



Home Office

ACE

Delivered by



TACKLING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS WITH AI

BRIEFING PACK





EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Violence against women and girls (VAWG) remains one of the most significant and complex public safety challenges facing the UK. While traditional interventions have focused on physical environments and criminal justice processes, the nature of harm has evolved. Abuse is increasingly digital, hidden, fast-moving, and spread across multiple agencies and systems. The Government's wider mission to make communities safer and rebuild trust in public services therefore demands a more proactive, data-driven and coordinated response. This work explores how Artificial Intelligence (AI) can support that ambition.

Through structured methodology, combining multi-agency problem capture, thematic analysis and expert validation, 87 operational challenges were identified and synthesised into 12 innovation focus areas. These areas reflect where AI has the greatest potential to improve prevention, early identification, risk assessment, safeguarding, victim support, and system learning. Opportunities range from detecting deepfakes and tackling online misogyny to improving dynamic risk modelling, enhancing frontline decision making, strengthening cross-agency information sharing and enabling more consistent, trauma informed victim experiences.

While AI is not a standalone solution, it can be a powerful enabler when used ethically and transparently. Realising these opportunities will require high quality data, shared standards, interoperable systems, and sustained collaboration across policing, government, health, social care, the justice system, and the third sector. Above all, any AI enabled intervention must be grounded in victim centred, trauma-informed design and uphold the rights, safety and dignity of women and girls.

This briefing provides a clear foundation for the next phase of work. With collective commitment and alignment to the Government's mission-led approach, these insights can help shape safer streets, stronger systems and more effective protection for women and girls across the UK.

**AROUND 1 IN 4 WOMEN HAVE
EXPERIENCED DOMESTIC ABUSE
SINCE THE AGE OF 16.**

(ONS Combined VAWG Measure)



ABOUT THE ACCELERATED CAPABILITY ENVIRONMENT (ACE)

The Accelerated Capability Environment (ACE) is a government-led organisation that helps public sector partners turn emerging technology into practical, operational capability, quickly, safely and responsibly.

ACE works at the intersection of policy, technology and frontline delivery, supporting government departments, law enforcement and wider public services to explore, test and deploy innovation where it can make the greatest real-world impact. This includes areas such as artificial intelligence, data, digital tools and new ways of working.

A core part of ACE's role is to reduce risk and accelerate learning. We do this by:

- **creating safe environments to trial new approaches**
- **bringing together multidisciplinary expertise across government, industry and academia**
- **focusing on practical use cases rather than theoretical solutions**
- **embedding ethical, legal and operational considerations from the outset.**

ACE has a strong track record of supporting sensitive and complex programmes, including work involving vulnerable groups, victim-centred services and high-trust data environments. Our approach is grounded in responsible innovation, ensuring that technology supports better outcomes for people while maintaining public confidence. We are delighted to be working with the Home Office on the Safer Streets mission on the programme exploring how violence against women and girls could be tackled by AI.



INTRODUCTION

Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) includes a spectrum of harmful behaviours, from domestic abuse and sexual violence to tech-enabled harms and online misogyny. Women and girls experience disproportionate levels of fear, coercion and harm in public, private and online spaces.

Recent years have seen:

- Increased reporting of spiking, stalking and digital abuse
- Growth of online misogynistic ecosystems
- Escalation in deepfake-enabled image abuse
- Strain across policing, probation, courts and victim services
- Erosion of trust among victims and communities.

Government strategies emphasise prevention, early intervention, system collaboration, and an improved victim experience.

In response to the challenges facing women and girls, the UK Home Office are working closely with the Accelerated Capability Environment (ACE) and have launched a commission to look at how AI could be used to tackle violence against women and girls:

C803: Harnessing AI to Tackle Violence Against Women and Girls

This briefing pack gives you an overview of our work and research done to date.

**1 IN 4 DOMESTIC ABUSE
PERPETRATORS ARE
REPEAT OFFENDERS
WITHIN A YEAR.**

(UK Probation Service and HMICFRS).



THE SAFER STREETS INITIATIVE — AND WHY IT MATTERS

The Safer Streets Mission is one of the Government's five core Missions, delivered by the Home Office to reduce serious harm and restore public confidence in policing and the criminal justice system. A central ambition of this Mission is to halve violence against women and girls (VAWG) within a decade while also tackling knife crime, anti-social behaviour, and strengthening neighbourhood policing

As the Government shifts towards a more prevention-led, data-driven approach to public protection, Safer Streets provides the local and national infrastructure through which these ambitions can be delivered. This is evidenced by the creation of Prevention Partnerships and the Young Futures Programme across England and Wales.

In line with this mission-led approach, recent work on Safer Streets have expanded to address the upstream and structural drivers of VAWG – the online ecosystems where misogyny grows, the gaps that prevent early identification of abuse, and the fragmentation that stops services acting as a single, coherent system.

The programme now explicitly supports work to prevent escalation, strengthen multi-agency co-operation, and rebuild confidence in reporting pathways. This aligns with ministerial commitments to reform policing, the implementation of the Neighbourhood Policing Guarantee, and the wider ambition to modernise public services and embed women's safety in national policy. And within this broader agenda, AI and data innovation play a critical enabling role, helping the system detect harm earlier, allocating resources more effectively and responding in a way that is trauma-informed and fair. Safer Streets is therefore not only about immediate crime prevention; it's a critical vehicle to deliver the Government's overarching mission to make Britain a safer place to live, particularly for women and girls.

**1 IN 3 GIRLS AGED 16-17
EXPERIENCE SOME FORM
OF RELATIONSHIP ABUSE**

(NSPCC)



WHY AI?

AI provides the UK with a powerful opportunity to strengthen how the system prevents, detects, and responds to violence against women and girls. Many forms of harm are captured across multiple agencies and digital environments, creating fragmented information that is difficult to join up or act on quickly.

AI can help identify risks earlier, spot patterns that would otherwise be missed and support frontline professionals with timely insight that improves decision-making and safeguarding. It also enables new protective capabilities, such as detecting deepfake images, mapping harmful online networks, and automating routine tasks so staff can focus on victims.

At the same time, AI is increasingly part of the problem. The accessibility of generative AI has enabled the rapid creation of deepfake sexual images, automated harassment, misogynist content, and much more, exposing women and girls to new forms of threat that evolve faster than traditional safeguards can respond. These emerging harms underline the urgency of responsible, ethical AI development that anticipates misuse and builds safety into systems from the outset.

Used responsibly and transparently, AI enhances, not replaces, professional judgement, helping move the system toward proactive prevention and supporting the Government's wider mission to modernise public services and make women and girls safer.

**REPORTS OF DEEPFAKE SEXUAL
IMAGES INCREASED BY 1,000%+
GLOBALLY BETWEEN 2019 – 2023
WITH WOMEN REPRESENTING
OVER 95% OF VICTIMS.**

(Deeptime)



THE APPROACH

The methodology for this work was designed to ensure a rigorous, inclusive, and evidence-driven process for identifying where AI could meaningfully support the UK's response to violence against women and girls. Given the complexity of the VAWG landscape and the number of agencies involved, the approach combined operational insight, technical expertise, and academic input to surface real-world challenges and shape credible innovation opportunities.

The methodology unfolded in three core stages:

1. Structured problem capture

2. Thematic analysis

3. Refinement of Innovation Focus Areas

Each stage was built on the one before it, ensuring that the final outputs were grounded in real operational needs, rooted in evidence, and validated by experts across disciplines.

1. Structured Problem Capture

The process began with a multi-agency workshop, built around Government Digital Service (GDS) discovery principles and Design Thinking, bringing together representatives from policing, government, the third sector, and safeguarding roles. Participants identified specific problems across three themes:

1. Detection, moderation & empowerment
2. Risk assessment & offender management
3. Multi-agency coordination

Each issue was documented using a standard template capturing the problem, evidence needs, desired outcomes, risks, data considerations, and cross-agency challenges. This ensured consistency and depth in how problems were articulated. In total, 87 problems were captured, providing a comprehensive picture of operational, digital, and systemic obstacles across the VAWG landscape.

2. Thematic Analysis

All problem statements were then analysed and grouped into broader parent problem clusters that reflected common drivers or recurring operational patterns. This mapping process ensured that no issue was lost: broad, systemic challenges and smaller emerging harms were both represented. The clusters formed the basis of early Innovation Focus Areas, translating a diverse set of individual problems into clearer, strategic opportunity domains.

3. Refinement of Innovation Focus Areas

A second workshop, involving academic and technical specialists, reviewed and stress-tested the draft Innovation Focus Areas. Participants considered the clarity of each area, its operational value, the risks and constraints associated with AI, and the enabling conditions required for success (such as data availability, interoperability, and governance). This stage strengthened definitions, validated feasibility, and ensured alignment with current evidence and best practice.



OUTCOME OF OUR APPROACH

Together, these stages produced a coherent and credible set of twelve Innovation Focus Areas, each grounded in real operational need and shaped by expert judgement. The methodology ensured breadth of input, clarity of problem definition, and confidence that the proposed areas for AI exploration are both high-impact and realistically deliverable within the wider mission to reduce VAWG.

INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 1:

AI-Enabled tools to combat Image Abuse & Deepfakes

INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 2:

Harmful Online Ecosystems & Algorithmic Exposure

INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 3:

Awareness, Education & Early Support

INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 4:

Emerging Threats & Safety by Design

INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 5:

Risk Management & Repeat-Offending

INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 6:

Operational Safeguarding & Frontline Decision Support

INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 7:

Cross-agency case management

INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 8:

Definitions, Standards & APIs (Application Programming Interface) Across Agencies

INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 9:

Reporting & Trust Restoration

INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 10:

System Learning & Policy Evaluation

INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 11:

Victim Experience & Communication Gaps

INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 12:

Spiking Detection & Prevention

**1 IN 14 ADULTS IN ENGLAND AND WALES
HAS EXPERIENCED IMAGE-BASED SEXUAL ABUSE.**

(Revenge Porn Helpline)



INNOVATION FOCUS AREAS



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 1:

AI-Enabled tools to combat Image Abuse & Deepfakes

Theme	Form of VAWG	Intervention Points
Detection, Moderation & Empowerment	Tech-enabled VAWG	Incident & Crisis Response; Protection & Ongoing Safeguarding; Recovery & Empowerment

CONTEXT

The ease of creating and sharing explicit images without consent (e.g. non-consensually shared images and deepfake pornography) has led to a surge in image-based abuse of women and girls. Problems identified in this area include the non-consensual sharing of intimate images (both real and AI-generated), the accessibility of AI tools to create deepfakes, and the lack of effective upload blocking and takedown in current systems. Victims (disproportionately women) suffer severe trauma and reputational damage as these images spread uncontrollably. Predators can now manipulate or create sexual images (deepfakes) of someone without consent, undermining trust online. While the Online Safety Act 2023, and forthcoming amendments, criminalise both the sharing and creation of explicit deepfakes, enforcement remains challenging. Tech platforms often struggle to identify and remove these images quickly, and cross-jurisdiction collaboration is weak, allowing abusers to exploit anonymity and global servers. Public and victim attitudes to deepfake VAWG are revealed in a recent nationally representative study conducted by Crest Advisory via ACE for the NPCC and the Home Office. In summary, intimate image abuse via technology is a growing crisis, with current systems ill-equipped to trace offenders or protect victims in real time.

Key drivers include accessibility of generative AI, rapid viral spread, anonymity in generation, and enforcement challenges. Impact: Victims lose agency over their own image, face harassment, extortion, and reputational damage, often with lifelong consequences.

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

20: Non-consensual sharing of images (AI & not); 3: Accessibility of AI to facilitate deepfakes; 82: Non-consensual image sharing (expanded context)

DESIRED OUTCOME

Dramatically reduce prevalence and impact of image-based sexual abuse through rapid detection, takedown, disruption of sharing networks, and robust victim support.

Intended impacts would be, an inability to generate or upload, rapid removal, reduced harm and humiliation, increased prosecutions and deterrence, restored online safety and trust, and a set global model for combating image-based abuse.

A successful solution would shut down the circulation of non-consensual intimate images quickly and at scale, provide faster takedown of content, hold perpetrators



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 1:

AI-Enabled tools to combat Image Abuse & Deepfakes

accountable, and offer better support to victims. Harmful networks that trade, or enable guidance on generation, of such content are disrupted, deter would-be offenders through higher risk of detection, and give victims more control (e.g. the ability to promptly remove images and access justice). Success means significantly reducing the prevalence of image-based sexual abuse and ensuring survivors feel protected rather than re-victimised by the system.

POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AI (NON-EXHAUSTIVE)

Detect and track non-consensual images via hash-matching databases, AI-driven crawlers to hunt content across platforms, AI to grade/characterise images, NLP to identify abusive patterns, AI-watermarking/poisoning of images, and automated victim reporting/takedown processes.

POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES

Hashed image databases (e.g., Revenge Porn Helpline), Images metadata, social media APIs, victim reports, Internet Watch Foundation and law enforcement datasets.

CONSTRAINTS

Data access and privacy (GDPR, Online Safety Act), need for cross-platform data sharing, continuous evolution to counter evasion tactics, and requirement for legal and educational measures alongside tech, perpetrators may collect, but not onward share, images.

RISKS

False positives/negatives, privacy and surveillance concerns, free speech and censorship issues, perpetrator adaptation and bias in detection models.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 2:

Harmful Online Ecosystems & Algorithmic Exposure

Theme	Form of VAWG	Intervention Points
Detection, Moderation & Empowerment	Tech-enabled VAWG; Stalking & Harassment	Early Warning & Identification; System Learning & Policy Evolution

CONTEXT

Digital platforms have become breeding grounds for misogyny and extremist ideologies. Key drivers include algorithmic amplification of harmful content, closed networks shielding actors, cultural regression in online discourse, and anonymity enabling impunity. These ecosystems can radicalise individuals, escalate harassment into real-world violence, and perpetuate gender inequality at scale.

This innovation focus area addresses the toxic digital environments and recommendation systems that foster violence and hate against women. Problems identified here include phenomena like the “manosphere” and extremist forums that radicalise boys and men (spreading misogynistic ideology), the risk of AI as a bad actor (for instance, bots or algorithms automatically generating harmful content), broader cultural shifts that legitimise online abuse, social media algorithms that unintentionally amplify extreme or hateful material, and the difficulty of tracking anonymous perpetrators who operate behind screens. In essence, certain online ecosystems (from mainstream platforms to fringe sites) create echo chambers of misogyny. Harmful content (such as; harassment, glorification of sexual violence, stalking, doxxing) can go viral with algorithmic boosting, making it seem normalised. Women and girls who have multiple intersecting characteristics are at a higher risk, for example those from ethnic minority groups, the LGBTQ+ community, or those living with disabilities. Encrypted or closed groups allow abusive content to circulate “facelessly,” so crimes like online stalking or threats often escape law enforcement’s notice. The faceless nature means perpetrators feel emboldened due to anonymity and jurisdictional complexity. Current moderation struggles to keep up: biased AI moderation sometimes fails to catch coded misogyny or over-censors legitimate speech. The context is a rapidly evolving digital culture where harmful norms can spread globally in minutes, so traditional reactive approaches are insufficient.

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

4: Manosphere; 10: “AI as a Bad Actor”; 12: Cultural shift; 16: Social media algorithms; 23: Inability to track faceless VAWG crimes; 40: Detecting fake accounts & grooming online

DESIRED OUTCOME

Healthier digital spaces that hinder VAWG harms, reduced exposure to misogynistic content, early detection and intervention, and a shift in online norms



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 2: Harmful Online Ecosystems & Algorithmic Exposure

toward respect and safety.

The goal is to curtail the exposure to and impact of harmful online content on women and girls, and counteract misogynistic narratives before they translate to violence. Success would mean online algorithms no longer amplify or profit from misogyny, instead they might dampen it or elevate counter-speech. Toxic communities would be disrupted or diminished, reducing the recruitment into extremist misogynistic ideologies. Success looks like a healthier online ecosystem where women and girls can engage without facing routine abuse, and where societal norms shift, hateful content becomes harder to find and less socially acceptable. Platforms might report decreases in the prevalence and reach of VAWG-related hate content, and any such content that does appear is quickly flagged and addressed. Transparent accountability by social platforms on this type of content, making tools available for researchers and external auditors to evaluate harms.

POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AI (NON-EXHAUSTIVE)

Monitor and moderate content at scale, AI assisted moderation based on user reporting, detect hate speech and radicalisation patterns, graph analysis of harmful networks, algorithmic audits and tuning for safety, and identification of coordinated harassment and bot activity.

POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES

Social media data and algorithmic logs, OSINT from forums and extremist sites, NGO, Police digital forensics logs (metadata on device extractions, Cybercrime reporting datasets, Tech platform trust & safety datasets (including takedown response metrics), and academic research on online harms.

CONSTRAINTS

Data access (platform secrecy, encryption, legal barriers), privacy and free expression concerns, technical scale and adaptability of harmful actors, and global jurisdictional differences, required international collaboration.

RISKS

False positives (censorship) and false negatives, biased moderation (e.g. risk of reinforcing bias if systems overlearn from disproportionate reporting), easy to overcome safeguards providing minimal value, overreach and surveillance concerns, and driving harmful actors to harder-to-monitor spaces.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 3:

Awareness, Education & Early Support

Theme	Form of VAWG	Intervention Points
Detection, Moderation & Empowerment	Domestic Abuse; Tech-enabled VAWG	Early Warning & Identification; Protection & Ongoing Safeguarding

CONTEXT

A significant share of abuse remains hidden because victims and bystanders fail to recognise early warning signs. Drivers include normalisation of harmful behaviours, missed signals by support networks, and limited education on consent and healthy relationships. As an impact of this risk victims could endure prolonged harm, and potential perpetrators escalate unchecked, perpetuating cycles of abuse. This innovation focus area centres on the knowledge and recognition gap around abuse, and the need for early-stage support systems. Problems highlighted under this umbrella include difficulty identifying children as victims of domestic abuse (or other VAWG) by individuals and local organisations, a general lack of public awareness about what constitutes abuse (many women “don’t know they are victims” or downplay serious warning signs), lack of available or known support for those at risk, situations where early warning signs are missed by professionals, and challenges specific to adolescent culture that may normalise or hide abuse (e.g. teen dating violence or harmful behaviours spread online). Younger victims more likely to know the perpetrator, which can be a barrier for self-reporting. Without early recognition, opportunities to intervene (school counselling, community support, low-level police action) are missed, allowing abuse dynamics to escalate to crises.

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

2: Identifying children as victims; 6: Early ID of problematic behaviour in youth; 7: Lack of awareness (behaviours = abuse); 8: Lack of support (for those exposed); 11: People don’t know they are victims; 21: Adolescence culture (abuse in schools); 70: Early interventions (peer-on-peer); 72: Early warning signs missed

DESIRED OUTCOME

Empowered individuals and communities recognising abuse early, increased early reporting and intervention, and a preventative culture reducing VAWG prevalence.

Success in this domain means more people recognise abuse early and seek help before crises occur. Concretely, desired outcomes include empowered victims and potential victims; individuals who understand their experiences (or those of peers) as unacceptable and feel confident to report or get support. It also includes preventing escalation: catching abusive situations at an early stage rather than after serious injury or trauma. In a successful scenario, reporting of early-stage incidents would increase, and those reports would lead to effective help



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 3:

Awareness, Education & Early Support

(counselling, warnings to perpetrators, etc.), thereby stopping many cases from turning into severe violence. The result would be fewer victims “falling through the cracks”: ideally reducing the number of serious abuse cases that, in hindsight, had clear warning signs that were ignored.

POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AI (NON-EXHAUSTIVE)

Personalised educational tools (chatbots, quizzes), analyse trends in youth attitudes and slang, signal detection for early warning in schools/services, and optimise awareness campaigns using data insights.

POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES

Prior Academic research, surveys, safeguarding hubs, NHS data, helpline data, social media trends among youth, and educational content repositories.

CONSTRAINTS

Limited curriculum space and institutional priorities, trust and privacy concerns for youth engagement, cultural sensitivity and diversity, and fragmented safeguarding data. Fragmented data, limited digital literacy/skills among frontline professionals.

RISKS

Misidentification and stigmatisation, privacy breaches, over-reliance on AI signals, cultural bias and lack of tailored content, and lack of human follow-up, relying on past data may mean interventions are not targeting new and emerging forms of violence against women and girls.

EVERY MONTH,
1,200 – 1,600 UK CASES
OF INTIMATE IMAGE
ABUSE ARE REPORTED.

(Revenge Porn Helpline)



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 4: Emerging Threats & Safety by Design

Theme	Form of VAWG	Intervention Points
Detection, Moderation & Empowerment	Tech-enabled VAWG; VAWG in Different Spaces	Early Warning & Identification; System Learning & Policy Evolution

CONTEXT

Emerging technologies, such as smart wearables, AR/VR environments, and AI-driven platforms, are transforming daily life, but they are also creating new vectors for abuse that existing safeguarding frameworks cannot anticipate. Unlike traditional online harms, these risks are embedded in physical-digital hybrids: smart tech in homes, smart glasses enabling covert surveillance, location-based apps facilitating stalking, and exploitation in immersive environments. Problems identified in this cluster include the absence of safety-by-design principles in product development, fragmented industry standards, and a lack of foresight mechanisms to predict future VAWG threats. Offenders can move seamlessly between IoT devices, AR/VR environments, creating a higher risk of harm for women and girls. Drivers include rapid innovation cycles, commercial pressure to prioritise speed and user engagement over safety, and global jurisdictional complexity that hampers enforcement. Victims face unprecedented risks (coercive control through connected devices, exploitation in virtual spaces, and systemic erosion of privacy) while law enforcement and regulators remain locked in a cycle of ‘catch-up.’ Without proactive measures, society risks normalising abuse in emerging tech ecosystems, leaving victims unprotected and perpetrators emboldened.

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

42: Safety by design not established (emerging tech); 68: Foresight on future VAWG threats.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

A proactive, resilient technology ecosystem where safety is embedded from design to deployment, and emerging threats are neutralised before they scale. Fewer ‘tech surprise’ abuses, increased public confidence in innovation.

Success means developers adopt mandatory safety-by-design frameworks, regulators enforce compliance globally, and cross-sector collaboration enables continuous horizon scanning for new abuse patterns. In practice, this looks like AR/VR/social media platforms with built-in harassment detection, designed with forensic-ready systems, wearables with privacy safeguards, and AI systems audited for misuse potential before launch. Victims can engage with innovation without fear, and agencies have predictive tools to intervene early. The system shifts from reactive to future proof; anticipatory, reducing harm, restoring trust, and setting a global benchmark for ethical tech development.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 4:

Emerging Threats & Safety by Design

POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AI (NON-EXHAUSTIVE)

AI-driven foresight engines to model future abuse scenarios, automated compliance audits for safety standards, and pattern recognition to detect coercive behaviours in emerging platforms, monitoring for new methods of harm in police reports, near real time AI generated anonymous synthetic data for investigation of new harms.

POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES:

Horizon-scanning reports, tech adoption analytics, ethical design benchmarks, historical data on tech misuse, police data, accounts of abuse through either self-disclosure to forums e.g Reddit.

CONSTRAINTS:

Industry resistance to regulation, global coordination challenges, and balancing innovation with privacy and user autonomy.

RISKS:

Over-regulation stifling innovation, misidentification of threats leading to false alarms, disabling of safety features, uneven/biased protection, privacy concerns in monitoring emerging technologies, legislation not keeping up with new forms of harm, trust in safeguards.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 5: Risk Management & Repeat-Offending

Theme	Form of VAWG	Intervention Points
Risk Assessment & Offender Management	Domestic Abuse; RASSO; Honour-Based Abuse	Early Warning & Identification; Perpetrator Management

CONTEXT

Current risk assessment tools can fail to predict escalation effectively and the changing landscape of VAWG. Drivers include static models, blind spots for coercive control and tech-enabled abuse, fragmented data, and poor model validation. The Impact of this is a potential for high-risk victims to fall through cracks, and repeat offenders evade detection until severe harm occurs. This focus area is about enhancing how risk of harm is assessed in domestic abuse, sexual offences, and related crimes, making predictions more accurate and catching dangerous patterns (like repeat offenders) earlier. The problems identified in this area signal multiple issues: “risk is dynamic” risk levels change rapidly with circumstances, but current tools might be too static; criminal activity escalation, minor incidents often precede major violence, yet the escalation patterns aren’t captured; data quality issues: the information fed into risk tools can be incomplete or inconsistent; risk assessments not capturing all types of abuse (for example, focusing on physical violence but overlooking coercive control or tech-enabled abuse); repeat offenders slipping through: if lower-level offences aren’t tracked or linked, a serial perpetrator might not be flagged; prevention patterns not well defined: lack of models that integrate prevention data; and fragmentation of risk assessments across agencies leading to missed signals. In practice, agencies use tools like DARA (Domestic Abuse, Risk Assessment), or various models to gauge if a victim is at high risk of serious harm. However, these tools have known limitations; they can produce false negatives (missing truly high-risk cases) or false positives (overestimating risk, which can strain resources). Many tools are based on fixed checklists and might not incorporate real-time updates (e.g., a change like a perpetrator losing a job could spike risk, but unless someone updates the form, the tool won’t know). Data silos exacerbate this: police might not see health or social services data that signal escalating risk, and vice versa. Also, certain forms of VAWG like “honour-based abuse” or tech stalking may not be well represented in models that were built primarily on domestic violence cases, leading to blind spots.

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

14: Risk is dynamic; 17: Criminal activity escalation; 18: Data quality (risk assessments); 26: Risk assessments capture all types; 24: Prevention patterns (is X illegal?); 28: Repeat offenders; 48: Risk assessments don’t flag early; 49: Tools lack evidence base; 50: ‘Lower’ offences not tracked; 52: Fragmented risk assessments; 58: Risk signals missed



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 5: Risk Management & Repeat-Offending

DESIRED OUTCOME

Accurate, dynamic risk grading, early identification of high-risk victims and offenders, targeted interventions, fewer severe repeat incidents, and efficient resource allocation.

Risk assessment frameworks with supported AI tools that are far more accurate, comprehensive, and proactive, leading to earlier interventions for high-risk cases and more effective monitoring of repeat perpetrators. A successful outcome would be truly dynamic risk indicators, risk scores or flags that update in near-real-time as new information comes in (e.g., if a new incident, however minor, is reported, or if an offender's circumstances change, the system automatically adjusts risk level). This would enable practitioners to intervene early, perhaps upgrading a case from standard to high risk before a tragedy occurs, and thus allocating more resources or protection (like a proactive visit or protective order). Another outcome is that repeat offenders are reliably identified and tracked, even if their offences span different areas or types. That means if someone has a history of serially abusing multiple partners, the system "identifies" this and ensures each new case involving them is tagged high risk and managed accordingly, rather than being treated as a first-time one. This should result in better allocation of services: high-risk victims get intensive support and monitoring, while lower-risk cases (or false alarms) don't consume disproportionate resources or intrusive interventions. Improved risk tools would give victims and the public more confidence, if victims see that minor reports lead to meaningful preventative actions, they might be more willing to come forward earlier.

POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AI (NON-EXHAUSTIVE)

Machine learning to detect complex escalation patterns, algorithms informed by AI in their design, continuous risk score updates from multi-source data, NLP to mine case notes and call transcripts, predictive analytics for unique offender linkage across data sources, and resource prioritisation.

POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES

Police incident logs, DASH/DARA assessments, criminal history, probation and prison data, MARAC records, HES data, social care data, domestic homicide reviews.

CONSTRAINTS

Data siloing across agencies, bias in historical data, legal limits on algorithmic decision-making, infrastructure and practitioner trust issues.

RISKS

False negatives leading to fatalities, false positives causing unnecessary interventions, automation bias and loss of human judgment, over reliance on AI, poor explainability/transparency, bias due to training on incomplete data, ethical concerns around predictive policing.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 6:

Operational Safeguarding & Frontline Decision Support

Theme	Form of VAWG	Intervention Points
Risk Assessment & Offender Management	Domestic Abuse; RASSO	Incident & Crisis Response; Protection & Ongoing Safeguarding

CONTEXT

First responders are at risk of making decisions with incomplete or overwhelming data. Drivers include lack of real-time context, information overload, and legal gaps for child protection in domestic abuse scenarios. Misjudgements lead to victims left in danger or unnecessary escalation. This innovation area focuses on information gaps and cognitive overload that first responders (like police officers, especially) face when handling domestic abuse or sexual violence incidents in the field. Identified problems include scenarios such as police protection orders for children not being readily accessible to officers on scene, an officer arriving at an incident with little context about prior history or risk factors. When responding to a domestic call or interviewing a victim at the hospital, the frontline personnel might not know crucial details, for example, that this address had multiple prior calls, or that a court order exists barring the suspect from contact, or the identity of a high-risk child inside. Without this, their decisions can be suboptimal. Conversely, modern systems are generating more data (bodycam footage, databases etc.) which can overwhelm if not filtered. The frontline also includes not just police, but emergency healthcare workers or social workers in immediate response, they too may miss information. Some information exists but not integrated, e.g., an officer might have to separately check a criminal database, a child welfare system, and paper files to piece together context, which is impossible in real-time.

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

9: Protection orders for children (legislation gap); 22: Officer lacks context; 47: First responders lack timely info; 80: Officer has too much/too little data

DESIRED OUTCOME

Fully informed, rapid safeguarding decisions, increased use of protective measures, reduced repeat callouts, and improved victim confidence.

Frontline decision-makers need to be well-informed and supported in real time, leading to better safeguarding decisions and faster response to protect victims. That means when a first responder is dispatched or arrives on scene, they immediately have a contextual risk summary: a concise, reliable briefing of any pertinent info (e.g. “Caution: subject has prior strangulation incident, a child present is on a child protection plan, multiple past calls from this address, high DASH/DARA risk last month”). Another outcome is alleviating cognitive overload: providing information in an easy-to-digest way (perhaps via a mobile app or during a briefing call over the radio from the operator) such that responders aren’t sifting



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 6:

Operational Safeguarding & Frontline Decision Support

through lengthy reports while at a volatile scene. Ideally, the solution also ensures consistency of response. Two officers in different towns responding to similar situations both get quality info and make similarly informed choices (e.g. preserve key digital evidence when needed), rather than it depending on local knowledge. For victims, it means not having to repeat their whole story to each new officer, the first responder can say “I see you’ve called us before and there’s an ongoing case, let me help with that in mind...”, which builds trust.

POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AI (NON-EXHAUSTIVE)

Real-time data synthesis for risk briefings, NLP to flag lethality indicators in live interactions, prioritisation and decision recommendations, and bodycam/video analysis for injuries or child presence.

POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES

Police databases (PND, local logs, case summaries), court orders, MARAC info, social services and health records, bodycam and call transcript data.

CONSTRAINTS

Fragmented IT systems and poor connectivity, data-sharing limits, training and cultural resistance, cost and scalability challenges.

RISKS

Technical failure or over-reliance on AI, data inaccuracies causing misjudgement, privacy breaches and misuse of sensitive info, liability and ethical concerns, an agentic solution risks no-human in the loop, Incomplete data picture due to limited data sharing minimising risk.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 7: Cross-agency case management

Theme	Form of VAWG	Intervention Points
Risk Assessment & Offender Management	Domestic Abuse; Tech-enabled VAWG	Perpetrator Management; System Learning, Cross Stages

CONTEXT

Offenders exploit systemic fragmentation to reoffend. Drivers include disjointed systems, no universal tracking, and manual data sharing. As a result, there is a risk that serial abusers slip through gaps, breaching orders and harming new victims. This focus area is about bridging gaps between agencies (police, courts, prisons, probation, social services, and other systems) so that offenders who commit violence against women and girls are managed continuously and consistently. Identified problems highlight issues like the lack of a joined-up approach, agencies often work in silos rather than as one system. There are limited or no data sharing standards, meaning one agency's database might not communicate with another's. For instance, a local police force may record domestic violence cases one way, the prison service another, and they can't automatically cross-reference. Also, some offenders cannot be tracked across platforms or jurisdictions: a perpetrator banned on one social media platform or convicted in one region might just move to another, exploiting the fragmentation. The problem includes when offenders move between areas or system, e.g. from prison back to the community, information about their risk or conditions doesn't always follow seamlessly. Another aspect, if an offender has multiple facets (like domestic abuse and online stalking), those might be handled by different units (police vs. cyber-crime units) that aren't linked. Legacy systems and incompatible IT in law enforcement and justice make it technically hard to share data. Cross-agency coordination suffers; multi-agency forums do exist, but without good data feeds, they rely on manual updates which can miss things. Platforms like social media have their own data on harassment or abuse, rarely shared with police due to privacy and policy differences, so an offender could be abusing someone online and that does not factor into their risk assessment by authorities. As a result, opportunities to intervene are lost.

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

27: "Joined-up approach" (no single crime system); 19: Limited/no data sharing standards; 55: Cannot track offenders across agencies; 56: Offenders move between platforms; 53: Court data doesn't support MAPPA alerts; 64: International offender data sharing gap

DESIRED OUTCOME

Seamless offender management across agencies, real-time updates on breaches and movements, and national visibility of high-risk offenders.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 7:

Cross-agency case management

The goal is a seamless, unified offender management system across agencies, where information flows efficiently and offenders cannot hide or exploit data gaps. Integrated case management where multi-agency teams see the same picture and collaborate effectively, leading to timely actions. Continuous monitoring is one desired outcome, meaning as an offender moves through the criminal justice system (from first report to conviction to release and beyond), there's a persistent record that can be updated and accessed by all relevant stakeholders.

POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AI (NON-EXHAUSTIVE)

Entity resolution across disparate systems, predictive alerts for mobile/high-risk offenders, unified search and alert platform, and workflow automation for compliance and notifications.

POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES

Police, court, prison, probation, MAPPA databases, specialised offender registers (e.g., VISOR), international systems (Interpol, Europol), NHS data, pre-sentencing report count.

CONSTRAINTS

Legacy systems and incompatible formats, legal/privacy barriers to data sharing, funding and political will, human resistance and alert fatigue.

RISKS

Data breaches and misuse, misidentification of individuals, over-surveillance and civil liberties concerns, action pathways not mapped ahead of deployment may mean option to intervene missed, technical failures disrupting operations.

**OVER 50% OF GIRLS AGED 11-21
SAY THEY FEEL UNSAFE ON SOCIAL MEDIA
BECAUSE OF MISOGYNIST CONTENT.**

(Girlguiding UK Girls' Attitude Survey)



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 8:

Definitions, Standards & APIs (Application Programming Interface) Across Agencies

Theme	Form of VAWG	Intervention Points
Multi-Agency Coordination	All forms of VAWG	System Learning & Policy Evolution, Cross Stages

CONTEXT

Inconsistent definitions and incompatible IT systems cripple collaboration and analytics. Drivers include different data languages, legacy systems, and manual reporting. The impacts of this include the potential for policy decisions based on incomplete or inaccurate data, slow multi-agency case handling, and opaque national trends. This innovation areas focuses on the foundational infrastructure of data and communication across the many entities tackling violence against women and girls (VAWG). The current landscape is fragmented: each of the 43 police forces, plus national bodies, health services, NGOs, etc., may use different definitions and categorisations for similar incidents. For example, what one force calls “domestic abuse - harassment” another might log as “stalking,” and a third might split categories differently. Without common standards, implementing any coordinated strategy or technology is significantly hampered. This stems in part from lack of standard exchange or documentation. Additionally, no common; data standards, metadata standards, data dictionaries, or APIs means automation is difficult; any sharing is bespoke, manual or slow. Without addressing it, efforts at multi-agency intervention, machine learning risk models, etc., all face friction.

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

30: Reporting categorisation (VAWG definitions); 35: Consistent system (all agencies); 31: Unknown data existence (no multi-agency flag); 36: Disparate datasets hinder analysis; 73: IT systems not compatible; 74: Antiquated systems (CPS/courts); 78: No consistent system; 65: Data not formulaically categorised; 1: Signal sharing across agencies (Lantern analogy); 46: Lack of VAWG data (scale, nature, location); 59: Crime recording rules hide VAWG element; 60: PND not single source of truth

DESIRED OUTCOME

Common data standards and definitions, APIs enabling real-time data exchange, and unified reporting and analytics for policy and operations.

The aim is to establish common definitions, data standards, and technical interfaces (APIs) that enable smooth data exchange and unified understanding across all agencies dealing with VAWG. Concretely, desired outcomes include having a shared taxonomy for key terms e.g., all police forces and partners agree on what counts as “domestic abuse” vs “sexual assault” vs “stalking” and use those terms uniformly in reports. It also means standardising data fields: for



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 8:

Definitions, Standards & APIs (Application Programming Interface) Across Agencies

instance, a victim's and offender's details, incident time/location, type of violence, risk level, etc., have the same format everywhere (maybe via a national data dictionary). This would enable interoperability, systems talking to each other with minimal friction, and enable development of API standards, akin to how banking has open APIs; here agencies would have endpoints to securely share or request data in real-time. Faster data exchange is a key outcome, what took weeks could be done in minutes via automated systems because of standardisation. This supports not just operational needs such as requests under Clare's law, but also policy and analysis, enabling evidence-based decisions with reliable comparative data.

POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AI (NON-EXHAUSTIVE)

Schema mapping and legacy data tagging, AI generated ontologies, NLP to standardise historical records, intelligent query layer for cross-agency analytics, and anomaly detection for data consistency.

POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES

Police, CPS, court, social services schemas, ONS definitions and international standards, legacy system documentation.

CONSTRAINTS

Jurisdictional autonomy and resistance, technical complexity and cost, security and privacy compliance, risk of oversimplification in standardisation.

RISKS

Data breaches and cascading failures, poor adoption or shadow systems, loss of nuance in standardisation/matching, misinterpretation of transitional data.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 9: Reporting & Trust Restoration

Theme	Form of VAWG	Intervention Points
Multi-Agency Coordination	All forms of VAWG	Early Warning; Incident Response; Recovery

CONTEXT

Victims avoid formal reporting due to distrust and poor experiences. Drivers include low confidence in police, fragmented reporting pathways, and poor feedback loops. Impact: Underreporting perpetuates abuse cycles and critical intelligence is lost. Many victims of VAWG are reluctant to report incidents to the police or formal authorities due to lack of trust and cumbersome processes. Instead, they may confide in friends, seek help from NGOs (third-sector organisations like domestic violence charities), or even share experiences anonymously on online forums or social media. This focus area addresses that multi-channel reporting landscape: currently, if a victim reports somewhere other than directly to police, that information often stays siloed and doesn't feed into the justice system or a holistic support pathway. Victims face a disjointed system; multiple doors (police, helplines, GP, women's refuge, etc.) that don't connect well, forcing them to repeat their story or not get comprehensive support. The challenge is both cultural (trust, empathy) and technical (integrating multiple reporting channels). The context also acknowledges third-sector and online platforms have emerged to fill gaps, which is positive for survivors getting help.

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

32: Trust in police is low; 33: No feedback (victim experience); 15: Culturally informed policing for HBA; 39: Frontline misunderstanding & trust gap; 75: Trust likely to go to online platforms; (76: Victim/public experiences – merged with 33).

DESIRED OUTCOME

Victim-centred, multi-channel reporting, seamless integration of NGO and police data (with consent from the victim, or anonymously to support understanding of the scale of VAWG), and continuous feedback and trust-building.

The aim is to restore trust in official systems while creating a seamless reporting experience that spans police, healthcare, NGOs, and digital platforms, without eroding trust in NGO's. A seamless experience would entail no wrong door for reporting; however someone reaches out, they're connected to the broader support and justice system. A primary desired outcome is increased victim confidence and engagement with reporting processes, measured by more victims coming forward to either police or affiliated channels, and fewer dropping out. Reporting options need to be convenient, safe, and responsive to victim needs.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 9:

Reporting & Trust Restoration

POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AI (NON-EXHAUSTIVE)

Smart triage and routing of reports, chatbots for anonymous reporting, sentiment analysis of victim feedback, and deduplication and case-linking across channels.

POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES

NGO case logs, GP data, Hospital episode statistics, police reports, social media (including dating apps) and public forums, victim feedback surveys and portal analytics.

CONSTRAINTS

Consent and privacy in data sharing, resource limits for expanded channels, cultural resistance and digital divide, security of new reporting platforms.

RISKS

Mismanagement of new channels harming trust, privacy breaches and impersonation risks, overload of reports without capacity, misinterpretation of social media signals, misclassification as a perpetrator or a victim. Chatbots may inadvertently reinforce harmful patterns or generate harm, defined decision points for acting on information not in place ahead of deployment.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 10: System Learning & Policy Evaluation

Theme	Form of VAWG	Intervention Points
Multi-Agency Coordination	All forms of VAWG	System Learning & Policy Evolution

CONTEXT

Policy and practice lack robust evidence and feedback loops. Drivers include siloed data and research, limited quality assurance, and slow adoption of proven interventions. Impacts of this may include resources being misallocated, ineffective policies persist, and frontline performance varies widely. VAWG strategies and interventions should be guided by evidence and learning, but often there's a disconnect between policy making and on-the-ground evidence. The problems identified indicate that data and lessons from the system aren't being effectively gathered or fed back. For instance, frontline services might experiment with approaches (e.g. a new program for perpetrators or a pilot of body cams), but the outcomes aren't consistently measured or pulled through to inform wider policy. Analysis of how officers handle cases or how prosecution decisions are made, is manual and may miss key data, missing patterns that AI could spot. Additionally, innovations or community successes in addressing VAWG might not be known outside local areas due to lack of knowledge sharing (e.g., one council finds a great method to help stalking victims, but others reinvent the wheel). Summarily, the system isn't "learning" as a whole entity; instead, pockets of good practice or failure points remain siloed. The risk is policies being made that are not informed by a complete data landscape. Without strong feedback loops, it's unclear whether a new law or procedure has reduced VAWG. And if it isn't working, is there a mechanism to detect this and make adjustments?

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

34: Poor evidence pull-through; 37: AI assist QA; 77: Policy made without evidence; 67: Not all datasets considered (need 3rd sector data).

DESIRED OUTCOME

Evidence-based policy and continuous improvement. Faster, smarter policy adaptation, consistent high-quality victim support, reduced variation in practice across regions, and a learning system that evolves continuously.

A continuously improving system where policies and practices are solidly evidence-based, with rigorous Quality Assurance (QA) of services and closed-loop learning. Initiatives such as training programs, a new law like making strangulation a specific offense, or a pilot court for DA cases should be accompanied by data collection and evaluation, with results directly informing whether they are scaled up, modified, or discontinued. Drawing learning from other sectors such as healthcare where evidence-based practice and continuous audit are standard.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 10: System Learning & Policy Evaluation

Another sign would be the reduction of variation, if evidence says method X is best, we'd see more uniform adoption of X across regions rather than multiple approaches being used.

POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AI (NON-EXHAUSTIVE)

Automated performance monitoring and anomaly detection, NLP to audit case notes and interactions, synthesis of multi-source evidence for policy, scenario modelling, machine learning, and predictive modelling for intervention impact.

POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES

Case records, outcome metrics, academic research and NGO reports, victim feedback and satisfaction surveys.

CONSTRAINTS

Data quality and fragmentation, analytical expertise and cultural resistance, privacy and ethical considerations, funding and institutional inertia.

RISKS

Misinterpretation of AI-driven insights, over-focus on measurable metrics vs qualitative factors, defensive reactions to performance audits, bias in data shaping policy, ongoing model maintenance skills gaps.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 11:

Victim Experience & Communication Gaps

Theme	Form of VAWG	Intervention Points
Multi-Agency Coordination	Domestic Abuse; RASSO;	Incident Response; Recovery

CONTEXT

Victims navigating the justice and support system do not all receive the support they need, with victims in some areas facing confusion, poor communication, and added trauma. Problems include lack of clear, timely information, repeated retelling of traumatic stories, and inaccessible updates. Drivers include fragmented case management, limited victim liaison capacity, and absence of standardised communication protocols. This can result in victims disengaging, cases collapsing, and trust in authorities diminishes.

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

5: Wellbeing support barrier to prosecution; 29: No end-to-end victim risk accountability; 38: Inaccessible court transcripts; 41: Victims unclear process; 69: Survivors repeatedly share stories; 71: Hidden harm missed; 85: Justice delays increase attrition; (81: Victims unaware – merged with 11 in awareness)

DESIRED OUTCOME

An end-to-end, trauma-informed journey where victims feel informed, supported, and respected at every step. Higher victim engagement, improved emotional outcomes, and greater trust in justice systems.

Success means consistent regular updates, single points of contact (with smooth handover if this changes), and streamlined storytelling processes. Victims experience improves via clarity, improving engagement and justice outcomes.

POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AI (NON-EXHAUSTIVE)

AI-powered platforms for personalised updates, real-time translation, and automated case tracking to reduce repetitive disclosures.

POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES

Case tracking systems, victim liaison logs, support service data, and user experience surveys.



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 11:

Victim Experience & Communication Gaps

CONSTRAINTS

Data privacy and consent, system interoperability, and resource limitations for training and support.

RISKS

Errors in automated communication, missing important information, privacy breaches, inequity in access to digital tools, and interaction with AI may impact people seeking help due to low trust in AI.

IN THE YEAR ENDING MARCH 25,
**12.8% OF WOMEN IN THE UK HAD
EXPERIENCED AT LEAST ONE
OF DOMESTIC ABUSE,
SEXUAL ASSAULT OR STALKING.**

(ONS Combined VAWG Measure)



INNOVATION FOCUS AREA 12:

Spiking Detection & Prevention

Theme	Form of VAWG	Intervention Points
Detection & Moderation	RASSO; Tech-enabled VAWG	Early Warning; Protection

CONTEXT

Spiking, surreptitious drugging in nightlife settings, remains a largely hidden epidemic, disproportionately affecting women and rarely captured through formal reporting. Incidents are hard to detect, underreported, and rarely tracked systematically, allowing perpetrators to act with impunity. Problems include lack of real-time detection, fragmented reporting, and absence of coordinated prevention strategies. Impact: victims suffer severe harm, venues lose public trust, and law enforcement struggles to respond effectively.

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

25: Spiking incidents

DESIRED OUTCOME

An environment where spiking is swiftly detected, reliably reported, and proactively prevented. Reduced spiking incidents, increased public confidence, and cultural shift toward proactive safety.

Success means real-time detection tools, increased reporting, and coordinated multi-agency response. Nightlife becomes demonstrably safer, restoring public confidence.

POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AI (NON-EXHAUSTIVE)

AI analyses incident patterns, powers real-time detection via CCTV and sensors (e.g. wearables), and streamlines reporting workflows, natural language contextual analysis of incident reports.

DATA SOURCES

Police, hospital, and ambulance data; social media reports; venue licensing data; CCTV data, sensor outputs, wearables.

CONSTRAINTS

Technical limitations it is a complex task for AI in video analytics, privacy concerns, and resource constraints for venue compliance.

RISKS

Over-surveillance, false accusations, and adaptation by offenders.



CROSS CUTTING CONSIDERATIONS



CROSS CUTTING CONSIDERATIONS

As opportunities for AI in tackling VAWG are explored, a set of cross-cutting considerations must guide all design and delivery. These are essential to ensuring solutions are safe, ethical and effective within such a highly sensitive, high stakes environment.

Ethics & rights

AI must uphold the rights, dignity, and safety of women and girls. Poorly designed systems risk reinforcing bias, misclassifying victims or automating decisions that should remain under human judgement. Ethical use therefore requires transparency, meaningful human insight and safeguards against unfair or unsafe outcomes. Given the potential impact of false positives and false negatives in VAWG contexts, AI must be deployed cautiously and with accountability.

Data quality

AI can only be as reliable as the data it draws on. VAWG data is often incomplete and inconsistently recorded, and is often fragmented across agencies. Without improvements in data capture, definitions and governance, AI systems may reflect or amplify existing gaps. High quality, well-structured data is therefore a prerequisite for trustworthy AI in this space.

Interoperability

Many of the most impactful AI opportunities rely on data flowing safely and consistently across policing, health, social care, courts, probation, and third sector services. Today, these systems are rarely compatible. Established common standards, shared taxonomies and secure APIs is essential to avoid AI becoming siloed or ineffective. Interoperability needs to be a foundational enabler, not a technical afterthought.

Victim-centred design

All AI enabled interventions must strengthen, not weaken, the experience for victims. Tools should minimise re-traumatisation, and reduce the need to repeat information, supporting clear, consistent communication. Solutions should be trauma-informed, accessible, and empower victims rather than imposing additional burden. AI must enhance safety, trust, and dignity at every stage.



| CONCLUSION



CONCLUSION

This work brings together the insights, expertise and lived realities of those across the VAWG system to identify where AI can make the greatest difference. The Innovation Focus Areas outlined here provide a clear, evidence-led foundation for future exploration, offering opportunities to prevent harm earlier, strengthen safeguarding, improve coordination and rebuild trust.

Delivering on this ambition will require continued collaboration, shared standards and a commitment to placing women and girls at the centre of system change. By working together, we can turn these insights into meaningful progress, helping to create a safer, more resilient future for women and girls across the UK.

HANDLING INFORMATION

As activity within the Safer Streets: Tackling Violence Against Women and Girls with AI programme is designed to align with data protection legislation and established best practice around privacy, security, and ethical use of information. We take a proportionate, risk-based approach to information handling, ensuring that data is only shared where necessary, for clear purposes, and with appropriate safeguards in place.

As part of the Vivace Community, all partners formally sign up to our data protection and privacy policy.

For organisations or individuals who wish to engage with this work but are not yet part of the Vivace Community, we would expect a non-disclosure agreement to be in place as a first step. This ensures that information can be shared safely while longer-term participation or partnership arrangements are explored.

This approach enables collaboration and innovation while maintaining the highest standards of care for people's information and the trust placed in the Safer Streets programme.



APPENDIX



Forms of Violence Against Women and Girls

SAFER STREETS WORKSHOP



Home Office

ACE

Delivered by
vivace

FORMS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS (VAWG)

DEFINITION/DESCRIPTION

DOMESTIC ABUSE	A pattern of controlling, coercive, threatening, degrading, or violent behaviour, including physical, emotional, sexual, financial, and tech-enabled abuse. This may also include or be referred to as intimate partner abuse.
RASSO	Rape and Serious Sexual Offences, including rape, attempted rape, sexual assault, and other serious sexual crimes.
CSEA	Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse involves grooming, coercion, and manipulation of children into sexual activity, often for exchange or trafficking.
MODERN SLAVERY & HUMAN TRAFFICKING	Exploitation through forced labour, sexual exploitation, servitude, or criminal activity. Victims may be trafficked across borders or within the UK.
HONOUR-BASED ABUSE	Violence committed to protect or defend the honour of a family or community, including forced marriage, FGM, and 'honour' killings.
STALKING & HARASSMENT	Persistent and unwanted attention causing fear or distress, including following, messaging, threats, intimidation, exposure, 'upskirting', and voyeurism.
TECH-ENABLED VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS	Abuse facilitated through digital means such as cyberstalking, cyberbullying, image-based abuse, online harassment, and use of spyware or tracking apps. This includes non-consensual intimate imagery (NCII), 'revenge porn', and abusive deepfakes.
VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS IN DIFFERENT SPACES	Occurs in public (e.g. street harassment), private (e.g. domestic abuse), and online spaces (e.g. social media abuse)
SPIKING	The act of adding drugs or alcohol to someone's drink or injecting them without consent, often with intent to assault or exploit.



Home Office

ACE

Delivered by
vivace



VAWG Intervention Points





Home Office

ACE

Delivered by

