAM</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>REP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL14-0001</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL14-0007</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL14-0003</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0013</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0022</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0016</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG12-0005</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0020</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0013</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0009</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-0008</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK09-008</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case: Current conservative government (to be defined)  
Divorce is pro equity  
GBV related legislation is pro women (partially has been coded as Yes)  
Conducting research on (xx)  
Awareness raising campaigns for general public (to be done has been coded as no)  
Capacity building of law enforcement on GBV/DV (partial coded as yes)  
decreased acceptance of GBV/DV (expected has been coded as yes; maybe has been coded as yes))\  
increase in reporting of GBV/DV to police
<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0010</td>
<td>SK09-0004</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SK09-0025</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SK09-0014</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE11-0005</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE11-0006</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE11-0002</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE11-0001</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5.4  Raw findings from QCA analysis

In the following pages you can find the raw QCA analysis that was derived from the data presented earlier in this annex (sections 1,2,3).

Annex 5.4.1  WLB dataset: Analysis of outcome POL

(you said you were particularly interested in COM, CAP, RES, CAM)

COM, cur and RES are subset-sufficient for POL (4/4) as single conditions; CUR is sufficient for cam. com, CUR, res, cam are necessary for pol (5/5); cap is almost necessary for pol (4/5).

The analysis of the model COM + CUR + CAP + RES + CAM = POL returns the following findings:

- For the positive outcome, there are 6 consistent combinations covering 100% of cases altogether (see green areas below). Four of them cover one case (14%) only and are 5-condition. The remaining two 4-condition combinations cover 2 cases (29%):
  - cur*cap*RES*cam and
  - COM*cap*RES*cam.
- For the negative outcome, there is one consistent 4-condition combination covering 100% of cases: com*CUR*res*cam.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw</th>
<th>unique</th>
<th>coverage</th>
<th>coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~com<em>~cur</em>cap<em>~res</em>~cam</td>
<td>0.142857</td>
<td>0.142857</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~com<em>~cur</em>cap<em>~res</em>~cam</td>
<td>0.142857</td>
<td>0.142857</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~com<em>cur</em>cap<em>res</em>~cam</td>
<td>0.142857</td>
<td>0.142857</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>com<em>~cur</em>cap<em>res</em>cam</td>
<td>0.142857</td>
<td>0.142857</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 1.000000
solution consistency: 1.000000

--- COMPLEX SOLUTION --- NEG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw</th>
<th>unique</th>
<th>coverage</th>
<th>coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~com<em>cur</em>~res*~cam</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 1.000000
solution consistency: 1.000000
Annex 5.4.2  DV dataset: Analysis of outcome NEWPOL

RES is necessary for NEWPOL, but not quite sufficient (9/11)

GOVCON and DIVEQ are always the opposite if each other in this dataset: this means they provide the same information. I removed DIVEQ and kept CON.

The analysis of the model GOVCON + GBVLAW + RES + CAM + CAP = NEWPOL returns the following findings:

- For the positive outcome, there are 4 consistent combinations covering 55% of cases altogether. They are quite different and correspond to the 4 green rectangles below. Each combination is made of 5 conditions (maximum complexity given the model).
  - Decreasing the consistency cutoff to 0.67, another 5-condition combination is added covering about 44% of cases in itself (the striped rectangle): govcon*GBVLAW*RES*CAM*CAP
- For the negative outcome, there are 4 sufficient combinations, which are simpler than the above: two 3-condition and two 4-condition combinations (pink areas). Each combination has relatively high coverage, covering between 20% and 35% of negative cases (between 13% and 30% uniquely) (see below for details)

--- COMPLEX SOLUTION --- NEWPOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw</th>
<th>unique</th>
<th>coverage</th>
<th>coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>govcon<em>gbvlaw</em>res<em>~cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.111111</td>
<td>0.111111</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>res<em>cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.111111 0.111111 1.000000</td>
<td>0.111111 0.111111 1.000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>govcon<em>gbvlaw</em>res<em>~cam</em>cap</td>
<td>0.222222 0.222222 1.000000</td>
<td>0.222222 0.222222 1.000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>res<em>cam</em>cap</td>
<td>0.111111 0.111111 1.000000</td>
<td>0.111111 0.111111 1.000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solution coverage: 0.555556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solution consistency: 1.000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0.67 --- COMPLEX SOLUTION --- NEWPOL

--- COMPLEX SOLUTION --- NEWPOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw</th>
<th>Unique</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>res<em>~cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.111111 0.111111 1.000000</td>
<td>0.111111 0.111111 1.000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>res<em>~cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.111111 0.111111 1.000000</td>
<td>0.111111 0.111111 1.000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>govcon<em>gbvlaw</em>res<em>~cam</em>cap</td>
<td>0.222222 0.222222 1.000000</td>
<td>0.222222 0.222222 1.000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>res<em>cam</em>cap</td>
<td>0.111111 0.111111 1.000000</td>
<td>0.111111 0.111111 1.000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>gbvlaw</em>res<em>cam</em>cap</td>
<td>0.444444 0.444444 0.666667</td>
<td>0.444444 0.444444 0.666667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solution coverage: 1.000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solution consistency: 0.818182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEG

--- COMPLEX SOLUTION --- NEWPOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw</th>
<th>Unique</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>~res</td>
<td>0.260870 0.173913 1.000000</td>
<td>0.217391 0.130435 1.000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~res</em>cap</td>
<td>0.217391 0.130435 1.000000</td>
<td>0.217391 0.217391 1.000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>govcon<em>gbvlaw</em>~res*~cam</td>
<td>0.217391 0.217391 1.000000</td>
<td>0.347826 0.304348 1.000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~gbvlaw<em>~res</em>cam*cap</td>
<td>0.347826 0.304348 1.000000</td>
<td>0.913043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.913043

solution consistency: 1.000000
Annex 5.4.3  DV dataset: Analysis of outcome PJCAP

GOVCON and DIVEQ are always the opposite if each other in this dataset: this means they provide the same information. I removed DIVEQ and kept CON.

The analysis of the model GOVCON + GBVLAW + RES + CAM + CAP = PJCAP returns the following findings:

- For the positive outcome, there are 4 consistent combinations covering 76% of cases altogether (see green areas below). Two of these are made of 5 conditions (maximum complexity given the model, the two isolated green areas at the centre);
  - another combination is made of 4 conditions and covers 41% of cases (35% uniquely): govcon*GBVLAW*CAM*CAP
  - the fourth is a 3-condition combination and covers 29% of cases (24% uniquely): govcon*res*CAP.
- For the negative outcome, there are 3 sufficient combinations, quite complex and covering only 20% of the cases.
  - If the consistency cutoff is lowered to 86%, an important combination is added covering 40% of the cases, including uniquely: GOVCON*gbvlaw*res*CAM*CAP
  - If the consistency cutoff is further lowered to 75%, another important combination is added covering 27% of cases: GOVCON*GBVLAW*res*cam

--- COMPLEX SOLUTION --- PJCAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw</th>
<th>unique</th>
<th>coverage</th>
<th>coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~res</em>cap</td>
<td>0.294118</td>
<td>0.235294</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>gbvlaw</em>cam*cap</td>
<td>0.411765</td>
<td>0.352941</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>res<em>cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.058824</td>
<td>0.058824</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
govcon*~gbvlaw*res*cam*cap       0.058824    0.058824    1.000000
solution coverage: 0.764706
solution consistency: 1.000000

NEG
--- COMPLEX SOLUTION --- PJCAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw</th>
<th>unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coverage</td>
<td>coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>~res<em>~cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.066667    0.066667    1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>gbvlaw</em>res<em>~cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.066667    0.066667    1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>govcon<em>gbvlaw</em>~res<em>~cam</em>cap</td>
<td>0.066667    0.066667    1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>~res<em>cam</em>cap</td>
<td>0.400000    0.400000    0.857143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
solution coverage: 0.200000
solution consistency: 1.000000
--- COMPLEX SOLUTION --- 0.86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw</th>
<th>unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coverage</td>
<td>coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>~res<em>~cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.066667    0.066667    1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>gbvlaw</em>res<em>~cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.066667    0.066667    1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>~res<em>~cam</em>cap</td>
<td>0.400000    0.400000    0.857143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
solution coverage: 0.600000
solution consistency: 0.900000
--- COMPLEX SOLUTION --- 0.75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw</th>
<th>unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coverage</td>
<td>coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>gbvlaw</em>~res*~cam</td>
<td>0.266667    0.266667    0.800000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>~res<em>~cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.066667    0.066667    1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>~res<em>~cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.066667    0.066667    1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>~res<em>~cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.400000    0.400000    0.857143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
solution coverage: 0.800000
solution consistency: 0.857143
### COMPLEX SOLUTION

--- 0.67 ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>~res*~cam</td>
<td>0.200000</td>
<td>0.200000</td>
<td>0.750000</td>
<td>0.200000</td>
<td>0.200000</td>
<td>0.750000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>govcon<em>gbvlaw</em>~res*~cam</td>
<td>0.266667</td>
<td>0.266667</td>
<td>0.800000</td>
<td>0.266667</td>
<td>0.266667</td>
<td>0.800000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~govcon<em>gbvlaw</em>~res<em>~cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.066667</td>
<td>0.066667</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>0.066667</td>
<td>0.066667</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>govcon<em>~gbvlaw</em>~res<em>~cam</em>~cap</td>
<td>0.400000</td>
<td>0.400000</td>
<td>0.857143</td>
<td>0.400000</td>
<td>0.400000</td>
<td>0.857143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**solution coverage**: 0.933333
**solution consistency**: 0.823529
Annex 5.4.4  DV reduced dataset: Analysis of outcome ACC

GOVCON and DIVEQ are always the opposite if each other in this dataset: this means they provide the same information. I removed DIVEQ and kept CON.

CAP is necessary for ACC; GBVLAW is necessary for acc; GOVCON almost sufficient for CAP and ACC (10/11); gbvlaw sufficient for CAM, CAP, ACC (8/8); CAP is almost trivial (30/32); CAM is sufficient for CAP (13/13).

The analysis of the model GOVCON + GBVLAW + RES + CAM + CAP = ACC returns the following findings:

- For the positive outcome, there are 3 consistent combinations covering 85% of cases altogether (see green areas below). One is maximally complex given the model (the small green rectangle).
  - One 4-condition combination covers 62% of cases, including uniquely: GOVCON*gbvlaw*CAM*CAP
  - Another 4-condition combination covers 15% of cases, including uniquely: GOVCON*GBVLAW*CAM*CAP.
  - The combination GOVCON*CAP is subset sufficient for ACC.

- For the negative outcome, there are two consistent combinations, both made of 5 conditions, covering 33% of cases (see below for details).
  - with a consistency cutoff of 75% one important combination is added, covering an additional 50% of cases: govcon*GBVLAW*RES*CAM*CAP.

--- COMPLEX SOLUTION --- ACC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw</th>
<th>unique</th>
<th>coverage coverage consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex 5.4.5  DV reduced dataset: Analysis of outcome REP

GOVCN and DIVEQ are always the opposite if each other in this dataset: this means they provide the same information. I removed DIVEQ and kept CON.

GOVCN and CAP are necessary for rep; CAP is almost trivial (30/32); govcon is sufficient for REP (8/8); for LAW; and almost sufficient for CAP (7/8). RES is almost sufficient for REP (6/7); CAM is sufficient for CAP (13/13).

The analysis of the model GOVCN + GBVLAW + RES + CAM + CAP = REP returns the following findings:

- For the positive outcome, there are 5 consistent combinations covering 91% of cases altogether (see green areas below). Three are maximally complex given the model (the isolated green areas), while two 4-condition combinations cover the majority of cases.
  - One 4-condition combination covers 45% of cases (36% uniquely): govcon*GBVLAW*CAM*CAP
  - Another 4-condition combination covers 27% of cases (18% uniquely): govcon*GBVLAW*res*CAP.
  - The combination govcon*GBVLAW is subset sufficient for REP.
- For the negative outcome, there is one consistent combination, made of 4 conditions, covering 25% of cases: GOVCN*GBVLAW*cam*CAP.
  - The remaining 75% of cases are covered by a 5-condition combination which is 86% sufficient: GOVCN*gbvlaw*res*CAM*CAP.
  - GOVCN*cap*CAP is subset sufficient for a negative outcome.
--- COMPLEX SOLUTION --- REP

raw unique
coverage coverage consistency
---------- ---------- ----------
~govcon*gbvlaw*~res*cap 0.272727 0.181818 1.000000
~govcon*gbvlaw*cam*cap 0.454545 0.363636 1.000000
govcon*~gbvlaw*res*cam*cap 0.090909 0.090909 1.000000
~govcon*~gbvlaw*res*~cam*~cap 0.090909 0.090909 1.000000
govcon*~gbvlaw*res*~cam*~cap 0.090909 0.090909 1.000000

solution coverage: 0.909091
solution consistency: 1.000000

--- COMPLEX SOLUTION --- REP NEG 0.86

raw unique
coverage coverage consistency
---------- ---------- ----------
govcon*~gbvlaw*~res*cam*cap 0.250000 0.250000 1.000000
govcon*~gbvlaw*~res*~cam*~cap 0.750000 0.750000 0.857143

solution coverage: 1.000000
solution consistency: 0.888889