

# **Protective Orders for People at Risk of Domestic Abuse**

## **Analysis of Consultation Responses**

**July 2020**



**Scottish Government**  
Riaghaltas na h-Alba  
gov.scot

## **Contents**

### **INTRODUCTION**

**Background to the Consultation  
Profile of Respondents**

**POWER FOR POLICE TO IMPOSE AN IMMEDIATE PROTECTIVE  
ORDER WITHOUT PRIOR COURT APPROVAL**

**POWER FOR COURT TO MAKE A PROTECTIVE ORDER**

**OPERATION OF PROTECTIVE ORDERS**

**OTHER ISSUES RELATING TO PROTECTIVE ORDERS**

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES, FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS, AND OTHER  
IMPACTS**

### **ANNEXES**

**Annex A: Organisational Respondents**

## Introduction

1.1 The Scottish Government published a consultation paper, 'Protection Orders for People at Risk of Domestic Abuse', on 21 December 2018. The consultation ran until 29 March 2019.

1.2 A number of jurisdictions across Europe have introduced protective orders for people at risk of domestic abuse, often referred to as 'emergency barring orders'. These are short-term orders which can be used to remove a suspected perpetrator of abuse from the home of a person at risk of abuse. They may also prohibit that person from contacting the person at risk.

1.3 They are intended to provide protection to a person at risk of abuse in the immediate term. The consultation paper contained proposals for protective orders which would not require the person at risk to make an application to the court themselves. In the longer term, the person at risk may consider seeking a civil protective order, such as an interdict, non-harassment order or exclusion order. These existing civil protective orders are applied for by the person seeking protection.

1.4 In the context of a criminal investigation or prosecution, there are a number of existing powers that the police and courts can use to protect a person at risk of domestic abuse. In addition, the disposal upon conviction for a criminal offence may include measures to put more long-term protection in place for the person at risk.

1.5 The purpose of the consultation was to seek views on whether the police and the courts should be provided with additional powers to impose a protective order to remove a person suspected of abusing their partner from the home of the person at risk and, if so, on how such a scheme should operate.

1.6 The consultation found that the great majority of respondents who expressed a view supported providing the police with a power to impose emergency protective orders to remove a suspected perpetrator of domestic abuse from the household of a person at risk of domestic abuse. There was almost unanimous agreement that the courts should have a power to impose a protective order that could run for a period longer than those imposed by the police.

1.7 However, there were differing views on the details of how any such scheme should operate. For example, there were a range of views on how long any police-imposed emergency orders and court-imposed protective orders should be able to run for, whether others besides the police should be able to make an application to the courts for a protective order, and whether the scheme should be restricted to people at risk of abuse from a partner or ex-partner or should cover other adult family members or unrelated individuals living in shared housing.

1.8 A great majority of respondents also thought that such orders should be sufficiently widely drawn to enable them to be used to protect any children connected to the person at risk.

1.9 Almost all respondents who expressed a view were of the view that it was vital that if protective orders are to provide effective protection to people at risk of abuse, then as well as removing a suspected perpetrator from a family home, they should also be capable of being used to impose restrictions similar to those which can be imposed by interdicts or non-harassment orders, such as not attempting to contact the person to be protected and not approaching their place of work or study.

1.10 A number of consultation respondents highlighted what they saw as the importance of people at risk of domestic abuse having access to support services which can assist them in making long-term decisions in order to ensure their personal safety if the creation of shorter-term protective orders are to be effective. Several of these specifically highlighted access to legal advice. Other issues raised by respondents included the importance of clear training and guidance being made available to professionals working in this area if any new scheme of protective orders is to be effective and of sufficient resources being made available to support services to enable them to provide effective support to people at risk of abuse.

1.11 This report presents a summary of the consultation responses received and the main points raised by those responses. Where permission has been given to do so, individual responses have been published and can be viewed at: [https://consult.gov.scot/justice/people-at-risk-of-domestic-abuse/consultation/published\\_select\\_respondent](https://consult.gov.scot/justice/people-at-risk-of-domestic-abuse/consultation/published_select_respondent). This consultation also sought views on matters relating to reform of exclusion orders. However this analysis is limited to consideration of the proposal to introduce new protective orders for people at risk of domestic abuse.

## **Background to the Consultation**

1.12 In February 2018, the Scottish Parliament passed the Domestic Abuse (Scotland) Act 2018, which provides for a specific statutory offence of domestic abuse. During the Parliament's consideration of the Domestic Abuse (Scotland) Bill, a number of third sector respondents raised concerns that there is a gap in protection available to victims of domestic abuse. They were concerned that a person wishing to obtain immediate or long-term protection, particularly in relation to keeping a perpetrator away from their home, can only obtain such protection if the perpetrator enters the criminal justice system or if the victim takes out a civil order against the perpetrator.

1.13 As part of their consideration of the Bill, the Justice Committee held an evidence session<sup>1</sup> on these issues in October 2017, taking evidence from Police Scotland, Scottish Women's Aid, the Law Society of Scotland, and Professor Mandy Burton.

1.14 Following that evidence session, the then Cabinet Secretary for Justice stated that a consultation would be published which would seek views on questions about how policy to provide for relevant powers to protect those at risk of domestic abuse might be developed.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=11165>

## Profile of respondents

1.15 There were 78 responses to the consultation. Of these responses, 32 were received from individuals and 46 were from organisations.

1.16 The organisations which responded to the consultation can be broken down into the following broad categories:

- Violence Against Women and Gender-based Violence Partnerships (10)
- Third sector groups representing victims (8)
- Justice and legal sector groups (6)
- Local Authorities (4)
- Health, Social Work and Social Care groups (6)
- Housing (5)
- Children's groups (4)
- Others (3)

1.17 The majority of individual responses came from people who said that they either had experienced domestic abuse or were recounting the experiences of a close friend or relative who had experienced domestic abuse. A minority came from individuals who said that they either had been, or knew someone who had been, falsely accused of perpetrating domestic abuse.

1.18 Further information on the organisations which responded and how they have been classified for the purpose of this analysis is set out at **Annex A**.

## Power for Police to impose an immediate protective order without prior court approval

2.1. The consultation asked two questions seeking views on whether the police should have a power to impose a protective order without first seeking court approval. The first sought views on whether the police should have such a power:

**Question 1: Do you think the police should have the power to bar a person from a home that they share with a person at risk of domestic abuse for a period of time and prohibit them from contacting that person, without the need to obtain court approval?**

2.2 The great majority of respondents to the consultation supported providing the police with a power to make an 'emergency' protective order without being required to first seek the agreement of a court. Of those respondents who offered a view, **61 respondents** supported providing the police with these powers, while **only 6 respondents** were opposed to doing so. A further **4 respondents** said that they were unsure.

2.3 Those who supported providing the police with a power to make such orders included all 8 of the victims' groups who responded, and all but one of the Gender-based Violence/Violence Against Women Partnerships. One victims' group respondent commented:

*"It is absolutely crucial that there's an immediate short term solution available. EBOs would allow police to take the necessary proactive steps to protect victims in their home, without the victim having to leave (perhaps with children) for their own safety...It will allow the Police and other key support agencies an opportunity to establish the level of risk and give the victim much needed time to consider her options and choices and for other protective procedures to be implemented."*

2.4 Respondents to this question raised a number of points about how such a power should be implemented, including the importance of ensuring that appropriate training and guidance on the use of such powers is put in place for police officers. One respondent suggested that the power to make such orders should be reserved to officers who have had specific training issues relating to the use of protective orders.

2.5 Of the 6 who were opposed to providing the police with such powers, 3 were individual respondents, who highlighted what they regarded as the risk that the existence of such powers would encourage people to make false allegations. One justice and legal sector respondent highlighted the importance of judicial oversight of any power to remove suspected perpetrators of abuse from their own home. They commented:

*"The courts play an essential role in ensuring fair, transparent and proportionate exercise of powers. This is particularly important in situations where preventative measures are being sought, where an individual has not been charged with any offence. The orders being proposed could result in a*

*significant restriction of an individual's right to private and family life and right to enjoy their property; and should therefore be handled with proper oversight and due process. Were this power to exist it would require to be a truly exceptional situation and would need to be subject to judicial determination at the earliest opportunity"*

2.6 A second question asked respondents for views on the length of time for which any order imposed by the police should have effect before requiring to be confirmed by a court.

**Question 2: If the police are given a power to put in place measures to protect a person at risk of domestic abuse for a period of time, we would welcome views on how long that period should be.**

2.7 There was a wide range of views on the question of how long any police-imposed order should run for before requiring to be confirmed by a court. The consultation asked respondents how long such orders should run for without setting specific alternative options available. As a consequence, respondents' answers varied from "a maximum of 48 hours" to others who were of the view that such an order should have indefinite effect. In broad terms, the answers given can be broken down as follows:

<b>Time order should have effect for before requiring confirmation by court</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>
Up to a week	13
One week to two weeks	9
More than two weeks, up to a month	11
Longer than a month	7

2.8 A number of respondents highlighted concerns that the 48 hours which Domestic Violence Prevention Notices issued by the police in England and Wales can run for is insufficient to enable a case to be prepared for court. For example, one victims' group respondent commented:

*"This period should be long enough to allow the victims of domestic abuse and any children in the household to feel safe, access adequate support and assess their options. The 48-hour period in England is viewed as too short to be effective."*

2.9 In terms of the length of time that respondents considered was sufficient for a police order to run for before being required to be confirmed by a court, there was an extent to which those who focused on the length of time required by the police to prepare a case for court tended to propose a shorter period of time than those who considered that work needed to be undertaken with the person at risk to assist them in determining their longer term accommodation options before a case came to court. For example, one justice and legal sector respondent commented:

*"...the period of time before court approval for that order is sought should be long enough to enable the victim and their family to establish constructive engagement with the police and relevant partners. The implementation of an*

*appropriate investigative strategy and assessment of further enquiry opportunities would also be key to providing the court with an informed application and meaningful information on which their determinations for additional measures can be made. Based on the responses made, this period of time is generally considered to be a period of no less than 7 days”*

While a victims’ group respondent suggested a longer time period:

*“...there should be an initial barring period of 21 days, to allow exclusive entitlement to the home for women and children, with the opportunity to seek an extension to this period, through the court. This will also work towards securing women and children’s safety and allow sufficient time for support to be provided to the woman and her children, as well as allowing her adequate time to explore her options.”*

2.10 A number of victims’ group respondents said that, with regard to the question of how long any police-imposed barring order should have effect for, in cases where, for whatever reason, a court was unable to hear a case within the required time period, it should be possible for the police barring order to have effect until a court hearing could be scheduled. On the other hand, one respondent from a justice and legal sector background highlighted concerns that too long a period could raise human rights issues if an alleged perpetrator of abuse was unable to challenge the imposition of an order in court.

## Power for court to make a protective order

3.1 The consultation asked two questions seeking views on whether the courts should have a power to impose a protective order barring a suspected perpetrator of domestic abuse from a home they share with a person at risk. The first asked respondents whether they supported providing the courts with a power to make such orders:

**Question 3: Do you agree that the courts should be given powers to make an order to protect a person at risk of domestic abuse by prohibiting the person posing the risk from returning to the person at risk's home while the order is in force?**

3.2 The great majority of respondents supported providing the courts with a power to make an order to protect a person at risk of domestic abuse by removing a suspected perpetrator of abuse from their home (including a small number of those who were opposed to providing the police with a power to make an order that didn't require to be confirmed by the courts). In total, **62 respondents** supported providing the courts with such powers, while **4 respondents** opposed providing the courts with such a power and **4 respondents** said they didn't know, or were unsure, about whether the courts should be provided with such a power. Those supporting the creation of such powers included all victims' group, housing and local authority respondents and all but one of the violence against women and gender based violence partnerships. One victims' group respondents, whose views were typical of many of the responses received, commented:

*"Yes, we agree with the proposal in...the consultation document that if powers are given to the police to impose an immediate measure to protect a woman at risk of domestic abuse, a court should then be involved in considering whether protective measures should remain in place for a specified period."*

3.3 For the most part, the small number of respondents who opposed providing the courts with such powers were concerned that it could encourage "false allegations", including the possibility that allegations would be made by people who are actually perpetrators of abuse. However, one health and social care respondent questioned whether the new powers would add to the courts and police's existing powers to deal with domestic abuse:

*"...if Scottish Government are considering an additional power to work alongside bail, special bail and use of remand it would be useful to have sight of the research which supports the need for this and better understand what is not working in the present system."*

3.4 Views were then sought on the question of how long any such order should be capable of having effect for:

**Question 4: If the courts are given a new power to impose measures to protect a person at risk of domestic abuse, we would welcome views on whether there should be a maximum period of time beyond which such measures would not apply and, if so, what that period should be.**

3.5 There was, again, a wide range of opinions from consultation respondents on the question of how long any court-imposed order should run for. Not all respondents provided a numerical answer to the question of how long orders should run for, but in very general terms, there was a split between those respondents who took the view that such court orders should be a short-to-medium term measure to be put in place to provide time for a person at risk of abuse to make longer-term plans for their housing needs (such as, for example, pursuing an exclusion order or removing the perpetrator from a joint tenancy).

3.6. The following table gives a broad summary of the range of views on this issue:

<b>Time court order should have effect for</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>
Short term (up to 1 month)	6
Medium term (1-3 months)	10
Long term (longer than 3 months, but for a fixed period)	6
Should be capable of running indefinitely	14

3.7 Generally speaking, individual respondents and those from the housing sector were most likely to be of the view that the order should either be long-term or indefinite in length. Beyond that, there was little clear correlation between the type of respondent and how long they thought the order should be capable of running for.

3.8 Other points raised by respondents included that there should be a mechanism to review the continuing need for a protective order (this from a housing sector respondent who favoured an approach where a court order could run for a long time), and a suggestion from a justice and legal sector respondent that a court order could run until particular agreed actions had been completed, as opposed to having a specific time limit. A number of respondents commented that it was important that an order should be capable of being extended on cause shown if this was necessary to ensure that the person whom the order was made to protect was not put at risk.

3.9 The consultation asked three questions about the circumstances in which a court should be able to consider imposing such an order. It was assumed that one route would be following an application by the police. The consultation also sought views on whether others should be able to make such applications and whether it should be possible for a criminal court to make such an order on conviction. In view of the close links between these three questions, the responses are considered together below.

**Question 5: We would welcome views on which bodies and/or people should be able to make an application to a court to impose measures to protect a person at risk of domestic abuse.**

**Question 6: Do you think a criminal court should be able to impose measures to protect a person at risk of domestic abuse that would bar a perpetrator from a shared home for a period of time, when sentencing the offender.**

**Question 7: Where an application is made to the court for measures to protect a person at risk of domestic abuse by someone other than the person at risk, should the consent of the person who may be at risk be required for such an order to be made?**

3.10 With regards the question of whom, beside the police, should be empowered to apply to the courts for a protective order, a wide range of bodies were suggested by respondents, including the person at risk themselves, family members of the person at risk, local authorities, housing associations, organisations providing support to victims of domestic abuse, healthcare professionals and others. The most commonly suggested people/organisations and the number of respondents who referred to them is noted in the table below:

<b>Organisation/individual who should be empowered to apply to the court for a protective order</b>	<b>Number of respondents<sup>2</sup></b>
Local authority/social work	34
3 <sup>rd</sup> Sector/Domestic Abuse/Women's Aid Groups	24
The person at risk themselves	22
Restrict to the police	7

3.11 It is worth noting that individual respondents were particularly likely to refer to local authority/social work officials as people who should be empowered to make applications on behalf of a person at risk of abuse. Of those who considered that the power to apply to the courts should be restricted to police officers, a number highlighted that they saw other bodies as having a role in advising the police where they consider a person may be at risk. For example, one local authority respondent commented:

*"...there should be a clear framework for making an application and that in the interests of developing consistent effective practice it may be appropriate to have a single agency lead on the application process. We would suggest that this should be the police with referrals in from social work, housing, housing associations or a third sector organisation like Women's Aid...Other organisations could inform the individual that a Barring Order is an option and support the person on this decision."*

3.12 Other respondents raised concern that allowing individuals or their family to apply directly to the courts for such orders could increase the risk that perpetrators would claim to be victims of abuse in cases where they wanted the victim to be removed from the shared home. One also questioned whether third sector organisations providing support to victims had appropriate governance arrangements in place to make decisions on whether to make an application.

3.13 However, other respondents explicitly saw advantages in widening out the pool of organisations who could apply for such orders beyond the police. For example, one justice and legal sector respondent commented:

---

<sup>2</sup> The total is greater than the number of respondents to the consultation as many respondents who answered this question referred to various organisations/individuals who should be able to make an application.

*“A person at risk, family members and local authority professionals should also be given the opportunity to apply to court for a protective order which would provide flexibility. Where a person at risk is reluctant to involve the police, this would be beneficial, and the court could act as the gate-keeper to ensure such an application is appropriate and proportionate.”*

3.14 Question 7 is directly linked to question 5 in that it relates to the question of whether the consent of the person at risk should be required before an application is made to the court for a protective order by a third party (whether this is the police or some other body). There were mixed views on this question. In total, **18 respondents** thought that consent *should* be required before an application was made, while **30 respondents** thought it should *not* be required. A further **17 respondents** either said that they did not know or provided a response to this question which was ambiguous.

3.15 Amongst those who thought that the consent of the person at risk should not be required before a court application was made, there was a clear recognition of the importance of keeping the person at risk informed and providing them with an opportunity to make their views known. There was, however, a concern that if a perpetrator of abuse knew that such an order could only be made with the person at risk's consent, this could in itself put the person the order is intended to protect at greater risk. One victims' group respondent, whose response was typical of many, commented:

*“it should not be required, but it should be taken into consideration. Sometimes women are concerned that if it is known by the perpetrator that they made the request, then they consider themselves to be at greater risk to further abuse. Orders should be made on the basis of risk and the perpetrators behaviour.”*

3.16 One individual respondent, again typical of a number of responses that were received, highlighted concerns that people at risk of abuse may not always recognise the extent to which they are at risk, and commented:

*“Sometimes a victim can be unsure, as the perpetrator has worn them down so much that they no longer have the ability to make a rational decision at that time as fear can be overwhelming...Therefore it is important that for the wellbeing and safety of the victim that they are protected and decisions made for them...”*

3.17 However, other respondents raised concerns that imposing an order without the consent of the person at risk may prove unlikely to be effective. One health, social work and social care respondent commented that:

*“Yes [consent should be required], otherwise the person at risk may seek to make contact with the alleged perpetrator which may lead to the victim enticing (even if unknowingly) the perpetrator to breach...conditions.”*

3.18 Question 6 sought views on whether the criminal courts should have a power to impose a protective order on a person convicted of a criminal offence against a person at risk when sentencing the offender. A significant majority of respondents favoured providing the courts with such a power. **42 respondents** said the criminal courts should be able to impose a protective order on conviction, while **11 respondents** did not support providing them with such a power and **3 respondents** either said they didn't know or provided an ambiguous response.

3.19 However, it is worth noting that there was a significant split between individual and organisational respondents on this question. Of the individuals who responded to this question, **27 favoured providing the courts with such a power**, while only **1 opposed doing so**. By contrast, **15 organisations** were in favour of giving the courts such a power, while **10 organisations** were opposed.

3.20 Those who favoured providing the criminal courts with such a power considered that it would provide them with a useful tool for protecting victims from further abuse that removed the need for a separate court process. One violence against women and girls/gender based violence partnership respondent commented:

*“Yes, we believe that criminal courts should be able to give barring orders when issuing a community sentence or a custodial sentence. It will also reduce anxieties for the survivor, and see cost-savings and time savings as two processes are streamlined.”*

3.21 However, a number of respondents, particularly justice and legal sector respondents and victims' group respondents, were of the view that such a power was unnecessary and could even be counter-productive because a court can already impose a Non-Harassment Order which can be used to prohibit a perpetrator from returning to a home they share with a victim and prevent them from making contact or otherwise harassing or abusing them in such cases. One response, which was typical of those who opposed providing the courts with such a power, commented:

*“No...we would not support giving the power to impose an EBO<sup>3</sup> to a criminal court. The new Domestic Abuse (Scotland) Act 2018...contains a presumption on the court granting a non-harassment order (NHO) for the same by the COPFS, unless the court concludes that such protection is not necessary. Such an order can contain a direction that the perpetrator does not enter approach or be in the vicinity of the home and indeed, NHOs currently imposed in criminal proceedings can be construed equally widely.*

*We would therefore be concerned that the ability to impose an essentially, short-term, emergency order in the form of an EBO would confuse matters with the police, the COPFS and the courts, and interfere with the court's powers to impose a NHO under the new legislation.”*

---

<sup>3</sup> a number of consultation respondents referred to the protective orders as 'emergency barring orders' or 'EBOs' as this language was used in the Istanbul Convention.

## Operation of Protective Orders

4.1 The consultation also sought views on a number of matters relating to the scope of any scheme of protective orders and how they will operate in practice. These are considered below.

**Question 8: We would welcome views as to which persons should be capable of being made subject to measures to protect a person at risk of domestic abuse. Should such protection be limited to providing protection from abuse by a partner or ex-partner? If not, what other relationships or circumstances should be covered by such provisions?**

4.2 There was a mix of views with regards the question of what relationships should be covered by the proposed protective orders. As set out in the table below, in general terms, consultation respondents' views can be characterised as falling into one of three categories: they either thought that the power should be restricted to cases involving partners and ex-partners, or that it should cover family members living in the same household, or that it should cover anybody living in the same household (so including, for example, unrelated people living in houses in multiple occupation):

<b>Relationships that should be covered by the protective orders</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>
Partners and ex-partners only	28
Any family members in the same household	9
Cohabitants/anyone living in a shared home	14
Don't know	8

4.3 Respondents representing victims' groups and violence against women and gender-based violence partnerships were particularly likely to support restricting the scope of the power to partners and ex-partners. Respondents supporting this approach often cited the Scottish Government's definition of domestic abuse and the fact that the domestic abuse offence in the Domestic Abuse (Scotland) Act 2018 is also restricted to partners and ex-partners. A number of respondents caveated this by commenting that the conditions that can be imposed by such orders should be capable of being widely drawn enough to ensure that protection is provided to the children or other family members of that partner or ex-partner<sup>4</sup>. Some respondents said that, while they thought the power should only cover partners and ex-partners, there may be a need to separately consider whether legislation is needed to address intra-familial abuse. One victims' group respondent commented:

*"Persons subject to measures should be limited to partners or ex-partners. The definition of domestic abuse recognised in Scotland identifies domestic abuse as occurring in an intimate relationship between a current or former partner. It does not include abuse from other family members including adult children or extended family members. This is a challenging and complex issue and the dynamics should be explored in a separate consultation."*

---

<sup>4</sup> these issues are considered in the analysis of answers to questions 10 and 11 below.

4.4 Set against this, some other respondents, highlighted that abuse could occur between, for example, parents and adult children, or people living in shared accommodation and thought that the powers should be wide enough to enable action to be taken in such cases. This view was more frequently held by individual respondents, though a number of organisational respondents from across different sectors also took this view. For example, one housing sector respondent commented:

*“Domestic abuse does not just happen between partners, therefore all vulnerable persons / victims should be protected from abuse in and around their home, no matter the relationship to the abuser.”*

4.5 The consultation sought views on what the test should be that is applied by the courts (or the police) for making such an order.

**Question 9: We would welcome views on what you think the test should be for deciding whether to impose measures to protect a person at risk of domestic abuse. In particular, do you think it should be a requirement that the person against whom the order is sought must have used or threatened violence against the person to be protected by the order, or do you think a wider test covering our modern understanding of what constitutes domestic abuse (i.e. behaviour likely to cause psychological, as well as physical, harm) should be used?**

4.6 A number of themes emerged from responses to this question. Many individual respondents, in particular, referred to the importance of ensuring that the test covered controlling behaviour, financial abuse, emotional abuse and psychological abuse as well as physical harm. A significant number of respondents (23 in total) referred to the definition of a course of abusive behaviour in the offence contained in the Domestic Abuse (Scotland) Act 2018 as a starting point for any definition used in determining whether to impose a protective order.

4.7 Victims’ group respondents were particularly likely to refer to the importance that any test of ‘harm’ to the person at risk does not impose a ‘severity threshold’ (for example, requiring that the victim is at risk of ‘serious harm’). A number of respondents referred to risk indicator tools currently used by the police and others to assess the risk posed to someone by their partner/ex-partner such as the ‘SafeLives checklist’<sup>5</sup>.

4.8 There were also a minority of respondents who specifically referred to the importance of ensuring that the test was not more wide-ranging than necessary. A small number of individual respondents (4) stated that it was important that any test was objective and designed in such a way as to deter false or malicious allegations. One justice and legal sector organisation stated that if it is to be made a criminal offence for such an order to be breached, it is important that the test for imposing an order is “a high one”.

---

<sup>5</sup> See <https://safelives.org.uk/node/516>

4.9 The consultation sought views on what the scope of any prohibitions imposed by protective orders should be, including whether, as well as barring the suspected perpetrator from approaching or entering the home of the person at risk, they should be capable of being used to put in place other restrictions or prohibitions intended to prevent the subject of the order from abusing the person at risk, and whether the orders should be capable of making provision with respect to any children living with the person at risk.

**Question 10: We would welcome views as to whether, as well as prohibiting the subject of the order from entering the person at risk's home, it should also be possible to impose conditions on the subject of the order to prevent them from contacting or approaching the person at risk, or prohibiting them from entering other specified locations (such as the person at risk's place of work or relatives' homes).**

**Question 11: Do you agree that, as well as enabling measures to be imposed to protect the person at risk, it should also be open to the police and courts to impose conditions requiring the subject of the order not to approach or contact any children living with the person at risk?**

4.10 With regard to the question of whether the order-making power should enable the imposition of wider conditions than simply barring the subject of the order from returning to the person at risk's home, **65 respondents** agreed that it should and **2 respondents** said it should not<sup>6</sup>. Consultation respondents highlighted in particular, that it was important that such orders should be capable of barring the subject of the order from making contact with the person at risk, or from approaching their place of work, college, or the homes of family members or close friends.

4.11 A number of respondents also highlighted the importance of ensuring that such orders can be used to make what might be regarded as supplementary provision with regards barring a person from returning to the person at risk's home. This might include requiring them to hand over any keys, prohibiting them from damaging or removing the property or personal effects of the person at risk, and prohibiting them from evicting or otherwise excluding the person at risk from the property.

4.12 There was also very widespread support for allowing these orders to be used to put in place measures to protect any children living with the person at risk. Of those respondents who answered this question, **55 respondents** supported such an approach, while **4 respondents** opposed doing so and **6 respondents** said they didn't know or were unsure.

4.13 A number of the respondents referred to the aggravation concerning harm to a child contained in the Domestic Abuse (Scotland) Act 2018 and indicated that they thought that in order to be consistent with that Act in terms of recognising the harm caused to children by domestic abuse, provision should be made in this area. One children's group respondent commented that:

---

<sup>6</sup> It should be noted that these respondents did not support the creation of protective orders.

*“It is critical that the proposed enabling measures are available to protect any child involved in the domestic abuse situation, as well as the adult victim. If this is not the case, the measures will be significantly out of step with the provisions to protect children in the new offence and the child’s best interest’s principle at the heart of the joint COPFS/ Police Scotland protocol on domestic abuse.”*

4.14 A number of respondents highlighted their view that children in such a situation will face direct risk of harm. For example, one victims’ group respondent commented:

*“Children experience all the same effects and risks as the non-abusive parent, and should be subject to the same protections. Children are also often used as part of the abuse, especially where there is on-going contact. Children exposed to domestic abuse need the protection of the courts.”*

4.15 Three respondents raised the question of how any protective order put in place would interact with existing child contact orders that may be in place. One respondent said that they considered it important that the requirements of any protective order should take precedence if there was any conflict between the requirements contained in it and in any child contact order.

4.16 The consultation sought views on whether breach of a protective order should be a criminal offence and, if so, what the maximum penalty should be.

**Question 12: We would welcome views on whether it should be a criminal offence to breach measures put in place to protect a person at risk of domestic abuse.**

**Question 13: If you think breach of such measures should be a criminal offence, we would welcome views on what you think the maximum penalty should be.**

4.17 Almost all respondents to the consultation thought that breach of a protective order should be a criminal offence. Of those who answered this question, **63 respondents** supported making breach a criminal offence, while **2 respondents** were opposed and **3 respondents** said they did not know.

4.18 In setting out why they favoured making breach of an order a criminal offence, many respondents highlighted what they saw as the deterrent effect that it could have, as well as noting that it would provide the police with greater powers to intervene. One justice and legal sector respondent commented:

*“Any breach should be treated as a criminal offence otherwise there would be little the police could use in terms of enforcement and it would also appear to send a weak message to the public regarding deterrence.”*

4.19 A number of respondents drew attention to the fact that breach of other, similar orders, such as non-harassment orders, and breach of bail conditions, are both criminal offences. One issue that attracted mixed views from the small number

of respondents who commented on it was whether breach of a police-imposed order, as well as a court-imposed order, should be a criminal offence. One local authority respondent specifically stated that it should depend on whether the order was made by the police or courts, but another 'other' respondent noted that there was precedent at section 26 of the Anti-social Behaviour (Scotland) Act 2004 for breach of a non-court issued order being a criminal offence.

4.20 There were mixed views on what the maximum penalties should be for breach of a protective order. A significant number of respondents (20 in total), particularly those representing victims' groups and gender-based violence and violence against women partnerships, drew attention to the maximum penalty for breach of other court orders. Most commonly cited examples were the penalties for breach of a bail order and breach of a non-harassment order. One victims' group respondent, whose response was typical of many, commented:

*"In line with other civil protective orders, and in recognition of the fact that this will be a short-term order, we would suggest a penalty, on summary conviction of imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months or to a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum or to both."*

4.21. Many individual respondents highlighted what they saw as the importance of ensuring that breach of a protective order could result in a prison sentence. Suggestions as to the maximum penalty ranged from 3 months to 5 years. One justice and legal sector respondent suggested that where the breach of an order amounts to a substantive criminal offence in itself, consideration should be given as to whether any breach should be treated as a separate aggravation, as is the case where an offender breaches their bail conditions.

4.22 The consultation sought views on whether any legislation creating such protective orders should place a statutory duty on the police to refer a person at risk to support services.

**Question 14: We would welcome views on whether there should be a statutory duty on the police, when making an application to the courts, or putting in place protective measures, to refer a person at risk to support services and, if so, how this should operate**

4.23 There were mixed views on this proposal. Of those who answered this question, **29 respondents** supported creating such a duty. A further **12 respondents** were of the view that there should not be a statutory duty, but that as a matter of operational practice, the police should offer to refer a person at risk to support services if they wish to be. **8 respondents** either provided an ambiguous response or said they didn't know, while **3 respondents** simply stated that there should not be such a statutory duty.

4.24 Victims' groups, in particular, often made the point that while the police service (or others) should offer to refer a person at risk to support services if they wish such a referral to be made, it was important that the person at risk should retain control as to whether a referral is made. One victims' group respondent commented:

*“The Police should always speak to the woman about making a referral to support services but it should not be ‘forced’ on her. Women will be at different stages of acceptance etc. and those who are not ready to accept help from support services should not be made to accept the referral.”*

4.25 Those who did not support a mandatory requirement being placed on the police to refer persons at risk to support services expressed a range of other concerns, including whether it would be compatible with their obligations under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and whether support service provision was sufficiently comprehensive in some parts of the country to make such a requirement practical. On the other hand, some of those who supported a duty to refer persons at risk to support services were concerned that there was a risk that the imposition of a protective order without accompanying support could actually increase the person at risk’s longer-term risk of abuse.

4.26 The consultation also provided an opportunity for respondents to make any other comments that were not covered by the other questions about protective orders.

**Question 15: Do you have any other comments you wish to make regarding the introduction of protective orders for people at risk of domestic abuse?**

4.27 The following table summarises the issues most commonly raised by consultation respondents in response to this question:

<b>Summary of issue being raised</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>
Need for legal aid or other financial support for person at risk to address their longer-term housing needs when a protective order has been put in place	11
Need for training and guidance to be in place for those administering any protective orders scheme and/or persons at risk	8
General welcome for the idea of introducing a protective orders scheme	7
General doubts about the idea of introducing a protective orders scheme	7
Issues relating to transition between protective orders and any longer-term orders such as exclusion orders or non-harassment orders	6
Practical issues relating to the implementation of any protective orders scheme	5
Funding issues/resources	4
Need to consider ‘service generated risks’ in implementing protective orders	4
Wider issues around access to housing and housing law	4

4.28 As can be seen from the above table, the most frequently raised issue related to access to legal aid for the person at risk. Respondents who raised this were concerned that if protective orders are to be effective in helping to resolve a person

at risk's longer term housing situation and ensure that they were able to choose not to continue living with their abusive partner, it is important that these people have access to financial support to bring a case in the civil courts if this is their preferred course of action. One victims' group respondent commented:

*“Access to free legal advice and representation around obtaining civil protection orders should be available from the very beginning of an EBO and emergency applications to the court allowed and prioritised. Free legal advice and representation is crucial for women to achieve access to justice, realise their right to protection, and effectively provide support and empower women during this transitional stage.”*

4.29 The importance of ensuring training and guidance is in place to accompany any scheme of protective orders was also highlighted by a significant number of respondents. Different respondents highlighted different areas where such training or guidance may be helpful. For example, one justice and legal sector respondent noted the importance of ensuring that guidance for people for whose protection an order has been made on their possible options would be very important if the scheme was to ensure that long-term protection is provided:

*“The proposals envisage a mix of civil and criminal options. The multiplicity of options for seeking protective orders runs the risk of leaving individuals unsure what orders they should seek. It will be important to have clear, publicly available advice and guidance.”*

4.30 Other respondents referred to the need for training to be in place for members of the judiciary and police forces. One gender-based violence and violence against women partnership commented:

*“Training of the police will be crucial to embed an understanding of how EBOs fit into the appropriate police response to domestic abuse. This should link into wider police training particularly that related to the new Domestic Abuse offence as recognising and responding to coercive behaviours will be important. For the judiciary the ongoing training on the civil and criminal aspects of domestic abuse will be important in their assessment of whether or not to grant a continuation of an EBO.”*

4.31 Some respondents used their answers to this question to reiterate either their support or their doubts or opposition to the introduction of protective orders for people at risk of domestic abuse. One individual respondent whose response was characteristic of many who wished to emphasise their support for the introduction of the orders, commented:

*“I think that this would be a positive step in providing safety for women and children from further exposure to domestic violence.”*

4.32 Those who expressed doubts about, or opposition to, the proposals contained in the consultation paper in their answer to this question typically highlighted either concerns that the existence of such orders might encourage false allegations of abuse, including from those who are themselves perpetrators of abuse. One

response from a gender-based violence and violence against women partnership respondent, that highlighted both of these concerns, said the following:

*“...we have to bear in mind that a man could, presumably, make an allegation against his female partner that he was at risk, and she would be the subject of ejection or whatever is proposed. There are very effective remedies available, very quickly, through the civil courts now, and there is a zero tolerance approach to allegations of domestic abuse in place for the police, so they now take action with criminal sanctions all the time. I’m not sure what apparent unmet need is driving this move to greater powers by the police.”*

4.33 A point made by several victims group respondents concerned the need to ensure that any protective order put in place by the courts was in place for long enough to ensure that there was no gap between that order expiring and any longer-term court order coming into effect to ensure the person at risk’s protection. This was often linked with the issue of access to free legal advice referred to at paragraph 4.28 above. One victims’ group respondent, whose concerns were typical of those who raised this issue, commented:

*“It is important that no gap in protection exists between an EBO ending and the commencement of a relevant protective order a woman will need to obtain through the court.”*

4.34 A number of respondents raised issues relating to how any protective orders scheme is implemented. These ranged from very general points, such as the importance of ensuring effective information sharing between different agencies, the need for consistent support to be available to persons at risk to assist them in considering their longer-term accommodation options and the possibility of learning from the implementation of domestic violence prevention orders in England and Wales to more specific questions, for example, highlighting the need to address how any order affects the parental rights of a person made subject to an order.

4.35 Several respondents drew attention to either the general need to ensure that adequate resourcing/funding is in place to enable implementation of any protective orders scheme, or to specific funding issues that would require to be addressed when any scheme is implemented. These included a general need to ensure that organisations which provide support to people experiencing domestic abuse are sufficiently resourced to assist those for whose protection an order is made in addressing their longer-term housing needs, and specific pressures, such as the impact of an increase in civil applications to courts on court business more generally.

4.36 A number of respondents highlighted the need to be mindful of what are sometimes described as ‘service generated risks’ – that is to say, any increase in risk to a victim that may be caused by an intervention, in implementing protective orders. One gender-based violence and violence against women partnership noted that the scope for perpetrators of abuse to make allegations against victims with the intent of having them removed from a shared home had to be considered, while a housing respondent and an individual respondent both drew attention to what they saw as the risk that the very act of making an order against a suspected perpetrator

of abuse could, in some circumstances, increase the risk of repercussions for the person at risk.

4.37 Four respondents, three of which were local authorities, raised issues relating to housing. Two of these related to the issue of joint tenancies with two local authority respondents stating that there should be reform of the Housing (Scotland) Act to enable a joint tenancy to be converted to a sole tenancy where one of the joint tenants has perpetrated domestic abuse against the other. One health, social care and social work respondent suggested that housing tribunals, rather than civil courts, could be made responsible for taking decisions on whether to make a protective order and one local authority respondent said that consideration should also be given to financial support for those remaining in the home in terms of e.g. access to universal credit and delays associated with change of circumstances.

4.38 A number of other matters were raised by a small number of respondents (three or fewer) in answering this question. These included the need for an awareness raising strategy to ensure those at risk knew that they could approach the police about having an order put in place, issues relating to the right to appeal a court's decision on an application for a protective order, the need for monitoring and evaluation of how any scheme put in place works in practice, the importance of considering the particular issues facing male and LGBT victims of domestic abuse, as they considered that they can be overlooked given the focus on women in heterosexual relationships when developing policy on domestic abuse, and a suggestion that a 'domestic abuse register', similar to the so-called 'sex offenders register' could assist in tackling domestic abuse.

## **Equal Opportunities, Financial Implications, and other impacts**

5.1 The consultation also sought views and information from consultation respondents on matters that will inform the preparation of impact assessments for any future legislation which is brought forward to implement a protective orders scheme.

5.2 There were two questions about the impacts of the proposed scheme on equality issues:

**Do you consider that any of the reforms proposed in this paper will have a particular impact - positive or negative - on a particular equality group (e.g. gender, race, disability, sexual orientation)**

**Are there any other issues relating to equality which you wish to raise in relation to the reforms proposed in this paper?**

5.3. The most frequently made point in response to this question was that new powers to remove suspected perpetrators of domestic abuse from a home they share with a person at risk are likely to be of particular benefit to women and children, as it is known that women are disproportionately likely to experience domestic abuse. In total, **19 respondents** made reference to this, and it was particularly likely to be made by groups representing victims and violence against women and gender based violence partnerships. One victims' group respondent whose comments reflect those made by many, stated:

*“the reforms proposed in this consultation are likely to have a positive impact on women (and their children). Homelessness resulting from domestic abuse is gendered, women make up almost 80% of homeless applicants in this category. These reforms can lead to the prevention of women and children’s homelessness by removing the perpetrator from the home for a period of time allowing women time and support to consider their options. These reforms can reduce the considerable and additional impact of homelessness on women and children’s health and wellbeing who have experienced domestic abuse. As well as prevent the disruption to children’s education, access to support networks and enormous financial and emotional cost of losing home and possessions.”*

5.4 Six respondents made the point that, as anyone can experience domestic abuse, it was important that the law should treat all victims the same irrespective of their protected characteristics. This should not be seen as necessarily contradicting the view expressed by others that women are at a significantly greater risk of domestic abuse. One local authority respondent stated:

*“As the reforms proposed will, if adopted, apply to individuals in all protected characteristic groups they are considered to be neutral in terms of their impact on all equality groups.*

*In practice however as the majority of instances of domestic abuse are perpetrated by man against women, it is anticipated that the measures proposed will be of particular benefit to women and children at risk of domestic abuse.”*

5.5 Other points raised by a smaller number of respondents included 3 individual respondents who expressed concerns about particular issues facing male victims of domestic abuse, two respondents who highlighted the particular issues facing victims of domestic abuse who have insecure immigration status, and two respondents who stated that LGBT people have the same risk of experiencing domestic abuse as women in heterosexual relationships and over 80% of transgender people have experienced domestic abuse. They stated that it was important that communications on this took account of the experiences of LGBT people and do not focus solely on men's violence against women.

5.6 Other matters that were raised by a single respondent included noting that people with disabilities are, in their view, at increased risk of experiencing domestic abuse and, in the case of people with physical disabilities, may face greater difficulty in finding suitable housing and that people from some minority ethnic groups are much more likely to experience domestic abuse in the context of forced marriage.

5.7 The consultation sought views on consultees' views on the financial implications of the protective orders scheme proposed in the consultation paper.

**Do you have any comments or information on the likely financial implications of the introduction of protective orders for the Scottish Government (Police Scotland, Scottish Courts and Tribunals Service, Scottish Prison Service, COPFS), local government or for other bodies, individuals and businesses?**

5.8 Responses to this question were inevitably quite general and high-level for the most part, both because the majority of respondents may not be in a position to offer views on the detailed financial implications of the proposals, and because the exact costs of the scheme would depend on how it is implemented.

5.9 Eleven respondents drew attention to what they saw as either the potential for a protective orders scheme to produce long-term savings by enabling intervention to prevent domestic abuse to be taken at an earlier point, or the fact that the costs of implementing such a scheme require to be set against the costs, both financial and in terms of the impact on victims of abuse and society more generally, of failing to take action.

5.10 Six respondents from a variety of groups said that there was a need to increase resources and support for victims of domestic abuse to deal with what they anticipate will be an increase in demand for support arising from the introduction of any scheme for protective orders.

5.11 Four respondents specifically highlighted the issue of access to legal aid or advice for persons at risk of abuse, to enable them to take appropriate steps to secure their longer-term safety. Respondents raising this issue highlighted that without such support, any protective orders scheme may not succeed in ensuring that persons at risk of abuse are able to take action to address their longer-term housing needs and one respondent said that, as a matter of fairness, it was not appropriate that people experiencing abuse should be expected to meet the cost of legal action required to secure their safety.

5.12 Other points made by respondents included the need for funding for training for those involved in administering the scheme, and for work to raise public awareness to encourage those at risk of abuse to come forward to seek help. Two respondents also noted that there could be costs for individuals who are barred from returning home as a consequence of their need to secure alternative accommodation. Some respondents, particularly justice and legal sector respondents, also made specific points about the likely financial impact of the scheme their organisation.

5.13 The consultation paper also sought input on how the proposals would impact on island communities, human rights, local government and sustainable development.

### **Do you consider that any of the proposals would have an impact on island communities, human rights, local government or sustainable development?**

#### Island communities

5.14 In total, **18 respondents** comments on how the proposals contained in the consultation paper could impact on island, remote and rural communities. The most commonly highlighted issues were concerns that either a lack of support services or increased difficulties in accessing support services, could make the implementation of protective orders more difficult in island, remote and rural communities (a point made by 7 respondents, the majority of which were from victims' groups and violence against women or gender-based violence partnerships). One victims' group respondent commented:

*“These proposals may have a particular impact on island communities in Scotland. This is due to potential barriers in accessing services, including police, social services, solicitors and support services, particularly in small rural communities and/or remote communities...For example, in a small rural community, there may only be one firm of solicitor undertaking this type of work and accordingly a conflict could arise if both parties were to seek to instruct them.”*

5.15 Another point that was raised by a number of respondents (6 in total, from a range of backgrounds) was that the nature of some small island, remote and rural communities may make victims of abuse more reluctant to report or seek help. One individual respondent commented that in island communities:

*“...anonymity is rare and having to cross paths with the accused and their family/friends plays a big part in reporting to the police.”*

5.16 A number of respondents also took the view that the nature of life in some small island and remote communities could make the operation of protective orders more difficult. Points made by respondents included that the small size of some such communities could make it difficult of the suspected perpetrator was excluded from certain geographic locations or required not to enter particular streets. It was also noted that particular difficulties could arise where the individuals work and live together on e.g. a croft, smallholding or farm. One housing sector respondent commented:

*“On island communities it may be harder for people to adhere to some aspects of exclusion orders due to size of area, location and availability of service, work opportunities etc and there may be limited alternative housing / accommodation available.”*

5.17 However, five other respondents, while noting the difficulties faced by those experiencing domestic abuse in island, remote and rural communities, took the view that protective orders could be especially useful for people experiencing abuse in these communities, by providing another means of protecting them from the risk of abuse. One victims' group respondent commented:

*“Hopefully by ensuring the appropriate introduction of EBOs and a strengthening of civil protection orders, victims in rural and island communities will have more options available. Victims in rural or island communities face particular issues relating to their geography and can be under far greater pressure than those in an urban context. We are aware that some of our clients have faced particular challenges and difficulties being safe in their communities that the provisions of EBOs could help alleviate.”*

5.18 The other issue concerning island, remote and rural communities made by four respondents was that any scheme which requires one or other party to find alternative housing may create particular difficulties in small, remote communities where there is a shortage of housing in the area. One housing sector respondent commented:

*“On island communities it may be harder for people to adhere to some aspects of exclusion orders due to size of area, location and availability of service, work opportunities etc and there may be limited alternative housing / accommodation available.*

*Councils and other landlords may need to provide alternative accommodation for abusers and there may be increased demand on homeless services / temporary accommodation.”*

## Human Rights

5.19 **Sixteen respondents** referred to matters relating to human rights in their response to this question.

5.20 The most common observation made by respondents, particularly those representing victims groups or violence against women and gender-based violence groups, raised by 7 respondents in total, was that the introduction of a scheme of protective orders for people at risk of domestic abuse that enables a suspected perpetrator to be barred from returning to their home is required to meet Scotland's obligations under the Istanbul Convention on Violence Against Women. One victims' group commented:

*“In the Istanbul Convention (article 52) it states that victims of domestic abuse are protected from immediate danger without having to vacate their homes. This includes EBOs and this would enable Scotland to meet its human rights obligations in relation to Article 52”*

5.21 Four respondents made comments noting that any scheme will need to balance the rights of a person who is suspected of domestic abuse (bearing in mind that the order will impact on their right to private and family life) and the rights of a person believed to be at risk of domestic abuse, and in particular the need to ensure they are protected from abuse. One local authority respondent commented:

*“The proposals have potential implications for the rights of perpetrators / suspected perpetrators e.g. they make become homeless and lose access to family life as a consequence of an order barring them from living in their previous home. This has however to be balanced against the need to protect the rights of victims of domestic abuse, including children particularly regarding personal safety.”*

5.22 Two individual respondents expressed specific concerns relating to how any such protective orders would impact on child contact arrangements, highlighting what they said was the risk that false allegations would be made by people wishing to prevent their ex-partner from contacting their children, while one respondent said that they considered there were particular concerns about human rights if it is to be possible for an order to be made contrary to the wishes of the person whom it is intended to protect (see question 7 above).

#### Local authorities

5.23 The impact of the proposals on local authorities housing was raised by **4 respondents**.

5.24 All respondents who referred to the impact of the proposals on local authorities in answering this question referred to its potential to impact on local authorities with regards the responsibility they may have for finding alternative accommodation for persons barred from returning to their home.

5.25 Three respondents also referred to the impact on local authorities which may result from the need to review and update processes, procedures and guidance associated with domestic abuse as a result of the introduction of protective orders, while one respondent said local authorities may have to provide additional funding to support people experiencing domestic abuse if more people come forward as a result of the introduction of protective orders. One violence against women and gender-based violence partnership respondent noted:

*“The proposals are considered to have potential implications for local government in terms of the need to review current practice in supporting victims of domestic abuse including, working with and funding partner organisations to do this. They may also have direct resource implications for local authorities in respect of the potential need to provide accommodation for individuals barred from their former family home.”*

#### Sustainable development

5.26 No respondents indicated that they considered the proposals had any implications for sustainable development.

## **Annex A – Organisational Respondents**

46 organisations responded to the consultation and are listed below.

### **Housing Sector Respondents**

Chartered Institute of Housing Scotland  
Coatbridge Federation of Tenants and Residents  
East Ayrshire Federation of Tenants and Residents  
Registered Tenants Federation – Region Three  
Registered Tenants Federation – Region Four

### **Justice System and Legal Respondents**

British Transport Police  
Glasgow Bar Association  
The Law Society of Scotland  
Police Scotland  
Scottish Courts and Tribunals Service  
Scottish Legal Aid Board

### **Groups representing victims of domestic abuse, crime or gender-based violence**

Angus Women's Aid  
ASSIST  
Edinburgh Women's Aid  
Safe Lives  
Scottish Women's Aid  
South Ayrshire Women's Aid  
Victim Support Scotland  
Scottish Women's Rights Centre

### **Local Authorities**

Scottish Borders Council  
South Lanarkshire Council Social Services  
Stirling Council  
West Lothian Domestic and Sexual Assault Team

### **Violence Against Women and Gender-based Violence Partnerships**

Angus Violence Against Women Partnership  
Dumfries and Galloway Violence Against Women Standing Group  
Dundee Violence Against Women Partnership  
East Lothian and Midlothian Public Protection Office – Violence Against Women & Girls Coordinator  
Forth Valley Gender-based Violence Partnership  
Glasgow Violence Against Women Partnership  
Highland Violence Against Women Partnership

North Lanarkshire Violence Against Women Partnership  
Renfrewshire Gender-based Violence Strategy Group  
South Ayrshire Violence Against Women Partnership

### **Health, Social Care and Social Work**

Aberdeen City Health and Social Care Partnership  
Glasgow Health and Social Care Partnership  
NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde  
NHS Highland  
Scottish Social Services Council  
Social Work Scotland

### **Children's and Young People's Groups**

Children and Young People's Commissioner  
LGBT Youth Scotland  
NSPCC Scotland  
Scottish Children's Reporter Administration

### **Others**

Information Commissioner's Office  
Monash University Gender and Family Violence Prevention Centre  
SACRO



Scottish Government  
Riaghaltas na h-Alba  
gov.scot

© Crown copyright 2020

**OGL**

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](https://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3) or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at [www.gov.scot](http://www.gov.scot)

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at  
The Scottish Government  
St Andrew's House  
Edinburgh  
EH1 3DG

ISBN: 978-1-83960-917-6 (web only)

Published by The Scottish Government, July 2020

Produced for The Scottish Government by APS Group Scotland, 21 Tennant Street, Edinburgh EH6 5NA  
PPDAS749626 (07/20)

w w w . g o v . s c o t