

COMPARING PRACTICES BY GREVIO AND THE UN CRPD COMMITTEE ON AWARENESS-RAISING INITIATIVES

by Bruna Gamulin

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master of Laws in Human Rights

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my mother, Ida, for being an unfailing source of motivation and inspiration, and my partner, Jure, for bringing the best out of me on the worst of days.

My gratitude goes to my supervisor, Dr. Mathias Möschel, who has taught me and guided me in my endeavours from the very beginning, and has imparted friendly wisdom to me during these times of uncertainty, and has always been available to resolve my queries and address my doubts.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my professor, Dr. Eszter Polgári, for the useful information provided during the Capstone seminar course and for words of kindness and wisdom, uttered with an inimitable humor.

I am thankful to my friends and colleagues from HR and CCL programme, especially Raunaq Jaiswal and Kateřina Krejčová, without whose help and support writing this thesis would be much more burdensome.

Abstract

*This paper describes the development of the awareness-raising articles in human rights arena and the growing importance of **awareness-raising** as a powerful mechanism in protection thereof. Hereinafter it focuses on the two game-changing articles on awareness-raising stemming from the Istanbul Convention and the UN CRPD. Given the comprehensive structure of these articles, the author decides to analyse whether and how their respective monitoring bodies, GREVIO and the UN CRPD Committee, assess States' implementation thereof. In doing that, the author uses common denominators which can be found in both texts of the respective conventions and/or the practice of their monitoring bodies. The author concludes by noting that GREVIO monitors awareness-raising more attentively than the UN CRPD Committee. Lastly, the author sets out her recommendations to the UN CRPD Committee on how to improve its monitoring of the implementation of the UN CRPD's Article 8 on awareness-raising, based on the practice of GREVIO.*

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1— AWARENESS-RAISING IN THE ISTANBUL CONVENTION AND THE UN CRPD ..	4
CHAPTER 2— COMPARISON OF PRACTICES BY GREVIO AND THE UN CRPD COMMITTEE	7
2.1. <i>Level of Intervention</i>	8
2.2. <i>Regularity and Duration of the Campaign</i>.....	10
2.3. <i>Targeted Groups and Issues</i>	12
2.3.1. <i>Stereotyping</i>	15
2.3.2. <i>Multiple and intersectional discrimination</i>	17
2.4. <i>Co-operation with various stakeholders</i>	20
2.5. <i>Evaluation and impact</i>	21
2.6. <i>Budget</i>	22
CONCLUSION	24
BIBLIOGRAPHY	27
APPENDIX: RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE UN CRPD COMMITTEE ON HOW TO IMPROVE ITS MONITORING OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 8 BASED ON THE PRACTICE BY GREVIO	34

INTRODUCTION

Awareness-raising, as a tool of protecting human rights, has gone through three stages of development: from being neglected in human rights treaties¹, through being introduced as a component of a broader provision on measures which the States undertake to implement in their pursuit of combating and eradicating violence and/or protecting human and/or women's rights², or as one of the functions and powers vested in the human rights bodies³, to finally being granted a separate, specific and detailed provision⁴.

The interesting part in this development process is the transition of awareness-raising from the second to the third stage. Why did the international community decide to grant such importance to awareness-raising instrument as to incorporate it in a separate and distinct article? According to the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner, legal measures started to be seen as an incomplete tool for changing society⁵. The sole adoption of legal norms will not necessarily produce a change in people's behavior⁶. An efficient awareness-raising campaign can help triggering such change⁷.

The first international treaty that had incorporated an entire article exclusively to *awareness-raising* was the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with

* For the purposes of this work, the author had studied comments on Article 13 on awareness-raising from all thirteen reports on States which GREVIO had issued thus far, available at: <<https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention/country-monitoring-work>>

As regards to the UN CRPD Committee, the author had studied comments on Article 8 on awareness-raising from its concluding observations on overall 94 States, available at:

<https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/TBSearch.aspx?Lang=en&TreatyID=4&DocTypeID=5>

¹ UN General Assembly, Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 18 December 1979, *in*: Mathias Möschel, Article 13, *in*: Sara De Vido and Adriana Di Stefano (eds), *The Istanbul Convention. A Commentary*, Edgar Elgar, 2021, Forthcoming, p. 1.

² Organization of American States (OAS), Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment and Eradication of Violence against Women ("Convention of Belém do Pará"), 9 June 1994, Article 8.; African Union, Protocol to the African Charter on Human and People's Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa, 11 July 2003, Article 5., *in*: Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1, p. 1.

³ Organization of American States (OAS), American Convention on Human Rights, "Pact of San Jose", Costa Rica, 22 November 1969, Article 41.

⁴ See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1, pp. 1 and 2.

⁵ Awareness raising under article 8 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, <<https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Disability/Pages/Article8.aspx>>

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*

Disabilities (*hereinafter* referred as “UN CRPD”)⁸. Article 8 on “Awareness-raising” prescribes the following:

1. States Parties undertake to adopt immediate, effective and appropriate measures:
 - a) To raise awareness throughout society, including at the family level, regarding persons with disabilities, and to foster respect for the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities;
 - b) To combat stereotypes, prejudices and harmful practices relating to persons with disabilities, including those based on sex and age, in all areas of life;
 - c) To promote awareness of the capabilities and contributions of persons with disabilities.
2. Measures to this end include:
 - a) Initiating and maintaining effective public awareness campaigns designed:
 - i. To nurture receptiveness to the rights of persons with disabilities;
 - ii. To promote positive perceptions and greater social awareness towards persons with disabilities;
 - iii. To promote recognition of the skills, merits and abilities of persons with disabilities, and of their contributions to the workplace and the labour market;
 - b) Fostering at all levels of the education system, including in all children from an early age, an attitude of respect for the rights of persons with disabilities;
 - c) Encouraging all organs of the media to portray persons with disabilities in a manner consistent with the purpose of the present Convention;
 - d) Promoting awareness-training programmes regarding persons with disabilities and the rights of persons with disabilities.

The Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence Against Women and Domestic Violence (*hereinafter* referred as “Istanbul Convention”) is the “first European legal instrument on violence against women”⁹. Its Article 13 on awareness-raising marks a progressive step in the domain of prevention of women’s rights¹⁰, as it binds the States to undertake comprehensive awareness-raising initiatives, in co-operation with the civil society organizations¹¹. The content of the respective Article is as following:

1 Parties shall promote or conduct, on a regular basis and at all levels, awareness-raising campaigns or programmes, including in co-operation with national human rights institutions and equality bodies, civil society and non-governmental organisations, especially women’s organisations, where appropriate, to increase awareness and understanding among the general public of the different manifestations of all forms of violence covered by the scope of this Convention, their consequences on children and the need to prevent such violence.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Feride Acar and Raluca Popa, From Feminist Legal Project to Groundbreaking Regional Treaty: The Making of the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence, *European Journal of Human Rights*, 2016/3, 33, p. 318; See also Ulla Jurviste, Rosamund Shreeves, The Istanbul Convention: A tool to tackle violence against women and girls, *European Parliamentary Research Service*, December 2019., pp. 1 and 2; Gizem Guney, ‘The Group of Experts under the Istanbul Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence and the ECtHR: Complementary or Contradictory Tools?’ (*EJIL: Talk!*, 31 March 2020) <<https://www.ejiltalk.org/the-group-of-experts-under-the-istanbul-convention-on-preventing-and-combating-violence-against-women-and-domestic-violence-and-the-ecthr-complementary-or-contradictory-tools/>>

¹⁰ Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 2.

¹¹ Council of Europe, The Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence, (Istanbul Convention), November 2014, Article 13.

2 Parties shall ensure the wide dissemination among the general public of information on measures available to prevent acts of violence covered by the scope of this Convention.

Still, awareness-raising instrument as a *per se* provision and the consequential requirement to separately monitor implementation of respective provision by the human rights bodies, represent a novelty in the human rights domain and has so far not occupied much space in academic literature, the reason why it is time to have a closer look at how it is operationalized by human rights bodies.

The focus here will be on the two respective conventions that have granted awareness-raising an important place in the promotion of human rights, specifically in the context of the rights of persons with disabilities and women's rights. The author of this thesis is of the opinion that it would be interesting to take a look at how human rights bodies established by the above-mentioned conventions, the UN CRPD Committee (*hereinafter* referred as "the Committee") and the Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (*hereinafter* referred as "GREVIO") respectively, monitor implementation of the awareness-raising articles, in order to gain a better understanding of their practical relevance.

CHAPTER 1— AWARENESS-RAISING IN THE ISTANBUL CONVENTION AND THE UN CRPD

The Istanbul Convention pioneered in producing a “clear consecration of violence against women as violation of human rights and discrimination against women”, being the first “treaty to prevent and combat all forms of violence against women as a human rights violation”¹². Among the many novelties that the Istanbul Convention had brought into human rights, specifically women’s rights domain, it is particularly interesting to see how much efforts have been put in elaborating Article 13 on *awareness-raising*¹³. Awareness-raising campaigns were recognized as a means to sensitize the public on the existence of such violence and to encourage victims and bystanders to take a stand against it¹⁴.

Awareness raising campaigns stemming from Article 13 of the Istanbul Convention are a *conditio sine qua non* to combating violence against women and should be understood in the context of both the preceding and following articles, namely Article 14 which lays down the importance of formal and informal education on gender equality or Article 15 requiring the training of professionals on adequate and nonprejudicial approach towards victims of violence, but also in the context of the entire Chapter III on Prevention.¹⁵

The Istanbul Convention established a body called GREVIO¹⁶. It monitors the implementation and produces reports on the status of implementation of the Istanbul Convention by the member States, on the basis of information gathered from the government of the respective States, their NGOs and domestic human rights bodies, other Council of Europe bodies and international or regional human rights bodies, as well as GREVIO’s State visits¹⁷. GREVIO issues its report year and half after initiating a procedure by sending its questionnaire to a designated member State¹⁸. These reports contain conclusions wherein

¹² Feride Acar and Raluca Popa, *supra* note 9, pp. 289 and 290.

¹³ Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 2.

¹⁴ Explanatory Report to the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, para. 91.

¹⁵ Raising Awareness of Violence Against Women: Article 13 of the Istanbul Convention, A collection of papers on the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, Karin Heisecke, Council of Europe, September 2014, p. 7.

¹⁶ Istanbul Convention, *supra* note 11, Article 66.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Article 68.

¹⁸ Council of Europe, Istanbul Convention, Action against violence against women and domestic violence, Steps in the first (baseline) evaluation procedure, <[https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention/steps-in-the-first-baseline-evaluation-procedure#%221392012%22:\[5\]}](https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention/steps-in-the-first-baseline-evaluation-procedure#%221392012%22:[5]})>

GREVIO indicates what kind of measures should be undertaken by the respective countries in order to improve implementation of the Istanbul Convention and in some cases, GREVIO will issue general recommendations¹⁹.

The UN CRPD elaborates on awareness raising initiatives in Article 8, paragraph 1, further explaining in paragraph 2 what kind of measures should be undertaken to achieve awareness²⁰. Here, awareness-raising campaigns were recognized as a preliminary step in combating disempowerment of persons with disabilities which is why it is important to conduct them at all educational and societal level²¹. Unlike the Istanbul Convention, which has incorporated separate articles on education and training, Article 8 of the UN CRPD encompasses both education and training when prescribing that “an attitude of respect for the rights of persons with disabilities” should be “fostered” on “all levels of the education system” and that the State should be “promoting awareness-training programmes regarding persons with disabilities and the rights of persons with disabilities”²². Role of the media in awareness-raising also forms an integral part of Article 8 of the UN CRPD²³, whereas in the Istanbul Convention, it stands as a separate Article 17, tagging along with the role of private sector²⁴.

The implementation of the UN CRPD is supervised by the Committee²⁵. In case their respective country ratified it, the Optional Protocol to the Convention provides an option to the individuals to file complaints with the Committee²⁶. Although the idea of its potential creation has been put forward, the optional protocol for the purposes of considering individual complaints by GREVIO has not yet been drafted²⁷.

In exercising powers conferred thereto by the UN CRPD, the Committee issues Concluding Observations which are drafted on the basis of States’ reports on the implementation of the UN CRPD²⁸. States usually send these reports to the Committee every

¹⁹ Istanbul Convention, *supra* note 11, Articles 68, 69.

²⁰ UN General Assembly, Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 24 January 2007, A/RES/61/106, Article 8.

²¹ Awareness Raising under Article 8 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 5; See Article 8 [Awareness-Raising], The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. A Commentary, edited by Fina, Valentina Della, et al., Springer, 2017, p. 222

²² Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 20, Article 8.

²³ *Ibid*, See Fina, Valentina Della, et al., *supra* note 21, pp. 221 and 222.

²⁴ Istanbul Convention, *supra* note 11, Article 17.

²⁵ Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 20, Articles, 34, 35 and 36.

²⁶ United Nations, Human Rights, Office of the High Commissioner, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, <<https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CRPD/Pages/QuestionsAnswers.aspx>>

²⁷ Gizem Guney, *supra* note 9.

²⁸ Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 26.; See Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 20, Articles 35 and 36.

four years²⁹. The Committee's Concluding Observations contain recommendations and suggestions to States on how to improve the implementation of the UN CRPD³⁰.

²⁹ Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 26.; See Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 20, Article 35.

³⁰ Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 26.; See Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 20, Article 36.

CHAPTER 2— COMPARISON OF PRACTICES BY GREVIO AND THE UN CRPD COMMITTEE

GREVIO emphasizes the need to raise awareness on violence against women³¹, domestic violence³² and children as victims of domestic violence³³, as well as on gendered stereotypes and attitudes towards women in society³⁴ and pressures States to combat them³⁵. This is in line with the aim of the Istanbul Convention, namely, “the creation of a Europe free from violence against women and domestic violence”³⁶.

On the other hand, the Committee’s “recommendations” are oriented towards raising awareness on the rights of persons with disabilities³⁷, as well as combating stereotypes³⁸, stigmas³⁹ and prejudices⁴⁰, in accordance with the UN CRPD’s aim of promoting the application “of rights [...] to persons with disabilities” and setting out measures which are to be undertaken in order for persons with disabilities “to effectively exercise their rights”, especially if “their rights have been violated, and where protection of rights must be reinforced”⁴¹.

The factors that both GREVIO and the Committee consider in their reports are analysed and grouped along the following lines: level of intervention (3.1.); regularity and duration of the campaign (3.2.); targeted groups and issues (3.3.) with a particular focus on stereotypes (3.3.1.) and intersectional and multiple discrimination (3.3.2.); co-operation with various stakeholders (3.4.); evaluation and impact (3.5.); and budget (3.6.)⁴².

³¹ See *e.g.* GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Monaco, GREVIO/Inf(2017)3, para. 43.

³² See *e.g.* GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Denmark, GREVIO/Inf(2017)14, para. 68.

³³ See *e.g.* GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Portugal, GREVIO/Inf(2018)16, para. 86.

³⁴ See *e.g.* GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Turkey, GREVIO/Inf(2018)6, para. 106.

³⁵ See *e.g.* GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Italy, GREVIO/Inf(2019)18, para. 92.

³⁶ Explanatory Report to the Istanbul Convention, *supra* note 14, para. 25.; See Istanbul Convention, *supra* note 11, Preamble.

³⁷ See *e.g.* Concluding observations, Bulgaria, Committee, CRPD/C/BGR/CO/1, para. 22.; See Fina, Valentina Della, et al., *supra* note 21, pp. 213-223.

³⁸ See *e.g.* Concluding observations, Guatemala, Committee, CRPD/C/GTM/CO/1, para. 26.

³⁹ See *e.g.* Concluding observations, Canada, Committee, CRPD/C/CAN/CO/1, para. 20.

⁴⁰ See *e.g.* Concluding observations, European Union, Committee, CRPD/C/EU/CO/1, para. 27.

⁴¹ Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 26.

⁴² Except for the issue stereotypes, the division into the respective categories was taken from: Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at pp. 5, 6 and 7., and modified accordingly.

2.1. Level of Intervention

GREVIO requires countries to run awareness raising campaigns on national, regional and local levels⁴³ and it “welcomes” such initiatives coming from the States⁴⁴. The Committee will express its “concerns” when the States have not implemented a “[comprehensive] national policy and strategy on disability awareness”⁴⁵, “coherent and comprehensive national strategy to raise awareness”⁴⁶, “coherent national policy and strategy”⁴⁷, or simply put, “national awareness-raising campaigns”⁴⁸.

The Committee in turn “recommends” to the States to adopt “national strategy to raise awareness”⁴⁹, “national awareness raising programme”⁵⁰, “coherent and comprehensive national strategy to raise awareness”⁵¹, “national disability awareness policy or strategy”⁵², or “national awareness-raising campaigns”⁵³.

GREVIO had “commended” many States for enforcing their national strategies or plans which included awareness-raising⁵⁴. Although countries might be raising awareness properly through the national campaigns, they might at the same time be oblivious towards creating campaigns on local levels, wherein GREVIO suggests boosting campaigns on “local level with

⁴³ GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Serbia, GREVIO/Inf(2019)20, para. 68.

⁴⁴ GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Sweden, GREVIO/Inf(2018)15, para. 77.

⁴⁵ Concluding observations, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Committee, CRPD/C/MKD/CO/1, para. 15.; Concluding observations, Sudan, Committee, CRPD/C/SDN/CO/1, para. 17.; Concluding observations, Ethiopia, Committee, CRPD/C/ETH/CO/1, para. 17.

⁴⁶ Concluding observations, South Africa, Committee, CRPD/C/ZAF/CO/1, para. 14.

⁴⁷ Concluding observations, Seychelles, Committee, CRPD/C/SYC/CO/1, para. 18.; Concluding observations, Haiti, Committee, CRPD/C/HTI/CO/1, para. 14.

⁴⁸ Concluding observations, El Salvador, Committee, CRPD/C/SLV/CO/1, para. 21.

⁴⁹ Concluding observations, Algeria, Committee, CRPD/C/DZA/CO/1, para. 19.; Concluding observations, India, Committee, CRPD/C/IND/CO/1, para. 19.; Similarly Concluding observations, Iraq, Committee, CRPD/C/IRQ/CO/1, para. 18.; Similarly Concluding observations, Australia, Committee, CRPD/C/AUS/CO/2-3, para. 16.; Similarly Concluding observations, Kuwait, Committee, CRPD/C/KWT/CO/1, para. 17.; Similarly Concluding observations, Vanuatu, Committee, CRPD/C/VUT/CO/1, para. 17.; Similarly Committee, Haiti, *supra* note 47 para. 15.; Concluding observations, Belgium, Committee, CRPD/C/BEL/CO/1, para. 18.

⁵⁰ Concluding observations, Rwanda, Committee, CRPD/C/RWA/CO/1, para. 16.

⁵¹ Committee, South Africa, *supra* note 46, para. 15.

⁵² Committee, Sudan, *supra* note 45 para. 18.; Similarly Committee, Ethiopia, *supra* note 45 para. 18.; Similarly Committee, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, *supra* note 45 para. 16.

⁵³ Concluding observations, Luxembourg, Committee, CRPD/C/LUX/CO/1, para. 19.; Similarly Concluding observations, Sweden, Committee, CRPD/C/SWE/CO/1, para. 24.

⁵⁴ See GREVIO, Turkey, *supra* note 34 para. 102.; GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 para. 83.; GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Netherlands, GREVIO/Inf(2019)19, paras. 82 and 83.; GREVIO, Italy, *supra* note 35 para. 89.; GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for France, GREVIO/Inf(2019)16, para. 88.; GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Finland, GREVIO/Inf(2019)9, para. 54.; GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Albania, GREVIO/Inf(2017)13, para. 54.

the stronger involvement of the municipalities”, as *e.g.* in Portugal and Serbia⁵⁵. In its report on Finland, GREVIO “welcomes” many “local and regional initiatives” concerning violence against women, but it “notes [...] the absence of nationwide public awareness-raising campaigns”⁵⁶. This is interesting, since States are more prone to conducting campaigns on a national level, rather than regional or local level.

As opposed to GREVIO, the Committee rarely mentions the local level *explicite*, noting just twice in its Concluding Observations for Bosnia and Herzegovina the “lack of information on the local and the nationwide campaigns”⁵⁷, and in its Concluding Observation for Albania, when it “recommends” to the State to “adopt measures to develop local and national awareness-raising campaigns”⁵⁸. Rather, the Committee uses “family”⁵⁹, “family and community levels”⁶⁰, “public and families”⁶¹, “families, schools and society”⁶², and “parents and extended families, employers, service providers and the community as a whole”⁶³, when discussing the awareness-raising concerns and recommendations. It appears as though the Committee prefers to use the indicator of various groups within the society to depict the levels of awareness-raising.

The author alludes that families, schools, parents, employers, community, etc. might therefore represent local levels, whereas national level might be represented by the society (micro, meso and macro division⁶⁴). GREVIO, on the other hand, prefers to categorize on the basis of administrative division, *i.e.*, national, regional, and local, as indicated above. However, both GREVIO and the Committee emphasize the need to raise awareness on the rights of

⁵⁵ See GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 paras. 85 and 86. and GREVIO, Serbia, *supra* note 43, para. 68.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 6.

⁵⁶ GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54 para. 54.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 6.

⁵⁷ Concluding observations, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Committee, CRPD/C/BIH/CO/1, para. 16.

⁵⁸ Concluding observations, Albania, Committee, CRPD/C/ALB/CO/1, para. 18.;

⁵⁹ Committee, South Africa, *supra* note 46 para. 14.; Concluding observations, Qatar, Committee, CRPD/C/QAT/CO/1, para. 17.; Concluding observations, Mongolia, Committee, CRPD/C/MNG/CO/1, para. 14.; Concluding observations, Nepal, Committee, CRPD/C/NPL/CO/1, para. 15.

⁶⁰ Concluding observations, El Salvador, Committee, CRPD/C/SLV/CO/2-3, para. 16.

⁶¹ Concluding observations, Niger, Committee, CRPD/C/NER/CO/1, para. 14.; Concluding observations, Oman, Committee, CRPD/C/OMN/CO/1, para. 18.

⁶² Concluding observations, Slovenia, Committee, CRPD/C/SVN/CO/1, para. 13.

⁶³ Committee, Seychelles, *supra* note 47 para. 18.

⁶⁴ Katrijn Dekoninck, Awareness raising on the rights of persons with disabilities, Contribution to the Council of Europe Strategy on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Council of Europe, June 2017, 54, pp. 15 and 16.

women and people with disabilities in rural areas⁶⁵, or as in case of concluding observations for Kenya and Uganda, “rural and urban areas”⁶⁶, hence using administrative indicators.

2.2. Regularity and Duration of the Campaign

According to GREVIO, States should conduct “long term and regular awareness-raising campaigns” in order to eradicate misconceptions surrounding domestic violence, as suggested to Montenegro and similarly, to Finland and Austria⁶⁷.

In its concluding observations, the Committee expresses its “concerns” as regards to “lack of regular [or continuous] awareness-raising programmes”⁶⁸, “comprehensive [and innovative] awareness-raising programmes”⁶⁹, “insufficient measures [...] taken to raise awareness”⁷⁰, or “lack of awareness about the rights of persons with disabilities among the general population”⁷¹. The Committee “recommends” to the States to have “intensive”⁷², “continuous and effective awareness-raising strategies”⁷³, “comprehensive public awareness-raising policy and strategy”⁷⁴, and “to strengthen awareness-raising campaigns to reinforce the positive image of persons with disabilities as holders of human rights”⁷⁵. The Committee “recommends” to the States to have “continuous campaigns”⁷⁶, “adopt a comprehensive public

⁶⁵ Committee, India, *supra* note 49 para. 19.; Concluding observations, Saudi Arabia, Committee, CRPD/C/SAU/CO/1, para. 14.; Committee, Vanuatu, *supra* note 49 para. 17.; Committee, South Africa, *supra* note 46 para. 15.; Concluding observations, Honduras, Committee, CRPD/C/HND/CO/1, para. 20.; Committee, Guatemala, *supra* note 38 para. 26.; Concluding observations, China, Committee, CRPD/C/CHN/CO/1, para. 16.; GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54 paras. 54 and 57, (100 and 109).; GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 paras. 57 and 58.

⁶⁶ Concluding observations, Kenya, Committee, CRPD/C/KEN/CO/1, para. 16.; Concluding observations, Uganda, Committee, CRPD/C/UGA/CO/1, para. 15.;

⁶⁷ GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Montenegro, GREVIO/Inf(2018)5, para. 76.; GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54 para. 57.; GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Austria, GREVIO/Inf(2017)4, para. 69.; *See* Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 6.

⁶⁸ Committee, Albania, *supra* note 58 para. 17.; Committee, Vanuatu, *supra* note 49 para. 16.

⁶⁹ Concluding observations, Myanmar, Committee, CRPD/C/MMR/CO/1, para. 17.; Concluding observations, Norway, Committee, CRPD/C/NOR/CO/1, para. 13.; Concluding observations, Republic of Moldova, Committee, CRPD/C/MDA/CO/1, para. 18.

⁷⁰ Concluding observations, Croatia, Committee, CRPD/C/HRV/CO/1, para. 13.

⁷¹ Committee, Kuwait, *supra* note 49 para. 16.

⁷² Committee, El Salvador, *supra* note 60 para. 17.

⁷³ Committee, Bulgaria, *supra* note 37 para. 22.

⁷⁴ Committee, Seychelles, *supra* note 47 para. 19.

⁷⁵ Concluding observations, the Republic of Korea, Committee, CRPD/C/KOR/CO/1, para. 16.

⁷⁶ Committee, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, *supra* note 45 para. 16.

awareness-raising campaign”⁷⁷, or to “systematically and continuously publicize [...] contents and purpose of the Convention”⁷⁸.

In its Concluding Observation on El Salvador, the Committee is “concerned” that the awareness-raising initiatives “remain limited to isolated and sporadic campaigns and training programmes”⁷⁹, which is what GREVIO sets out as an issue in its reports – lack of long term and regular awareness-raising initiatives and/or information about them⁸⁰. Consequently, GREVIO will “encourage” States to develop “long term and regular awareness-raising” initiatives⁸¹.

In order for the awareness raising campaigns to be successful, they need to be built in the State’s long-term policy of combating violence against women⁸², whereas awareness-raising is recognised as one of important measures in combating violence against women, falling under the category of preventive activities⁸³. For the persons with disabilities, lack of “long-term and systematic” initiatives represent a barrier to their full enjoyment of rights and “participation in [...] society”⁸⁴.

Although conducting “long-term” campaigns was not *explicite* suggested in either of the two respective conventions, it was something which their respective monitoring bodies had recognized as an imperative for a successful awareness-raising and they appear to be equally paying importance to monitoring whether such campaigns are conducted by the States. The expression “long-term” goes hand in hand with the expression “regular” which can in fact be found in the Article 13 of the Istanbul Convention, and “maintaining”, which can be found in the Article 8 of the UN CRPD.

⁷⁷ Concluding observations, Latvia, Committee, CRPD/C/LVA/CO/1, para. 15.; Similarly Committee, European Union, *supra* note 40 para. 27.

⁷⁸ Committee, Republic of Korea, *supra* note 75 para. 16.

⁷⁹ Committee, El Salvador, *supra* note 60 para. 16.

⁸⁰ GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54 para. 54.; GREVIO, Montenegro, *supra* note 67 para. 73.

⁸¹ GREVIO, Montenegro, *supra* note 67 para. 76.; Similarly GREVIO, Turkey, *supra* note 34 para. 106.; Similarly GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54 para. 57.

⁸² Karin Heisecke, *supra* note 15 at p. 13.

⁸³ Karin Heisecke, *supra* note 15 at p. 11.

⁸⁴ Implementation of the Council of Europe Action Plan to promote the rights and full participation of people with disabilities in society: Improving the quality of life of people with disabilities in Europe 2006-2015, Abridged Evaluation Report (2015), p. 67, *in*: Katrijn Dekoninck, *supra* note 64 at p. 6.

2.3. Targeted Groups and Issues

GREVIO often “encourages” or strongly encourages” States to conduct awareness-raising campaigns, which would showcase “different manifestations of all forms of violence” stemming from the Istanbul Convention, as is in case of Turkey, and similarly in Serbia, Montenegro and Finland⁸⁵. GREVIO “notes” or “observes” when campaigns do not cover all “forms of violence”, e.g. in case of Serbia and France⁸⁶.

GREVIO will often highlight a certain form of violence which represents a pressing issue in a designated State, as it did in its report for Italy⁸⁷, and in its report for Montenegro⁸⁸. On the other hand, GREVIO will “welcome” or “particularly commend” campaigns which the States have conducted⁸⁹, sometimes underlining a designated campaign as a “particularly inspiring example”, “interesting example”⁹⁰, or an “example of good practice”⁹¹.

GREVIO “welcomes” when a State targets various groups with its campaigns⁹². GREVIO “welcomed” awareness-raising campaigns in Portugal, which targeted not only various “groups of victims”, but “general public”⁹³, and campaigns in Netherlands and Austria on various forms of violence which targeted “both the general public and professionals”⁹⁴.

Both GREVIO and the Committee emphasize the neglect of children, as an especially vulnerable group, either in their role as witnesses of domestic violence; as victims of prejudices and stereotypes due to their disability; or as a group which needs to be educated on respecting the rights of the persons with disabilities, from the earliest age⁹⁵.

⁸⁵ See e.g. GREVIO, Turkey, *supra* note 34 para. 106.; GREVIO, Serbia, *supra* note 43 para. 69.; GREVIO, Montenegro, *supra* note 67 para. 266.; GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54 para. 57.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 5.

⁸⁶ GREVIO, Serbia, *supra* note 43 paras. 66, 67 and 68.; GREVIO, France, *supra* note 54 paras. 91 and 93.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 5.

⁸⁷ GREVIO, Italy, *supra* note 35 paras. 91 and 92.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 5.

⁸⁸ GREVIO, Montenegro, *supra* note 67 paras. 74 and 76.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 5.

⁸⁹ GREVIO, Monaco, *supra* note 31 para. 41.; GREVIO, Austria, *supra* note 67 para. 65.; GREVIO, Italy, *supra* note 35 para. 89.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 8.

⁹⁰ GREVIO, Sweden, *supra* note 44 paras. 77, 78.

⁹¹ GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 para. 83.

⁹² GREVIO, Serbia, *supra* note 43 paras. 66, 67 and 68.; GREVIO, France, *supra* note 54 paras. 87 and 88.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 8.

⁹³ GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 paras. 82, 83.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 5.

⁹⁴ GREVIO, Netherlands, *supra* note 54 paras. 81-85.; GREVIO, Austria, *supra* note 67 para. 65.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 5.

⁹⁵ See e.g. GREVIO, Sweden, *supra* note 44 para. 80.; Committee, Myanmar, *supra* note 69 para. 18.; Concluding observations, Turkey, Committee, CRPD/C/TUR/CO/1, paras. 17 and 18.; See Fina, Valentina Della, et al., *supra* note 21, p. 221.

When addressing “concerns” and/or “recommending” measures which are to be undertaken in order to improve status of rights of persons with disabilities in the society, the Committee will sometimes point out to a particular disability⁹⁶, and/or to a particularly vulnerable group⁹⁷, if it considers that people with such particular disability and/or belonging to a particular group might be additionally discriminated in designated States.

According to the Committee, States are not covering all professions and all levels of society when it comes to awareness-raising⁹⁸, and it “recommends” promoting rights of people with disabilities throughout all groups in the society⁹⁹. This is an issue GREVIO will point out, thus “encouraging” States to fix it, by raising “awareness on violence against women [...] [within] public at large”¹⁰⁰. When implementing their awareness-raising campaigns, the Committee “recommends” to the States to target “employers”¹⁰¹; “medical professionals and service providers”¹⁰²; “general population, schools, public officials, the private sector and educational institutions”¹⁰³; “media [...] judges, lawyers, the police, social workers [...] including ethnic and religious minorities”¹⁰⁴; “members of parliament and government officials at the national and local levels”¹⁰⁵; or simply, “public authorities, private-sector service providers and the general public”¹⁰⁶.

The Committee “recommended” to El Salvador to undertake “training programmes” for various professionals, “judges, lawmakers, law enforcement officials and health and

⁹⁶ See *e.g.* Committee, Canada, *supra* note 39 paras. 19 and 20.; Concluding observations, Senegal, Committee, CRPD/C/SEN/CO/1, para. 14.; Committee, South Africa, *supra* note 46 paras. 14 and 15.; Committee, Slovenia, *supra* note 62 para. 12.; Concluding observations, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Committee, CRPD/C/GBR/CO/1, paras. 22 and 23.; Committee, Uganda, *supra* note 66 paras. 14 and 15.; See Fina, Valentina Della, et al., *supra* note 21, p. 218.

⁹⁷ See *e.g.* Concluding observations, Italy, Committee, CRPD/C/ITA/CO/1, para. 20.; Committee, Senegal, *supra* note 96 para. 14.; Committee, Niger, *supra* note 61 para. 14.; Committee, South Africa, *supra* note 46 para. 15.; Committee, Oman, *supra* note 61 paras. 17 and 18.; Committee, Nepal, *supra* note 59 para. 15.; See Fina, Valentina Della, et al., *supra* note 21, p. 219.

⁹⁸ Committee, El Salvador, *supra* note 60 para. 16.; Committee, Australia, *supra* note 49 para. 15.

⁹⁹ Committee, Myanmar, *supra* note 69 para. 18.

¹⁰⁰ GREVIO, Monaco, *supra* note 31 para. 43.

¹⁰¹ Committee, Saudi Arabia, *supra* note 65 para. 14.; See also Fina, Valentina Della, et al., *supra* note 21, pp. 220 and 221 as regards to employment of persons with disabilities

¹⁰² Committee, Turkey, *supra* note 95, para. 18.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, para. 18.

¹⁰⁴ Committee, Myanmar, *supra* note 69 para. 18.

¹⁰⁵ Committee, Bosnia and Herzegovina, *supra* note 57 para. 17.; Similarly Concluding observations, Tunisia, Committee, CRPD/C/TUN/CO/1, para. 19.

¹⁰⁶ Committee, Albania, *supra* note 58 para. 18.

education personnel”¹⁰⁷; and additionally, to Ecuador, to provide such programmes to “students [...] and members of the community at large”¹⁰⁸. Similar recommendations can be found in the Committee’s concluding observations for India¹⁰⁹, Turkey¹¹⁰, and Croatia¹¹¹. The States were “recommended” to provide “training for public and private media on the Convention”¹¹²; to provide “training [to] people [...] in the mass media about the negative effects of stereotypes”¹¹³; and to “establish [...] awareness-raising campaigns and training programmes [...] in order to overcome entrenched gender and disability stereotypes in society”¹¹⁴.

As previously mentioned, Articles 8 of the UN CRPD lumps together awareness-raising and training. GREVIO, on the other hand, gives separate comments on both, in line with the respective Articles 13 and 15 of the Istanbul Convention. In its comments on Article 15 of the Istanbul Convention, GREVIO warns countries that the initial and in-service training of combating gender-based violence is offered only to some groups of the professionals or is covering only some forms of violence¹¹⁵. GREVIO suggests to countries to have mandatory trainings for all professionals working with victims¹¹⁶, albeit it sometimes focuses more on certain sector, *e.g.* health, legal, and/or asylum/immigration sector¹¹⁷, when it considers that some sectors either do not receive sufficient training on issues listed in Article 15 or when workers within the same sector unjustifiably receive different types of training and finally, if and when underlying causes of violence are neglected in trainings¹¹⁸.

¹⁰⁷ Committee, El Salvador, *supra* note 60 para. 17.

¹⁰⁸ Concluding observations, Ecuador, Committee, CRPD/C/ECU/CO/2-3, para. 20.

¹⁰⁹ Committee, India, *supra* note 49 para. 19.

¹¹⁰ Committee, Turkey, *supra* note 95 para. 18.

¹¹¹ Committee, Croatia, *supra* note 70 para. 14.

¹¹² Concluding observations, Montenegro, Committee, CRPD/C/MNE/CO/1, para. 17.

¹¹³ Committee, Italy, *supra* note 97 para. 20.; Similarly Committee, Bosnia and Herzegovina, *supra* note 57 para. 17.

¹¹⁴ Concluding observations, United Arab Emirates, Committee, CRPD/C/ARE/CO/1, para. 18.; Committee, Qatar, *supra* note 59 para. 18.; Similarly Concluding observations, Gabon, Committee, CRPD/C/GAB/CO/1, para. 21.

¹¹⁵ See GREVIO, Serbia, *supra* note 43 paras. 78 and 79.; GREVIO, Montenegro, *supra* note 67 paras. 86, 87 and 88.; GREVIO, Sweden, *supra* note 44 paras. 91, 93 and 94.

¹¹⁶ See GREVIO, Turkey, *supra* note 34 para. 120.; GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 para. 69.

¹¹⁷ See GREVIO, Austria, *supra* note 67 paras. 75 and 79.; GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 paras. 65, 66, 67 and 69.; GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 paras. 96, 97, 98 and 99.

¹¹⁸ GREVIO, Turkey, *supra* note 34 para. 121.; GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 paras. 65, 66, 67 and 68.; GREVIO, Austria, *supra* note 67 paras. 73, 74, 76, 78 and 80.; GREVIO, Portugal, GREVIO, *supra* note 33 paras. 96, 97, 98 and 121.

Two issues relating to clusters come up in particular and the author groups them along the lines of stereotyping (3.3.1.) and intersectionality and multiple discrimination (3.3.2.).

2.3.1. Stereotyping

Both GREVIO and Committee are “concerned” about the stereotypes, prejudices and stigmas which women and people with disabilities face and “recommend”, or “[strongly] encourage” States to “take the necessary [...] measures” to “address” them¹¹⁹, *e.g.* carry out “comprehensive awareness-raising programmes”¹²⁰ or “media campaigns aimed at eliminating” them¹²¹.

In its report on Portugal, GREVIO noted that the country had the biggest increase in awareness about the available measures for combating violence against women but pointed to certain indications that “stereotypes and attitudes justifying violence against women still persist”¹²². GREVIO was “particularly concerned” about the “sexist hate speech, misogyny and tolerance towards violence against women” occurring in media in Italy, and it “strongly encouraged” Italy to engage in changing male behavior and combating stereotypes surrounding women¹²³. In case of Finland, GREVIO was “concerned” that the “level of awareness...will not increase sufficiently” if the State does not engage more in campaigning on “gender equality, non-stereotyped gender roles and the different manifestation of violence against women”¹²⁴. Although GREVIO “commended” Albania’s awareness-raising initiatives, it “noted” that these should also challenge practice of “forgiveness under the pretext of traditional family values” and “aim at reshaping preconceived gender roles and stereotypes within the family”, which GREVIO “strongly encouraged”¹²⁵.

In countries where it is considered that violence should be tolerated as a way of upholding the traditional family values¹²⁶ or disciplining disobedient women¹²⁷ which

¹¹⁹ Committee, Algeria, *supra* note 49 paras. 18 and 19.; GREVIO, Austria, *supra* note 67 para. 67.; GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 paras. 54 and 58.; GREVIO, Italy, *supra* note 35 paras. 87, 88 and 92.; *See* Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at pp. 5 and 6.

¹²⁰ Committee, Myanmar, *supra* note 69 paras. 17 and 18.; Committee, India, *supra* note 49 paras. 18 and 19.

¹²¹ Committee, Ecuador, *supra* note 108 paras. 19 and 20.

¹²² GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 para. 84.; *See* Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 6.

¹²³ GREVIO, Italy, *supra* note 35 paras. 87, 88 and 92.

¹²⁴ GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54 para. 56.

¹²⁵ GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 paras. 54 and 58.; *See* Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 6.

¹²⁶ *See* GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 paras. 54, 55 and 58.

¹²⁷ *See* GREVIO, Turkey, *supra* note 34 para. 103.

countries tend to disregard the impact on the children within violent families, GREVIO recommends challenging views of the society on violence against women, and raising awareness about the collateral victims, children¹²⁸. However, even in countries as Monaco, where GREVIO does not mention issue with rooted unjust and misconceived behavior towards women, it warns about the insufficient awareness on women and children's rights¹²⁹.

The Committee often expresses its “concern” about the “high prevalence of stigmatization and negative stereotypes and attitudes”¹³⁰, or their “persistence”¹³¹ in the “media”¹³². The Committee will underline when the campaign was steered in the wrong direction, portraying persons with disabilities as “objects of charity”¹³³, or when the States use “charity-based approach”¹³⁴ instead of human rights-based approach”¹³⁵. Following this, the Committee is “concerned” about the “absence of strategies”, “awareness-raising campaigns”, “lack of measures”¹³⁶, insufficient action or efforts¹³⁷, and “shortage of programmes and initiatives”¹³⁸ to combat these stereotypes and prejudices.

¹²⁸ See GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 paras. 54, 55 and 58.; GREVIO, Turkey, *supra* note 34 para. 106.; GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 paras. 85 and 86. and GREVIO, Serbia, *supra* note 43 para. 68.; GREVIO, Italy, *supra* note 35 paras. 91 and 92.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at pp. 5 and 6.

¹²⁹ GREVIO, Monaco, *supra* note 31 para. 42.

¹³⁰ Committee, Vanuatu, *supra* note 49 para. 16.; Similarly Committee, India, *supra* note 49 para. 18.; Similarly Committee, Turkey, *supra* note 95 para. 17.; Similarly Committee, Niger, *supra* note 61 para. 13.; Similarly Committee, Haiti, *supra* note 47 para. 14.

¹³¹ Committee, Norway, *supra* note 69 para. 13.; Similarly Committee, Rwanda, *supra* note 50 para. 15.; Similarly Committee, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, *supra* note 96 para. 22.; Similarly Committee, Republic of Moldova, *supra* note 69 para. 18.; Similarly Concluding observations, Thailand, Committee, CRPD/C/THA/CO/1, para. 19.; Similarly Concluding observations, Azerbaijan, Committee, CRPD/C/AZE/CO/1, para. 20.; Similarly Concluding observations, Spain, Committee, CRPD/C/ESP/CO/2-3, para. 14.; Similarly Committee, Honduras, *supra* note 65 para. 19.

¹³² Committee, Luxembourg, *supra* note 53 para. 18.; Concluding observations, Armenia, Committee, CRPD/C/ARM/CO/1, para. 13.

¹³³ Concluding observations, Mexico, Committee, CRPD/C/MEX/CO/1, para. 17.

¹³⁴ See e.g. Concluding observations, Peru, Committee, CRPD/C/PER/CO/1, para. 18.; Concluding observations, Malta, Committee, CRPD/C/MLT/CO/1, para. 13.; Committee, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, *supra* note 45 para. 15.; Committee, Sudan, *supra* note 45 para. 17.

¹³⁵ See e.g. Committee, Honduras, *supra* note 65 para. 19.; Committee, Montenegro, *supra* note 112 para. 16.

¹³⁶ Committee, Slovenia, *supra* note 62 para. 12.; Similarly Committee, Sudan, *supra* note 45 para. 17.; Similarly Committee, El Salvador, *supra* note 48 para. 21.; Similarly Committee, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, *supra* note 45 para. 15.; Similarly Committee, South Africa, *supra* note 46 para. 14.; Similarly Committee, Seychelles, *supra* note 47 para. 18.; Similarly Concluding observations, Serbia, Committee, CRPD/C/SRB/CO/1, para. 15.; Similarly Committee, Italy, *supra* note 97 para. 19.

¹³⁷ Concluding observations, Slovakia, Committee, CRPD/C/SVK/CO/1, para. 27.; Similarly Concluding observations, Austria, Committee, CRPD/C/AUT/CO/1, para. 21.; Concluding observations, Panama, Committee, CRPD/C/PAN/CO/1, para. 24.; Committee, Guatemala, *supra* note 38 para. 25.; Concluding observations, Chile, Committee, CRPD/C/CHL/CO/1, para. 17.

¹³⁸ Concluding observations, Turkmenistan, Committee, CRPD/C/TKM/CO/1, para. 15.

The Committee refers to stereotyping issues in majority of its reports and “recommends” to the States to: “adopt and implement the measures”¹³⁹, conduct or improve their “public awareness and media campaigns”¹⁴⁰, and “develop a coherent and comprehensive national strategy”¹⁴¹ aimed at combating and eliminating stereotypes, prejudices and stigmas.

2.3.2. *Multiple and intersectional discrimination*

Intersectional discrimination occurs when a person is discriminated on several grounds which are so closely intertwined that they cannot be separately evaluated, whereas multiple discrimination is based on more than one ground, thus becoming “compounded or aggravated”¹⁴². Individuals in both vulnerable groups (women and disabled persons) can be affected by the intersectional or multiple discrimination, if except for being a woman or a disabled person, they also belong to a particular ethnic minority or their sexual orientation does not conform with their particular society’s standards, or they are women with disabilities¹⁴³.

Women with disabilities face specific disadvantages and are “particularly exposed to violence, abuse and exploitation, and their sexual forms”¹⁴⁴. This was acknowledged by the “Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) in 1991 in its General Recommendation 18 and by the UNCRPD Committee in 2016 in its General Comment

¹³⁹ Committee, Vanuatu, *supra* note 49 para. 17.; Similarly Committee, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, *supra* note 45 para. 16.; Similarly Committee, Sudan, *supra* note 45 para. 18.; Similarly Committee, Ethiopia, *supra* note 45 para. 18.; Similarly Committee, Slovakia, *supra* note 137 para. 28.; Similarly Committee, Uganda, *supra* note 66 para. 15.

¹⁴⁰ Committee, Spain, *supra* note 131 para. 15.; Similarly Concluding observations, Colombia, Committee, CRPD/C/COL/CO/1, para. 21.; Similarly Committee, Azerbaijan, *supra* note 131 para. 21.; Committee, Peru, *supra* note 134 para. 19., Similarly Committee, Senegal, *supra* note 96 para. 14.; Similarly Committee, Honduras, *supra* note 65 para. 20.; Similarly Committee, Norway, *supra* note 69 para. 14.; Similarly Committee, Austria, *supra* note 137 para. 22.; Similarly Committee, Niger, *supra* note 61 para. 14.; Similarly Committee, Panama, *supra* note 137 para. 25.; Similarly Committee, Chile *supra* note 137 para. 18.; Similarly Committee, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, *supra* note 96 para. 23.; Similarly Committee, Thailand, *supra* note 131 para. 20.; Similarly Committee, India, *supra* note 49 para. 19.

¹⁴¹ Committee, South Africa, *supra* note 46 para. 15.; Similarly Committee, Haiti, *supra* note 47 para. 15.

¹⁴² UN CRPD Committee, General comment No. 3, Article 6: Women and girls with disabilities, CRPD/C/GC/3, 2016, paras. 4 and 16.

¹⁴³ See e.g. Committee, India, *supra* note 49 para. 19.; Committee, Australia, *supra* note 49 paras. 15 and 16.; Committee, Ecuador, *supra* note 108 para. 19.; GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 paras. 57 and 58.; GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 paras. 85 and 86.; GREVIO, Italy, *supra* note 35 paras. 91 and 92.; GREVIO, Sweden, *supra* note 44 paras. 79 and 80.; GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54 paras. 54 and 57.; GREVIO, Montenegro, *supra* note 67 paras. 75 and 76.; GREVIO, Netherlands, *supra* note 54 para. 86.; and GREVIO, France, *supra* note 54 paras. 91 and 93.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at pp. 5 and 6.; See also Fina, Valentina Della, et al., *supra* note 21, p. 219.

¹⁴⁴ Katrijn Dekoninck, *supra* note 64 at p. 29.

No. 3 focusing on women and girls”¹⁴⁵. In its General recommendation No. 18 on disabled women, CEDAW Committee recognized the issue of “double discrimination” and “recommended” to the State parties to include in their reports information on all the measures they have undertaken to secure full enjoyment of all rights to disabled women¹⁴⁶. Similarly, but explicitly invoking intersectional discrimination, UNCRPD Committee’s General Comment 3, affirms that disabled women have faced many obstacles in the past when attempting to exercise their rights and that these obstacles continue to persist¹⁴⁷.

The UN CRPD dedicates Article 6 to “women with disabilities” which bounds the State to secure “full and equal enjoyment by them of all human rights and fundamental freedoms”¹⁴⁸, thereafter setting out in the following articles that States should adopt “women- and child-focused legislation and policies”, with the aim of combating violence against “persons with disabilities”¹⁴⁹ and “ensuring access... in particular [to] women and girls with disabilities [...] to social protection programmes and poverty reduction programmes”¹⁵⁰. In its preamble, Istanbul Convention underlines its aim to serve as an instrument to “strengthen the protection and ensure the support for victims” which was already provided by the previous treaties, such as UN CRPD, among many others¹⁵¹, or shall be provided by the future treaties¹⁵².

In fact, both the UN CRPD and the Explanatory Report to the Istanbul Convention emphasize the heightened risk of violence against “women and girls with disabilities”¹⁵³. Besides that, “disability” is mentioned in Article 4, Paragraph 3 of the Istanbul Convention, as a basis for discrimination, which needs to be eliminated by undertaking “particular measures to protect the rights of victims”¹⁵⁴. The Explanatory Report elaborates more on the respective non-discrimination clause, stressing out the vulnerability of victims affected by the intersectional discrimination and multiple discrimination (disabled women, women belonging

¹⁴⁵ UN CEDAW Committee, General Recommendation No. 18: Disabled Women, A/46/38, 1991; UN CRPD Committee, General comment No. 3, *supra* note 142., *in*: Katrijn Dekoninck, *supra* note 64 at p. 29.

¹⁴⁶ General Recommendation No. 18, *supra* note 145.

¹⁴⁷ World Health Organization (WHO) and World Bank, World Report on Disability, 350., *in*: UN CRPD, General comment No. 3, *supra* note 142 para. 2; UN CRPD, General comment No. 3, *supra* note 142, para 3.

¹⁴⁸ Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 20, Article 6.; *See* Fina, Valentina Della, et al., *supra* note 21, p. 219.

¹⁴⁹ Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 20, Article 16, para. 5.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, Article 28, para. 2, subpara. (b).

¹⁵¹ Explanatory Report to the Istanbul Convention, *supra* note 14 para. 364.

¹⁵² Istanbul Convention, *supra* note 11, Preamble.; Explanatory Report to the Istanbul Convention, *supra* note 14 paras. 363, 364 and 365.

¹⁵³ Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *supra* note 20, Preamble.; Explanatory Report to the Istanbul Convention, *supra* note 14, para. 26.

¹⁵⁴ Istanbul Convention, *supra* note 11, Article 4, Para. 3.

to ethnic minority, etc)¹⁵⁵. Disability is proposed as a factor which can be recorded by the official authorities when they collect relevant data on victims and perpetrators¹⁵⁶. The Explanatory Report particularly refers to the requirement imposed upon States to render positive measures for protection of vulnerable groups, identified as the groups facing multiple and intersectional discrimination¹⁵⁷.

GREVIO “encourages” or “strongly encourages” Sweden, Portugal, Italy, France and Albania to target women affected by the intersectional discrimination and children witnessing domestic violence through campaigns¹⁵⁸, and similarly, in Finland¹⁵⁹. GREVIO establishes that women belonging to ethnic minorities, LGBTI communities and/or other vulnerable groups are particularly susceptible to different forms of violence, hence it underlines the importance of encompassing those groups in awareness raising campaigns¹⁶⁰. In its reports for Portugal, France, Italy, Albania, Finland and Netherlands, GREVIO particularly emphasizes that the States should put more efforts into raising awareness as regards to women with disabilities who are victims of violence¹⁶¹. In some of its concluding observations, the Committee was either particularly “concerned” about the insufficient awareness-raising on the rights of “women [and girls] with disabilities”, the obstacles they faced or had “recommended” to the States to improve its awareness-raising initiatives, targeting this vulnerable group¹⁶².

¹⁵⁵ Explanatory Report to the Istanbul Convention, *supra* note 14, para. 53.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 76.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, para. 87.

¹⁵⁸ GREVIO, Sweden, *supra* note 44 paras. 79, 80.; GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 paras. 85, 86.; GREVIO, Italy, *supra* note 35 paras. 91 and 92.; GREVIO, France, *supra* note 54 paras. 91 and 93.; GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 paras. 57 and 58.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 5.

¹⁵⁹ GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54 para. 57.

¹⁶⁰ See GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 paras. 57 and 58.; GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 paras. 85 and 86.; GREVIO, Italy, *supra* note 35 paras. 91 and 92.; GREVIO, Sweden, *supra* note 44 paras. 79 and 80.; GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54 paras. 54 and 57.; GREVIO, Montenegro, *supra* note 67 paras. 75 and 76.; GREVIO, Netherlands, *supra* note 54 para. 86.; and GREVIO, France, *supra* note 54 paras. 91 and 93.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 5.

¹⁶¹ GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 paras. 85 and 86.; GREVIO, France, *supra* note 54 paras. 91 and 93.; GREVIO, Italy, *supra* note 35 paras. 91 and 92.; GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 paras. 57 and 58.; GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54 paras. 54 and 57.; GREVIO, Netherlands, *supra* note 54 para. 86.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 5.

¹⁶² Concluding observations, Philippines, Committee, CRPD/C/PHL/CO/1, para. 18.; Committee, Nepal, *supra* note 59 para. 15.; Committee, Italy, *supra* note 97 para. 20.; Committee, Guatemala, *supra* note 38, para. 25.; Committee, Sweden, *supra* note 53, para. 22.; Committee, European Union, *supra* note 40, para. 27.;

2.4. Co-operation with various stakeholders

Article 13 of the Istanbul Convention directs the States to work closely with “national human rights institutions and equality bodies, civil society and non-governmental organisations, especially women’s organisations, where appropriate”. Following the respective Article, GREVIO commends campaigns that are carried out by the NGO sector, but stresses out that the campaigns should nevertheless be majorly crafted by the governments¹⁶³.

Both GREVIO and the Committee are sometimes “concerned” about the lack of involvement of civil society organizations in creation of awareness-raising initiatives¹⁶⁴, wherein GREVIO would “strongly encourage” States to “engage in partnerships with the relevant women’s specialist support services, community-based grass-roots organisations and the media”, as suggested to Serbia, and similarly to Italy, France and Finland¹⁶⁵.

On the other hand, Article 8 of the UN CRPD does not mention anything about the organizations with which the States should cooperate. Nevertheless, many concluding observations of the Committee “recommend” to the States to work on creating awareness-raising initiatives in “[close] collaboration”¹⁶⁶ or “close consultation”¹⁶⁷, “cooperation”¹⁶⁸, or just “involvement of organizations of persons with disabilities”¹⁶⁹, sometimes adding “meaningful”¹⁷⁰ or “active”¹⁷¹, besides close, to describe what kind of involvement is expected, and emphasizing “[active] involvement [or participation] of persons with disabilities, through their representative organizations”¹⁷², or “participation and involvement in society of all persons with disabilities”¹⁷³.

¹⁶³ See GREVIO, Austria, *supra* note 67, paras. 68 and 69.

¹⁶⁴ Committee, Albania, *supra* note 58, para. 17.; Committee, Australia, *supra* note 49 para. 15.

¹⁶⁵ GREVIO, Serbia, *supra* note 43, para. 69.; GREVIO, Italy, *supra* note 35, para. 92.; GREVIO, France, *supra* note 54 para. 93.; GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54, para. 57., See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1, pp. 6- 7.

¹⁶⁶ Committee, Algeria, *supra* note 49 para. 19.; Committee, Myanmar, *supra* note 69 para. 18.

¹⁶⁷ Committee, Belgium, *supra* note 49, para. 18.; Similarly Committee, Australia, *supra* note 49, para. 16.; Committee, Kuwait, *supra* note 49, para. 17.

¹⁶⁸ Committee, Saudi Arabia, *supra* note 65, para. 14.; Committee, India, *supra* note 49, para. 19.; Committee, Croatia, *supra* note 70, para. 14.

¹⁶⁹ Committee, Turkmenistan, *supra* note 138, para. 16.

¹⁷⁰ Committee, Turkey, *supra* note 95, para. 18.

¹⁷¹ Committee, Albania, *supra* note 58, para. 18.; Committee, Belgium, *supra* note 49, para. 18.

¹⁷² Committee, Iraq, *supra* note 49, para. 18.; Committee, Vanuatu, *supra* note 49, para. 17.; Concluding observations, Morocco, Committee, CRPD/C/MAR/CO/1, para. 21.; Committee, Serbia, *supra* note 136, para. 16.; Committee, Uganda, *supra* note 66, para. 15.

¹⁷³ Committee, Seychelles, *supra* note 47, para. 19.

In six of its concluding observations, the Committee had “recommended” to the States to cooperate with “[traditional and] religious leaders”, among other groups of professionals.¹⁷⁴ This is supposedly due to an important role of the religious leaders in communities of the respective States, wherein they can be seen as an “authority” *per se*. It is highly unlikely that GREVIO would ever encourage such cooperation. Besides not explicitly mentioning cooperation with “religious leaders” in the Article 13, all current member parties to the Istanbul Convention are also Council of Europe’s member parties and “one of Europe’s shared values [...] is the separation of church and State”¹⁷⁵.

2.5. Evaluation and impact

Both the UN CRPD and the Istanbul Convention do not impose any kind of obligation on the States to evaluate their awareness-raising initiatives. Moreover, studies show that measuring awareness-raising is troublesome¹⁷⁶. Therefore, it is important to have an evaluation framework beforehand¹⁷⁷. Evaluations are integral part of checklists which are offered to the States to help them in creating, implementing, and assessing awareness-raising initiatives¹⁷⁸. It appears that GREVIO pays significantly more attention than the UN CRPD Committee in monitoring whether the States evaluate their awareness-raising initiatives or not.

GREVIO “notes” that France should create “tools [...] to measure the impact and success of awareness-raising campaigns”¹⁷⁹. As regards to Netherlands, it “commends” the State for “measuring the impact” of such campaigns, though it is “concerned” by the insufficient emphasis on the “gendered nature of the different forms of violence against women” and of “specific forms of violence”, hence it “encourages” the State to address these

¹⁷⁴ Committee, Niger, *supra* note 61 para. 14.; Committee, Senegal, *supra* note 96 para. 14.; Committee, South Africa, *supra* note 46 para. 15.; Committee, Oman, *supra* note 61 para. 18.; Committee, Haiti, *supra* note 47 para. 15.; Committee, Morocco, *supra* note 172 para. 21.

¹⁷⁵ PACE - Recommendation 1804 (2007) - State, religion, secularity and human rights, <<https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=17568&lang=en>>

¹⁷⁶ Council of Europe (2014), “Analytical study of the results of the fourth round of monitoring the implementation of Recommendation Rec(2002)5 on the protection of women against violence in Council of Europe member states”, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, p. 35, *in*: Karin Heisecke, *supra* note 15 at p. 11.; Karin Heisecke, *supra* note 15 at pp. 18 and 19.

¹⁷⁷ Karin Heisecke, *supra* note 15 at pp. 17, 19 and 30.

¹⁷⁸ Katrijn Dekoninck, *supra* note 64 at pp. 39-41.; Karin Heisecke, *supra* note 15 at pp. 31-32.

¹⁷⁹ GREVIO, France, *supra* note 54 para. 92.; *See* Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 7.

two issues, particularly as regards to most vulnerable women victims¹⁸⁰. For Austria, it draws attention to the fact that the campaigns have apparently not been evaluated¹⁸¹.

The Committee, on the other hand, rarely “recommends” evaluating awareness-raising initiatives. The author found “recommendations” to evaluate these campaigns in concluding observations for only six States. In its Concluding Observation for Malta and Luxembourg the Committee “recommended” to the States to “periodically review and evaluate the impact of [...] awareness-raising efforts”¹⁸². In its Concluding Observation for South Africa, the Committee “recommended” to the State to “adopt effective mechanisms for the inclusion and participation of persons with disabilities [...] in [...] evaluation of awareness-raising campaigns and training programmes”¹⁸³ and similarly, in its Concluding Observation for Belgium, the Committee “recommended” to the State to “carry out accessible information and awareness-raising campaigns [...] through close consultation with, and the active involvement of, representative organizations of persons with disabilities [...] in [...] evaluation of those information and awareness-raising campaigns”¹⁸⁴. Lastly, the Committee recommended to Cyprus to “initiate and evaluate cross-sectoral campaigns and trainings”¹⁸⁵, and to Denmark to “undertake and regularly evaluate campaigns and other forms of training”¹⁸⁶.

2.6. Budget

Awareness-raising initiatives are not feasible without the adequate funding¹⁸⁷. However, neither the UN CRPD nor the Istanbul Convention mention funding or allocation of financial resources for the implementation of awareness-raising initiatives. Given the quantity of the Committee’s concluding observations, one would expect more expressions of “concern” on the funding issue, especially in comparison to GREVIO which had already noted this issue

¹⁸⁰ GREVIO, Netherlands, *supra* note 54 paras. 85 and 86.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at pp. 5, 6 and 7.

¹⁸¹ GREVIO, Austria, *supra* note 67 para. 65.; See Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 7.

¹⁸² Committee, Malta, *supra* note 134 para. 14.; Committee, Luxembourg, *supra* note 53 para. 19.; Similarly Concluding observations, Germany, Committee, CRPD/C/DEU/CO/1, para. 20

¹⁸³ Committee, South Africa, *supra* note 46 para. 15.

¹⁸⁴ Committee, Belgium, *supra* note 49 para. 18.

¹⁸⁵ Concluding observations, Cyprus, Committee, CRPD/C/CYP/CO/1, para. 24.

¹⁸⁶ Concluding observations, Denmark, Committee, CRPD/C/DNK/CO/1, para. 25.

¹⁸⁷ Karin Heisecke, *supra* note 15 at p. 15.

in three of its overall thirteen reports, thus recognizing the important correlation between adequate budget and awareness-raising initiatives.

In its report on France, GREVIO “notes” that due to the cuts in funding, many NGOs which have been steering awareness-raising campaigns in the past, are now struggling to continue their work, so it “strongly encourages” France to allocate to them sufficient funding¹⁸⁸. Setting aside “appropriate” budget for awareness-raising initiatives is mentioned in GREVIO’s report for Austria¹⁸⁹. In case of Monaco, GREVIO “strongly encourages” the State to “renew [...] support” for the particular campaign¹⁹⁰.

The Committee recommended to couple of States to “adequately fund” awareness-raising initiatives¹⁹¹. In its concluding observations for Seychelles and Niger, it was “concerned” about the insufficient funding¹⁹². Interestingly, the Committee recommended to Guatemala, and similarly to Chile, to “ensure that public funding is not used for the purposes that violate Convention”, referring to the organizations which receive public funds, but promote charity-based approach¹⁹³.

¹⁸⁸ GREVIO, France, *supra* note 54 paras. 89, 90 and 93.; Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 7.

¹⁸⁹ GREVIO, Austria, *supra* note 67 para. 69.; *See* Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 7.

¹⁹⁰ GREVIO, Monaco, *supra* note 31 para. 43.; *See* Mathias Möschel, *supra* note 1 at p. 7.

¹⁹¹ Committee, Malta, *supra* note 134 para. 14.; Similarly Committee, Cyprus, *supra* note 185 para. 24; Similarly Concluding observations, Poland, Committee, CRPD/C/POL/CO/1, para. 14; Similarly Committee, Seychelles, *supra* note 47, para. 19, Similarly Committee, Montenegro, *supra* note 112, para 17.

¹⁹² Committee Seychelles, *supra* note 47, para. 18.; Committee, Niger, *supra* note 61, para. 13

¹⁹³ Committee, Guatemala, *supra* note 38 paras. 25 and 26.; Committee, Chile, *supra* note 137, paras. 17 and 18

CONCLUSION

Awareness-raising articles in both the Istanbul Convention and the UN CRPD are important tools in combating prejudices and stereotypes which public as well as groups of professionals foster towards persons with disabilities and women and children victims of gender-based and domestic violence¹⁹⁴.

GREVIO's comments on awareness-raising are placed in couple of broader paragraphs and they usually start with listing initiatives which were successfully carried out in the respective States and it "welcomes" them or "[particularly] commends" the State therefor. However, it might be "particularly alarmed" and "concerned" with the "low level of awareness" or because it predicts insufficient increase in awareness-raising if the "efforts" are not stepped up, using administrative indicator or various groups within the society to identify the scope. Then it "notes [with concern]" which issues require covering since they were not covered sufficiently or were not covered at all, followed by the instructions to the States on what actions should be undertaken and which vulnerable groups in the society should be particularly addressed, to improve awareness-raising. Finally, GREVIO formulates its recommendations as "encouragements" or "strong encouragements", which are divided into separate items (subparagraphs)¹⁹⁵.

The Committee's comments are divided in two separate paragraphs, one dealing with "concerns", and the other one with "recommendations". The Committee uses a plethora of general expressions and rhetoric, to put forward its "concerns" as regards to the current status of the rights of persons with disabilities in the respective States, lack of awareness-raising initiatives, presence of "medical model of disability", negative portrayal, stereotyping, discrimination and similar, often revealing no particular actions which the States have undertaken in their compliance with the UN CRPD's Article 8, nor the Committee's evaluation thereof. Recommendations, sometimes called "encouragements", are at times merged into one

¹⁹⁴ See *e.g.* GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 para. 84.; Committee, Ecuador, *supra* note 108 paras. 19 and 20.

¹⁹⁵ For examples of comments on Article 13 of the Istanbul Convention, see *e.g.* GREVIO, Albania, *supra* note 54 paras. 54-58.; GREVIO, Portugal, *supra* note 33 paras. 82-86.; GREVIO, Montenegro, *supra* note 67 paras. 72-76.; GREVIO, Finland, *supra* note 54 paras. 54-57.

or two sentences, while at other times they are structurally divided into separate subparagraphs¹⁹⁶.

GREVIO's comments provide an examination of the current situation in the States, thus giving a background story to the reader, unlike those of the Committee, from which one cannot understand a broader picture. GREVIO's recommendations (or "encouragements") are consistently structured, unlike those of the Committee, which structure varies from one to another concluding observation¹⁹⁷.

The findings of the thesis indicate that the Committee should take cognizance of the mechanisms that GREVIO uses: a broad overview of the status of the rights and violations thereof, followed by structurally consistent and relevant recommendations. The Committee should avoid using rhetorical language which reiterates obligations from the Article 8 and does not disclose any particularities about the respective States, making its comments easily applicable to each and any State. Additionally, the Committee should look more in-depth at the evaluation and budget factors.

Though the Committee uses the expressions "seriously concerned" or "deeply concerned" as regards to the status of implementation of some other articles of the Convention and the rights contained therein¹⁹⁸, when it comes to the implementation of Article 8, it should be noted that it only used expression "deeply concerned" once, in its Concluding Observations for Guatemala¹⁹⁹. In all other concluding observations on the Article 8 it used expression "concerned"²⁰⁰.

The author noted that the Concluding Observations for Greece, Russian Federation, Jordan, Portugal, Lithuania, Czech Republic, New Zealand, Hungary and Argentina, contain

¹⁹⁶ For examples of comments on Article 8 of the UN CRPD, see *e.g.* Committee, Ecuador, *supra* note 108 paras. 19 and 20.; Committee, Poland, *supra* note 191, paras. 13 and 14.; Concluding observations, Costa Rica, Committee, CRPD/C/CRI/CO/1, paras. 17 and 18.; Committee, China, *supra* note 65 paras. 15 and 16.

¹⁹⁷ For examples of comments on Article 8 of the UN CRPD and examples of comments on Article 13 of the Istanbul Convention, see *e.g.* GREVIO, Turkey, *supra* note 34 paras. 102-106.; GREVIO, France, *supra* note 54 paras. 87-93; See *e.g.* Committee, Myanmar, *supra* note 69, paras. 17 and 18; Committee, Algeria, *supra* note 49 paras. 18 and 19.

¹⁹⁸ See *e.g.* Committee, El Salvador, *supra* note 60 paras. 20 and 30.; Committee, Australia, *supra* note 49 paras. 27, 29 and 33.; Committee, Ecuador, *supra* note 108 para. 25.; Committee, Croatia, *supra* note 70 paras. 11 and 27.; Concluding observations, Dominican Republic, Committee, CRPD/C/DOM/CO/1, paras. 36 and 38.

¹⁹⁹ Committee, Guatemala, *supra* note 38 para. 25.

²⁰⁰ See *e.g.* Committee, Myanmar, *supra* note 69 para. 17.; Committee, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, *supra* note 45 para. 15.; Concluding observations, Cuba, Committee, CRPD/C/CUB/CO/1, para. 19.

no Article 8 “concerns” or “recommendations” at all²⁰¹. Concluding Observations on the Initial report on Australia do not contain “concerns” or “recommendations” as regards to the Article 8, but the Concluding Observations on the Combined Second and Third Periodic Report on the respective State contain “concerns” and “recommendations”²⁰².

It is difficult to imagine that GREVIO would skip commenting on the status of Article 13 in any of the member States in its upcoming reports, considering its practice thus far.

²⁰¹ See respective concluding observations

²⁰² Concluding observations, Australia, Committee, CRPD/C/AUS/CO/1, pp. 1-8. and Committee, Australia, *supra* note 49 at pp. 15 and 16.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

‘African Union, Protocol to the African Charter on Human and People's Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa, 11 July 2003’

<https://www.un.org/en/africa/osaa/pdf/au/protocol_rights_women_africa_2003.pdf>

‘The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. A Commentary, edited by Fina, Valentina Della, et al., Springer, 2017’

‘Awareness Raising under Article 8 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities’ <<https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Disability/Pages/Article8.aspx>>

‘Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Peru, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/PER/CO/1, 16 May 2012’

‘Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Tunisia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/TUN/CO/1, 13 May 2011’

‘Concluding Observations on the Combined Second and Third Periodic Reports of Australia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/AUS/CO/2-3, 15 October 2019’

‘Concluding Observations on the Combined Second and Third Periodic Reports of Ecuador, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/ECU/CO/2-3, 21 October 2019’

‘Concluding Observations on the Combined Second and Third Periodic Reports of El Salvador, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/SLV/CO/2-3, 1 October 2019’

‘Concluding Observations on the Combined Second and Third Periodic Reports of Spain, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/ESP/CO/2-3, 13 May 2019’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Periodic Report of Hungary, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/HUN/CO/1, 22 October 2012’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Albania, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/ALB/CO/1, 14 October 2019’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Algeria, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/DZA/CO/1, 27 June 2019’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Argentina, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/ARG/CO/1, 8 October 2012’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Armenia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/ARM/CO/1, 8 May 2017’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Australia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/AUS/CO/1, 21 October 2013’

- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Austria, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/AUT/CO/1, 30 September 2013’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Azerbaijan, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/AZE/CO/1, 12 May 2014’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Belgium, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/BEL/CO/1, 28 October 2014’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/BIH/CO/1, 2 May 2017’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Bulgaria, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/BGR/CO/1, 22 October 2018’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Canada, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/CAN/CO/1, 8 May 2017’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Chile, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/CHL/CO/1, 13 April 2016’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of China, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/CHN/CO/1, 15 October 2012’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Colombia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/COL/CO/1, 30 September 2016’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Costa Rica, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/CRI/CO/1, 12 May 2014’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Croatia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/HRV/CO/1, 15 May 2015’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Cuba, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/CUB/CO/1, 10 May 2019’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Cyprus, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/CYP/CO/1, 8 May 2017’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Denmark, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/DNK/CO/1, 30 October 2014’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of El Salvador, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/SLV/CO/1, 8 October 2013’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Ethiopia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/ETH/CO/1, 4 November 2016’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Gabon, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/GAB/CO/1, 2 October 2015’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Greece, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/GRC/CO/1, 29 October 2019’
- ‘Concluding observations on the initial report of Germany, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/DEU/CO/1, 13 May 2015’

- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Guatemala, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/GTM/CO/1, 30 September 2016’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Haiti, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/HTI/CO/1, 13 April 2018’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Honduras, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/HND/CO/1, 4 May 2017’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of India, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/IND/CO/1, 29 October 2019’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Iraq, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/IRQ/CO/1, 23 October 2019’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Italy, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/ITA/CO/1, 6 October 2016’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Jordan, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/JOR/CO/1, 15 May 2017’
- ‘Concluding observations on the initial report of Kenya, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/KEN/CO/1, 30 September 2015’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Kuwait, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/KWT/CO/1, 18 October 2019’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Latvia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/LVA/CO/1, 10 October 2017’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Lithuania, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/LTU/CO/1, 11 May 2016’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Luxembourg, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/LUX/CO/1, 10 October 2017’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Malta, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/MLT/CO/1, 17 October 2018’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Mexico, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/MEX/CO/1, 27 October 2014’
- ‘Concluding observations on the initial report of Mongolia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/MNG/CO/1, 13 May 2015’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Montenegro, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/MNE/CO/1, 22 September 2017’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Morocco, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/MAR/CO/1, 25 September 2017’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Myanmar, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/MMR/CO/1, 22 October 2019’
- ‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Nepal, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/NPL/CO/1, 16 April 2018’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of New Zealand, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/NZL/CO/1, 31 October 2014’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Norway, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/NOR/CO/1, 7 May 2019’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Oman, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/OMN/CO/1, 17 April 2018’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Panama, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/PAN/CO/1, 29 September 2017’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Poland, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/POL/CO/1, 29 October 2018’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Portugal, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/PRT/CO/1, 20 May 2016’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Qatar, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/QAT/CO/1, 2 October 2015’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Rwanda, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/RWA/CO/1, 3 May 2019’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Saudi Arabia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/SAU/CO/1, 13 May 2019’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Senegal, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/SEN/CO/1, 13 May 2019’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Serbia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/SRB/CO/1, 23 May 2016’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Seychelles, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/SYC/CO/1, 16 April 2018’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Slovakia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/SVK/CO/1, 17 May 2016’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Slovenia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/SVN/CO/1, 16 April 2018’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of South Africa, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/ZAF/CO/1, 23 October 2018’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Sweden, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/SWE/CO/1, 12 May 2014’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Thailand, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/THA/CO/1, 12 May 2016’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of the Czech Republic, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/CZE/CO/1, 15 May 2015’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of the Dominican Republic, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/DOM/CO/1, 8 May 2015’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of the European Union, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/EU/CO/1, 2 October 2015’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/MKD/CO/1, 29 October 2018’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of the Niger, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/NER/CO/1, 1 May 2019’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of the Philippines, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/PHL/CO/1, 16 October 2018’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of the Republic of Korea, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/KOR/CO/1, 29 October 2014’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of the Republic of Moldova, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/MDA/CO/1, 18 May 2017’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of the Russian Federation, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/RUS/CO/1, 9 April 2018’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of the Sudan, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/SDN/CO/1, 10 April 2018’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of the United Arab Emirates, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/ARE/CO/1, 3 October 2016’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/GBR/CO/1, 3 October 2017’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Turkey, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/TUR/CO/1, 1 October 2019’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Turkmenistan, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/TKM/CO/1, 13 May 2015’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Uganda, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/UGA/CO/1, 12 May 2016’

‘Concluding Observations on the Initial Report of Vanuatu, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, CRPD/C/VUT/CO/1, 13 May 2019’

‘Council of Europe, The Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence, (Istanbul Convention), November 2014’

‘Council of Europe, Istanbul Convention, Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence, Steps in the First (Baseline) Evaluation Procedure’

<[‘Council of Europe, Istanbul Convention, Action against violence against women and domestic violence, Country monitoring work’](https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention/steps-in-the-first-baseline-evaluation-procedure#%221392012%22:[5]}></p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

<[>](https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention/country-monitoring-work)

‘Explanatory Report to the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence’ <<https://rm.coe.int/16800d383a>>

‘Feride Acar and Raluca Popa, From Feminist Legal Project to Groundbreaking Regional Treaty: The Making of the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence, *European Journal of Human Rights*, 2016/3’ 33

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Albania, GREVIO/Inf(2017)13, 24 November 2017’

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Austria, GREVIO/Inf(2017)4, 27 September 2017’

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Denmark, GREVIO/Inf(2017)14, 24 November 2017’

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Finland, GREVIO/Inf(2019)9, 2 September 2019’

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for France, GREVIO/Inf(2019)16, 19 November 2019’

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Italy, GREVIO/Inf(2019)18, 13 January 2020’

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Monaco, GREVIO/Inf(2017)3, 27 September 2017’

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Montenegro, GREVIO/Inf(2018)5, 25 October 2018’

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Netherlands, GREVIO/Inf(2019)19, 20 January 2020’

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Portugal, GREVIO/Inf(2018)16, 21 January 2019’

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Serbia, GREVIO/Inf(2019)20, 22 January 2020’

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Sweden, GREVIO/Inf(2018)15, 21 January 2019’

‘GREVIO’s (Baseline) Evaluation Report for Turkey, GREVIO/Inf(2018)6, 15 October 2018’

‘Gizem Guney, The Group of Experts under the Istanbul Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence and the ECtHR: Complementary or Contradictory Tools?’ (*EJIL: Talk!*, 31 March 2020) <<https://www.ejiltalk.org/the-group-of-experts-under-the-istanbul-convention-on-preventing-and-combating-violence-against-women-and-domestic-violence-and-the-ecthr-complementary-or-contradictory-tools/>>

‘Katrijn Dekoninck, Awareness Raising on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Contribution to the Council of Europe Strategy on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Council of Europe, June 2017’ 54

‘Mathias Möschel, Article 13, in: Sara De Vido and Adriana Di Stefano, The Istanbul Convention. A Commentary, Edgar Elgar, 2021, Forthcoming’

‘Organization of American States (OAS), Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment and Eradication of Violence against Women ("Convention of Belem do Para"), 9 June 1994’ <<https://www.oas.org/en/mesecvi/docs/BelemDoPara-ENGLISH.pdf>>

‘Organization of American States (OAS), American Convention on Human Rights, "Pact of San Jose", Costa Rica, 22 November 1969’
<<https://www.cidh.oas.org/basicos/english/basic3.american%20convention.htm>>

‘PACE - Recommendation 1804 (2007) - State, Religion, Secularity and Human Rights’
<<https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=17568&lang=en>>

‘Raising Awareness of Violence Against Women: Article 13 of the Istanbul Convention, A Collection of Papers on the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence, Karin Heisecke, Council of Europe, September 2014’ <<https://rm.coe.int/168046e1f1>>

‘Ulla Jurviste, Rosamund Shreeves, The Istanbul Convention: A tool to tackle violence against women and girls, European Parliamentary Research Service, December 2019’

‘UN General Assembly, Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 18 December 1979’

‘UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), General Recommendations Nos. 16, 17 and 18, A/46/38, 1991’

‘UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), General comment No. 3, Article 6: Women and girls with disabilities, CRPD/C/GC/3, 2016’

‘UN General Assembly, Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 24 January 2007, A/RES/61/106’ <https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/CTC/Ch_IV_15.pdf>

‘United Nations, Human Rights, Office of the High Commissioner, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities’
<<https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CRPD/Pages/QuestionsAnswers.aspx>>

‘United Nations, Human Rights, Office of the High Commissioner, UN Treaty Body Database, Human Rights Bodies, CRPD’
<https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/TBSearch.aspx?Lang=en&TreatyID=4&DocTypeID=5>

APPENDIX: RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE UN CRPD COMMITTEE ON HOW TO IMPROVE ITS MONITORING OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 8 BASED ON THE PRACTICE BY GREVIO

Given the growing recognition of the importance of awareness-raising and its fluency as a mechanism of prevention, it is to be expected that it will occupy even more space in both GREVIO and the Committee's upcoming reports or concluding observations. Even though GREVIO is a younger monitoring body, it had already established a significant practice in monitoring the implementation of its awareness-raising article. The author is of the opinion that the Committee should build upon the practice of GREVIO and issue a more in-depth comments on the awareness-raising situation in a particular State and structure its recommendations accordingly.

These are the eleven recommendations which the Committee might consider adopting:

1. Include comments on Article 8 in each of its concluding observations, without exceptions;
2. Pay more attention to whether and how States are conducting campaigns on local and regional levels, preferably using administrative indicator, and give recommendations, where applicable;
3. Continue monitoring whether States are implementing long-term, regular and comprehensive campaigns, as regards to promoting the content of the UN CRPD, rights of persons with disabilities, human rights-based approach, positive image of persons with disabilities and their contributions to the society, challenging and rebutting myths, stereotypes, stigmas, etc. surrounding persons with disabilities;
4. Clearly define which particularly vulnerable groups States need to target in order to increase level of awareness on their own rights and which groups States need to target in order to raise their awareness on the rights of the others and to provide them with the necessary training. Among the latter groups, prioritize sectors or professionals which are urgently in need of awareness-raising initiatives and training;
5. Continue addressing negative stereotypes, stigmas, prejudices and attitudes towards persons with disabilities, with a greater emphasis on multiple and intersectional discrimination and groups who are facing such discriminations;
6. Monitor whether States engage with organizations of persons with disabilities which operate on all levels (local, regional and national), in a pursue of a more diverse and in-depth collaboration;
7. Closely monitor whether the States evaluate the campaigns they report, what is the method they use in evaluation and whether it can be verified. Based on this information, welcome the successful awareness-raising initiatives, or recommend the ways to

improve. Recommend conducting regular surveys before, during and after carrying out the campaigns;

8. Include more comments on the funding, if noted that the States are not allocating sufficient funding to awareness-raising initiatives;
9. Enlist successful campaigns the States have carried out and commend them for their positive contributions towards implementing Article 8;
10. Use more supportive wording or expressions, where appropriate;
11. Adopt a General Comment on Article 8 to provide guidance to the States on how to improve in their implementation of Article 8.