Funded by
the European Union

INIDI

INSTITUTE FOR WAR & PEACE REPORTING

IWPR

ИНСТИТУТ РЕПОРТАЖЕЙ ВОЙНЫ И МИРА

White Paper

This publication was funded by the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of IWPR and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.

2026

Author: Aigerim Kussaiynkyzy

REINTEGRATION OF WOMEN AFTER RELEASE:

Barriers, Success Factors and Measures to Strengthen Probation in the Republic of Kazakhstan

About the Author

Aigerim Kussaiynkyzy is a gender expert and legal researcher working at the intersection of constitutional law, equality principles, and the implementation of state gender policy. She is a Senior Lecturer at Maqsut Narikbayev University in Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan, and is involved in academic governance and quality assurance processes, including course development, assessment, and internal regulatory frameworks.

Her research focuses on legal mechanisms of non-discrimination, the reintegration of women after deprivation of liberty, and digital rights and gender-based violence in the online environment. In her professional practice, she combines academic analysis with applied projects, developing training modules and policy-oriented recommendations for institutions and partners with a focus on measurable social impact.

About the Public Association «Centre for Development and Social Assistance to the Population «My Home»

The core mission of the Public Association «Centre for Development and Social Assistance to the Population «My Home» is to mobilise women's communities and carry out awareness-raising work in the areas of women's rights, gender equality, women's empowerment, and the prevention of violence against women and girls. For more than 20 years, the organisation has provided support to women exposed to stigma and discrimination and has developed practical assistance mechanisms for women and children who have experienced violence.

The Public Association «My Home» places particular emphasis on developing a sustainable referral system and intersectoral cooperation between state and non-state actors providing services to survivors. Since 2014, the organisation has operated a crisis centre for women with children, functioning as specialised infrastructure in the form of a separate two-storey building. The centre provides comprehensive assistance in situations of violence and life crises.

The organisation's priorities include the prevention of social risks, including family breakdown and social orphanhood. It also implements initiatives aimed at reducing factors that contribute to self-destructive behaviour and family crises.

Key areas of work include the accompaniment of women and girls who have experienced various forms of violence, including violence perpetrated by representatives of law enforcement agencies; support for women in difficult life situations; assistance to women released from places of deprivation of liberty; and support for other stigmatised groups of women.

In parallel, the organisation works with professional target groups involved in preventing and responding to gender-based violence, including representatives of the judiciary, law enforcement agencies, prosecution authorities, and social protection institutions.

The organisation has substantial experience in institutional participation and advocacy. Its team is represented in interdepartmental councils and working commissions under the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the National Commission on Women, Family and Demographic Policy. It also participates in the Association of Business Women, is a member of the Civil Society Advisory Group of UN Women in Kazakhstan, and is part of the Union of Crisis Centres of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The organisation's staff are also involved in the work of the National Preventive Mechanism and municipal commissions. This strengthens dialogue with state stakeholders and expands opportunities to advance human rights and counter discriminatory practices.

ABOUT IWPR

IWPR (Institute for War & Peace Reporting) *amplifies the voices of local communities, helping them drive change in countries experiencing conflict, crisis, and transition. Where hate speech and propaganda spread, and journalists and civil society activists are under attack, IWPR promotes credible information and fosters public discussions that truly matter. In a context where new forms of disinformation are fueling societal divisions, digital threats are growing, and attacks on journalists are increasing, IWPR's mission to support local voices is especially vital.*

The organization's main goal *is to strengthen the flow of reliable and objective information, enabling journalists and civil society to inform, educate, and mobilize communities. IWPR helps societies find their own solutions by strengthening their capacity in journalism and civic activism, and by supporting the fight for accountability, freedom of expression, and human rights.*

About the European Union

The European Union *is an economic and political union of 27 European countries. It is based on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law, and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. It acts globally to promote sustainable social, environmental, and economic development for the benefit of all.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction

The penitentiary framework in the Republic of Kazakhstan is characterised by a significant number of persons held in institutions of the penal enforcement system and in pre-trial detention facilities. This objectively creates sustained demand for mechanisms of resocialisation and post-penitentiary support.

During public discussion of the draft amnesty law dedicated to the 30th anniversary of the Constitution, media reports noted that «more than 40,000 persons» were held in 63 penal enforcement institutions and 16 pre-trial detention facilities, including «33,000 convicted persons and 7,000 persons under investigation and arrest».

At the same time, a significant burden is also observed in the area of probation supervision. As of the end of 2023, open sources citing the Ministry of Internal Affairs reported that 28,463 persons were registered with the Probation Service. In 2025, public communications also referred to approximately 27,900 persons on probation records. The key normative basis is the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan «On Probation». It defines probation as a system of activities and individually determined measures of a supervisory and social-legal nature, aimed at correcting behaviour and preventing offences, including in relation to persons released from places of deprivation of liberty. Accordingly, the legal logic of probation cannot be reduced to supervision alone. As conceived by the legislator, probation combines control with social and legal support. It should therefore be understood as an instrument of legal policy in the field of preventing reoffending.

THE REINTEGRATION OF WOMEN RELEASED FROM PLACES OF DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A COMPLEX FIELD IN WHICH THE FOLLOWING DIMENSIONS INTERSECT:

human rights guarantees, including access to housing, employment, medical and social assistance, and protection from discrimination;

the objectives of penal enforcement policy, including correction and the prevention of reoffending;

the obligations of the state to ensure effective mechanisms of social adaptation.

FACTORS THAT HINDER SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATION, IN LEGAL TERMS, OPERATE BOTH AS BARRIERS TO ACCESS TO RIGHTS AND SERVICES AND AS CRIMINOGENIC RISKS THAT INCREASE THE LIKELIHOOD OF RENEWED INVOLVEMENT IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM. THESE FACTORS INCLUDE:

- housing shortages, lack of registration and identity documents, which in practice block access to employment and social services;
- discriminatory practices in the labour market related to criminal record status, amounting de facto to restricted equal access to employment;
- breakdown of family ties and loss of support, including issues related to contact with children;
- the psychological consequences of imprisonment and mental health vulnerabilities, requiring accessible medical and social services;
- addictions, as a factor contributing to reoffending and social disadvantage.

International specialised guidelines on the health care of women in places of deprivation of liberty and during release emphasise the higher prevalence of mental health issues among women prisoners and the need to ensure continuity of care, including social and medical support, during the transition from institution to community.

In 2025, the amnesty dedicated to the 30th anniversary of the Constitution was initially assessed as a measure potentially covering up to 15,000 persons, through a combination of release from custody and sentence reduction.

According to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, as of October 2025, 1,770 convicted persons had already been released from places of deprivation of liberty, including 135 women. A further 2,240 persons had received sentence reductions. In addition, 2,507 persons registered with the Probation Service had been released from punishment.

By January 2026, it was reported that more than 2,000 persons had been released under the amnesty, while more than 11,000 persons had received sentence reductions. From a legal perspective, amnesty is an act of humanism and an element of criminal policy. However, its social effectiveness depends on a second layer: the readiness of the probation system and inter-agency services to ensure the legally envisaged social-legal component of support.

Otherwise, a legal risk arises whereby the state has «released the person — and formally fulfilled the requirement», while the objective of preventing reoffending remains only partially achieved.

Given the scale of the population within the penal enforcement system and the significant number of persons registered under probation supervision, reintegration — particularly the reintegration of women - requires probation to be understood not as a departmental control procedure, but as an intersectoral legal mechanism for the realisation of rights and the prevention of reoffending within the meaning of the Law «On Probation».

In practical terms, this means prioritising legally measurable «access points»: identity documents and registration, housing, employment, medical and social assistance, and anti-discrimination safeguards — at least during the initial adaptation period following release.

1.1. Purpose of the Document

This document has been prepared to assist state authorities in implementing the constitutional principle of respect for human rights and human dignity, and in ensuring the effective resocialisation of women after release.

Based on field research materials — including surveys conducted in penal enforcement institutions, expert interviews, and official responses from state authorities — the document proposes practical, measurable, and implementable measures aimed at improving the effectiveness of post-penitentiary support and strengthening the social component of probation.

The research instrument expressly establishes the lawful framework for the use of information: the data are not intended for individual intervention and are used only in aggregated form to improve probation practice. In particular, the questionnaire states that «all data will be used only in aggregated form...» and further emphasises that they are used «...to improve the work of the Probation Service of the Republic of Kazakhstan...».

Accordingly, this White Paper is oriented towards systemic change: improving access to services, removing administrative barriers, and institutionalising inter-agency mechanisms that enable probation to perform not only supervisory, but also social and legal functions.

1.2. Methodology

The research area for this project was Karaganda Region of the Republic of Kazakhstan, selected as a territory with a sustained burden on penitentiary and probation infrastructure, as well as the presence of a target group of women who had been held in places of deprivation of liberty and/or registered with the Probation Service.

The study covered two institutional dimensions: institutions of the penal enforcement system and the Probation Service, particularly in relation to the support provided to women after release and the implementation of individually determined social and legal measures.

The methodological approach was designed to establish an evidence base for this White Paper on the factors hindering the reintegration of women with criminal records and on the challenges of implementing legislative norms. This included release procedures and subsequent support mechanisms, as well as the application of the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan «On Probation», taking into account the 2022 amendments, and related procedures under the Penal Enforcement Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

1.3 Object of the Study

THE OBJECT OF THE STUDY WAS THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES OF ACTORS INVOLVED IN THE PROCESS OF RESOCIALISING WOMEN AFTER DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY, INCLUDING:

- administrations of penal enforcement institutions, in relation to preparation for release, document processing, transfer of information, and assistance with referral;
- the Probation Service, in relation to registration, the development and implementation of individually determined social and legal measures, and inter-agency routing;
- related state actors, including law enforcement agencies and prosecution authorities, in relation to supervision, coordination, and response practices regarding identified problems.

The subject matter of the study included barriers to the integration of women with prior convictions, such as housing, registration, identity documents, employment, access to services, stigma, and risks of reoffending.

It also covered the legal deficiencies affecting the removal of these barriers, including gaps in regulation, insufficient legal certainty of norms, inconsistency of procedures, and the formalistic performance of institutional duties.

1.4. Data Collection and Analysis

To examine the social and institutional-legal dimensions of reintegration, the study applied a mixed-methods research methodology based on the triangulation of data sources: surveys, interviews, and official responses from state authorities.

Quantitative Component: Survey

Over a period of three months, a structured survey was conducted with N=200 women, including:
— women held in places of deprivation of liberty;
— women registered with the Probation Service of Karaganda Region.

The questionnaire was designed to identify factors affecting successful integration after release, including access to identity documents and registration, housing situation, employment, access to social and medical services, experience of interaction with the Probation Service, and perceived effectiveness of individually determined social and legal measures.

Qualitative Component:
Semi-Structured Interviews and In-Depth Interviews

In parallel, expert interviews were conducted with representatives of relevant state authorities at the level of department heads and specialised professionals, including representatives of:
— the penitentiary system / Committee of the Penal Enforcement System;
— the Probation Service;
— prosecution authorities;
— law enforcement agencies.

The interviews made it possible to identify actual procedures for release and subsequent support, practices for implementing individually determined social and legal measures, inter-agency gaps, resource constraints and areas of discretion, as well as typical cases of formalistic application of the requirements of the Law «On Probation».

Documentary Component:
Official Requests and Responses from State Authorities

To clarify and legally substantiate the issues identified, official correspondence was conducted with the relevant public authorities. As a result, written responses were received from state bodies. These responses were used as an independent source of data and made it possible to record the official position on matters of law enforcement and implementation practice.

By comparing official positions with empirical data, the study identified instances of legislative gaps, insufficient legal certainty of certain provisions, as well as shortcomings in subordinate regulation and departmental procedures.

Analytical Processing and Legal Qualification

THE ANALYSIS WAS BASED ON A COMPARISON OF EMPIRICAL FINDINGS WITH NORMATIVE REQUIREMENTS — DE JURE VERSUS DE FACTO — AND INCLUDED:

descriptive statistics based on the survey results, including frequencies and proportions of key barriers;

thematic coding of interviews, identifying stable patterns and «bottlenecks» in law enforcement and implementation practice;

legal qualification of the identified problems as gaps in regulation, insufficient certainty of legal norms, inconsistency between regulatory legal acts and procedures, and defects in implementation practice, including the formalisation of measures and the absence of inter-agency routing.

The methodology resulted in the formation of an evidence base for the White Paper and the development of legally feasible recommendations for changing the implementation practices of probation and penitentiary system actors.

Participation by respondents was voluntary. Informed consent, confidentiality, and depersonalisation of data were ensured. Questions were formulated in neutral terms, and respondents were given the opportunity not to answer individual questions without any consequences.

The survey materials confirm that the reintegration of women after release does not depend on a single factor, but on a sequence of interrelated conditions that the state system should ensure as a unified route: restoration of identity documents and registration, access to services, safe accommodation, lawful income, employment, health and psychological stability, and family-related matters where necessary and subject to safety considerations.

From a human rights perspective, this concerns access to basic social rights and guarantees without discrimination or stigmatisation. In the absence of identity documents and registration, actual access to services often becomes merely formal: a person «has the right» but cannot exercise it in practice.

This creates conditions in which a woman is compelled to rely on informal survival mechanisms, including unstable accommodation and informal employment, thereby increasing the risk of renewed vulnerability and the loss of stable social ties.

The first 30–90 days are of particular importance, as this is the period during which the adaptation trajectory is formed. The questionnaire records varying degrees of readiness for this transition and a corresponding need for support.

The response options expressly included the following formulations:

«YES, WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF THE ADMINISTRATION»;
«NO, I DO NOT KNOW WHERE TO START»;
«NO, I DO NOT THINK ABOUT IT».

This response is significant not as an emotional remark, but as an indicator of a law enforcement risk. The absence of an identifiable «entry point» into the support system objectively reduces the likelihood of effective social and legal assistance and weakens the preventive function of probation, transforming it predominantly into a control-based regime.

From a legal perspective, such a situation points to insufficient procedural certainty in the provision of assistance. Even where the normative objective of supporting resocialisation and reducing reoffending is formally established, the outcome depends on whether the person has access to an accessible, predictable, and manageable mechanism for receiving assistance «from day one».

The statement «I do not know where to start» effectively means that the addressee of the measures does not see, or does not understand, the route: who is authorised, where to apply, in what procedure, within what time limits, what documents are required, and what the expected outcome of support should be.

Accordingly, this constitutes evidence in favour of introducing regulated case management as a mandatory element of post-penitentiary support.

1.5. Post-Release Risks Identified by Participants

The research instrument directly records a list of anticipated difficulties after release, allowing for multiple responses. In particular, the questionnaire includes the following options: «search for housing», «search for employment», «registration and restoration of documents», «acceptance by society», «reunification with family», and «psychological insecurity».

FOR STATE AUTHORITIES, WHAT MATTERS IS NOT ONLY THE LIST ITSELF, BUT ALSO ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE.

Documents and registration constitute the entry point to services. If this stage is not completed, other guarantees become difficult to access in practice.

Housing and income are key conditions of stability. Without them, the risk of repeated victimisation and dependence on an unsafe environment increases.

Acceptance by society, or stigma, is a factor that cannot be eliminated by an administrative order alone.

Family-related issues require an individualised approach. Restoration of family ties is possible only where safety is ensured and the best interests of the child are taken into account.

Psychological stability is not an optional measure provided «upon request»; it is a condition for maintaining a life plan, preserving employment, and sustaining effective interaction with support services.

1.6. High-Level Recommendations

1) A unified support pathway during the first 90 days after release

The state should ensure not episodic referrals to separate agencies, but a coordinated pathway that includes an initial needs assessment, an action plan, monitoring of procedural steps, and minimum time limits for implementation. Given that the questionnaire recorded the need of some women for assistance at the initial stage, support should be available from the first days after release and should be result-oriented.

2) Documents and registration as a priority legal step

The accelerated restoration of identity documents and resolution of registration issues should be formalised as a mandatory inter-agency procedure. The basis for this priority is the questionnaire's direct reference to the risk of «registration and restoration of documents». It is recommended to assign a responsible support specialist and establish a unified package of requirements in order to prevent repeated applications and institutional «looping» from one authority to another.

3) Employment and lawful income as measurable outcomes, not consultations

The questionnaire directly identifies «search for employment» as an anticipated difficulty. Therefore, the measure should be assessed not by the number of consultations or interviews conducted, but by actual employment, participation in training, and retention of employment. Support must continue until a tangible result is achieved. This requires engagement with employers and mechanisms to reduce stigma in recruitment.

4) Housing as a condition of safety and stability

Given that «search for housing» is identified as one of the key risks, temporary solutions are required for the first 30–90 days after release, including social and crisis centres and partner accommodation facilities. A clear mechanism should also be established for transition to stable accommodation. Without basic housing, probation supervision becomes objectively difficult to implement and the risk of renewed vulnerability increases.

5) Medical and psychological assistance as a standard module of post-penitentiary support

The questionnaire includes «psychological insecurity» as an anticipated difficulty. Accordingly, needs screening and referral to specialised services should be embedded into the support pathway. Access to such services should be ensured during the first weeks after release, including through priority appointment windows and referral mechanisms.

6) Inter-agency cooperation regulation: unified timelines, responsible persons, and information exchange

To eliminate the gap between legal norms and actual practice, a regulation is required that clearly establishes who is responsible for each step of the pathway, within what time limits each action must be performed, how information is transferred, and who bears responsibility for the outcome.

The state system should operate as a single, coordinated mechanism of public authority, ensuring continuity in the consideration of applications, inter-agency connectivity, and personal responsibility for results. It should not function as a set of fragmented formal receptions and procedures that fail to constitute a unified framework for the protection of rights.

2. Context and Law Enforcement Issue

2.1. Legislative Requirements for the Socialisation of Persons after Release within the logic of the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan «On Probation»

Under the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan «On Probation», probation is constructed not as departmental supervision, but as a system of activities and individually determined measures of a supervisory and social-legal nature, designed to prevent repeated criminal offences.

Probation is a legally established system of measures, not supervision for the sake of supervision. The Law defines probation as a set of supervisory and social-legal measures aimed at correcting behaviour and preventing reoffending.

The intended outcome of probation is the resocialisation and social adaptation of released persons. The normative purpose of probation is formulated through the protection of public safety by means of the resocialisation of convicted persons, as well as the social adaptation and rehabilitation of persons released from institutions of the penal enforcement system.

The Law envisages a two-component model of implementation: supervision and social-legal assistance. Official explanations confirm that probation is implemented not only through control, but also through measures of assistance and support — namely social-legal assistance — for persons subject to probation.

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPETENCES: PROBATION «ORGANISES AND SUPPORTS», WHILE ASSISTANCE «IS PROVIDED». THE LEGAL MODEL OF DISTRIBUTION OF ROLES IS AS FOLLOWS:

- the Probation Service carries out probation supervision and facilitates access to social-legal assistance;
- social-legal assistance is provided by local executive bodies and other authorised structures within their respective competences.

Social-legal assistance is a regulated set of services, not an optional consultation. The procedure and content of social support are specified in the relevant rules at the level of subordinate regulation. Such assistance includes specific areas of support and procedural algorithms for interaction among the relevant actors.

Accordingly, the state obligation is fulfilled only when both elements operate jointly. Supervision without assistance does not achieve the purpose of the Law, while assistance without the organising framework of probation does not ensure the sustainability of the outcome.

In the legal system of the Republic of Kazakhstan, probation is institutionally constructed as a comprehensive mechanism combining elements of supervision over the performance of imposed obligations and social-legal support for persons registered with the Probation Service.

In this sense, probation operates not only as an instrument of supervision, but also as a channel of resocialisation, presupposing access to support measures and the restoration of social rights and ties.

The Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan «On Probation» establishes the basic regulatory framework: it defines the concept and purpose of probation, formulates its goals and objectives, sets out the principles of its functioning, and determines the types of probation and the general architecture of powers of authorised bodies and participants in the process.

Subordinate regulation further specifies the procedural framework of the social component. It approves the rules for providing, and facilitating access to, social-legal assistance for persons in respect of whom probation supervision has been established, as well as for other categories covered by the relevant normative provisions.

The Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan «On Probation» establishes probation not as a supervisory function, but as a system of supervisory and social-legal measures aimed at correcting behaviour and preventing repeated offences.

It follows from the purpose and objectives of the Law that the state is obliged to ensure comprehensive support for a person after release. Law-abiding behaviour must be secured not only through control, but also through access to social adaptation and rehabilitation measures.

LEGAL REGULATION PROVIDES FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNCTIONS AMONG ACTORS

- The Probation Service implements probation supervision and organises the application of individually determined measures, including referral of the person to receive social-legal assistance and coordination of interaction.

- Local executive bodies and other authorised organisations ensure the provision of social-legal assistance in the areas set out in the rules approved by the Government.

At the first level, it is assessed whether the actions directly required by legislation and subordinate acts have been performed and whether they are documented.

AT A MINIMUM, THE FOLLOWING MUST BE ASSESSED

- 1. Individualisation of measures
  Whether a specific and implementable package of measures and actions has been developed for the person registered under probation supervision, rather than merely a formal recording of status.

- 2. Referral into the service system
  Whether the person was referred to local executive bodies and organisations to receive the assistance provided for by law, including training, employment support, and other forms of support.

- 3. Inter-agency coordination
  Whether there is evidence of interaction between the Probation Service and local executive bodies, such as requests, responses, and notifications confirming the provision or impossibility of providing assistance.

In the absence of such evidence, the issue is one of improper performance of procedural obligations, that is, a defect in law enforcement and implementation practice.

At the second level, it is assessed whether the measures taken have produced the results for which they were established by law: social adaptation, rehabilitation, and reduction of reoffending.

LEGALLY SIGNIFICANT INDICATORS INCLUDE

- employment and/or vocational training after release;
- restoration of identity documents and registration procedures as a condition for access to rights and services;
- actual receipt of social-legal assistance in the areas provided for by the relevant rules;
- reduction of repeated offences among persons under probation supervision.

Where formal actions have been performed, but these results are not achieved systematically, this indicates either procedural uncertainty and inconsistency of regulation, or institutional defects in implementation. Such defects may include inter-agency gaps, the absence of mandatory minimum actions, and insufficient mechanisms for actual referral.

Under the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan «On Probation», the state is obliged to ensure a unified mechanism of probation supervision and social-legal assistance: the Probation Service carries out supervision and organises support, while local executive bodies and authorised organisations provide assistance in accordance with the established rules.

2.2. Law Enforcement and Implementation Issue

Despite the normative recognition of social-legal assistance as an equivalent component of probation, the most vulnerable point in implementation practice remains the interface between probation support and external service systems: registration and identity documents, housing, employment, medical and psychological assistance, and family-law matters.

The key risk is caused not so much by a lack of legal regulation, but by a gap in the implementation mechanism. Registration of a person with the Probation Service — that is, formal registration, the establishment of probation supervision, and the determination of obligations and support conditions — does not in itself ensure actual access to social-legal assistance.

As a result, the legal status of a person registered under probation supervision remains formal and is not converted into access to the services necessary for social adaptation. For women, this gap is intensified by gender-related vulnerability factors, which place an increased burden on the probation mechanism and expose its inter-agency limitations. These factors include:

- a disproportionately high risk of losing housing and registration;
- the breakdown of family ties and the risk of losing contact with children;
- more frequent prior experience of violence and related psycho-emotional consequences;
- pronounced stigma in the labour market and within the community;
- the need for simultaneous access to several types of assistance — social, legal, medical, and psychological — provided by different actors without a unified support pathway.

IN THE REINTEGRATION OF WOMEN, THE FOLLOWING ISSUES ARE OF PARTICULAR IMPORTANCE:

- responsibility for children and the need to restore family ties, including matters of guardianship, contact, and other legally significant relationships with the child;
- stigmatisation and related restrictions on actual access to employment and housing, including distrust on the part of employers and landlords, as well as informal barriers;
- increased need for medical and psychological support, including in view of traumatic experience and the need for longer-term accompaniment;
- risks of repeated victimisation, including domestic violence, as well as the reproduction of economic dependency as a factor increasing the likelihood of unsafe life strategies and secondary marginalisation.

As a result, the legally envisaged social-legal component of probation de facto depends on the quality of inter-agency cooperation and the existence of an end-to-end support pathway. Without such a pathway, probation risks being reduced to a control function, thereby losing its declared resocialisation effectiveness.

2.3. Data Analysis

The current model of resocialisation for women after release formally combines supervision and social-legal assistance. However, according to the questionnaire data, the key law enforcement and implementation risks are concentrated at the interface between support and external services: employment, housing, identity documents and registration, psychological adaptation, and family-related issues.

As a result, social-legal assistance is often perceived as formal rather than effective: 45% of respondents assessed the work of the Probation Service as «average» — predominantly supervisory; 17% assessed it as low, citing insufficient support; and only 38% assessed it as high, referring to real assistance.

According to the survey results, the core of the sample consisted of women of working age: 31–40 years — 44%, 21–30 years — 28%, 41–50 years — 20%, and other age groups, including women under 20 and over 50, accounted for 8%. Thus, the prevailing category comprises women in the most active period of economic independence and potential employment. In the presence of a criminal record, this directly increases the importance of probation measures focused on labour and social adaptation.

A pronounced factor of family responsibility was also recorded: 72% of respondents had minor children. In legal terms, this indicator qualifies as a sign of heightened social vulnerability and, at the same time, as an indicator of the increased public significance of effective reintegration, since it concerns the realisation of related rights and obligations, including access to social support, stable income, housing stability, and the restoration of family ties.

The sample is characterised by the combination of two key features: working age and motherhood. This requires the probation mechanism to provide not formal supervision, but properly resourced inter-agency support capable of ensuring actual access to the services necessary for stable social adaptation.

The family status of respondents was distributed as follows: 58% identified as single, divorced, or widowed, while 32% were in a registered or de facto marriage. This ratio has direct significance for assessing reintegration potential: the predominance of women without stable family support increases the likelihood of housing and economic instability in the post-penitentiary period and strengthens dependence on the availability of state and municipal social assistance mechanisms.

The high proportion of mothers, combined with the predominance of women of working age, creates an increased burden on the reintegration mechanism. The need for lawful income and safe housing arises immediately, and if unmet under conditions of stigma and social pressure, it increases the risk of secondary marginalisation and renewed involvement in a criminogenic environment.

For this group, therefore, the key issue is not the formal status of being «registered under supervision», but the actual availability of an inter-agency pathway: housing, employment, access to services, and support in restoring family ties.

The educational profile of respondents was characterised by levels that limit access to the competitive labour market: secondary specialised education — 46%, general secondary education — 41%, and higher education — 13%. Taken together, this means that the overwhelming majority of participants had either basic or applied qualifications requiring targeted support in employment, including career guidance, training, skills validation, and employment accompaniment.

Employment status prior to criminal prosecution demonstrated a structurally weak connection with the formal labour market: informal employment — 52%, unemployment — 33%, and formal employment — 15%. Thus, 85% of women were outside a stable legal employment framework. In legal and social-administrative terms, this means the absence or minimisation of social guarantees, including stable income, pension and social contributions, insurance coverage, labour rights, and protection against arbitrary dismissal.

The predominance of informal employment and unemployment indicates a systemic deficit of stable life strategies, formalised labour skills, and access to social guarantees. In the post-penitentiary period, this becomes a factor of increased risk: upon release, women must secure income and basic stability within a very short time, while criminal record status, stigma, and a weak employment history objectively restrict access to lawful employment.

Accordingly, the effectiveness of probation for this group should be assessed by the system's capacity to ensure an actual transition into formal employment and access to social-legal assistance measures, rather than by the formal fact of registration with the Probation Service.

The assessment of detention conditions was distributed as follows: 76% of respondents described the conditions as «good/satisfactory», while 24% described them as «unsatisfactory». This indicator is relevant for the legal assessment of compliance with standards of treatment. However, it does not in itself exhaust the issue of readiness for release and subsequent adaptation, since key reintegration risks are shaped not only by the quality of the regime, but also by health status, support resources, and access to services.

Requests for assistance demonstrated the priority of immediate support measures: psychological support — 65%, medical assistance — 42%, and legal consultations — 18%. Thus, the leading request was psychological support, indicating a high need to restore psycho-emotional stability before release and during the first months after release.

The mental health of women in the post-penitentiary period cannot be treated as a «private matter» or an optional service. On the contrary, with a request rate of 65%, it becomes a systemic condition for the effectiveness of resocialisation. Without accessible psychological assistance, the implementation of individually determined social-legal measures becomes more difficult, while the risks of behavioural breakdowns, family and community conflicts, and return to destructive social ties increase.

Therefore, the effectiveness of probation and inter-agency support must be assessed not only by the formal performance of supervisory procedures, but also by the actual provision of continuous psychological and medical-social support as a component of preventing reoffending.

According to the survey results, the key barriers to reintegration were distributed as follows: employment — 68%, including refusals related to criminal record status and stigma; housing — 42%, including lack of housing and conflicts with relatives; and legal issues — 35%, including identity documents, registration, and judicial or claims-related procedures.

Employment and housing constitute basic preconditions for the realisation of other social rights and access to services, while identity documents and registration function as a legal «entry barrier». In their absence, employment, social support, and access to established assistance mechanisms are impeded. As a result, the person's legal status is not effectively converted into access to guarantees.

At the same time, assessment of readiness for independent living revealed a mixed picture: 55% of respondents expressed confidence, while 45% reported fear, anxiety, and social insecurity. These indicators should not be treated merely as subjective experiences, but as legally relevant indicators of the need for support. A high level of anxiety increases the risk of disruption during the adaptation period and return to unsafe social ties.

A high level of stigmatisation was also recorded: 74% of respondents had faced prejudiced treatment, while 26% had not experienced such pressure. In legal terms, this means that even where there is internal readiness for integration (55%), the actual social environment creates restrictions on access to lawful means of subsistence, primarily through employment refusals (68%) and lack of access to housing (42%).

In other words, an objective gap emerges between the intention to lead a law-abiding life and the real possibility of implementing such a strategy under conditions of discriminatory practices.

COMPARISON OF THE DATA MAKES IT POSSIBLE TO IDENTIFY A STABLE «RECIDIVISM TRAP» CAUSED BY THE COMBINATION OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND GENDER-RELEVANT FACTORS:

- absence or inaccessibility of lawful employment due to stigma and criminal record status;
- housing instability and dependence on conflictual family relationships;
- legal access barriers, including identity documents and registration, which block services and formal support measures;
- psycho-emotional vulnerability, including fear and anxiety, which increases dependence on external resources;
- multiple needs requiring inter-agency support, in the absence of a guaranteed referral pathway.

In this configuration, probation registration without real access to services turns predominantly into a control-based regime and does not fully perform the task of resocialisation. The key conditions for a law-abiding life — work, housing, and legal access to rights — remain unattainable for a significant proportion of women.

Motherhood as Both a Risk Factor and a Source of Motivation

According to the survey, 72% of respondents had minor children. In legal terms, this implies heightened social responsibility and objectively stricter timeframes for reintegration. In the absence of rapid access to income and housing, the likelihood of forced survival strategies increases. Under such conditions, the risk of repeated acquisitive offences should be qualified not as an individual «choice», but as a derivative of structural vulnerability and institutional deficit in access to basic guarantees.

Economic Deprivation before Conviction as a Predictor of Post-Penitentiary Instability

Prior to criminal prosecution, 85% of women were outside the formal labour market, either in informal employment or unemployed. This indicator points to weak inclusion in formal social mechanisms, including social contributions, labour guarantees, and stable income. This reduces the starting opportunities for reintegration and increases dependence on external support during the first months after release.

Critical Gap between Declared Readiness and Actual Barriers

While 55% of respondents declared confidence in their readiness for independent living, the study simultaneously recorded 68% employment-related barriers, including refusals on the basis of criminal record status, and 74% cases of stigmatisation. The legal significance of this discrepancy lies in the fact that supervisory measures not supported by effective inter-agency accompaniment do not eliminate the key causes of vulnerability.

Accordingly, under conditions where discriminatory barriers dominate and access to basic resources remains limited, probation registration without actual service provision is not capable of fully achieving the objectives of resocialisation and prevention of reoffending.

3. Proposed Measures

The research analysis identified a core set of risks: housing, employment, stigmatisation, and family conflicts. In this regard, it is proposed to introduce an Inter-Agency Referral Matrix into the work of the Probation Service.

This mechanism would enable work with convicted persons to be transferred to a case management model, in which a risk in one domain — for example, lack of registration — is not treated as an isolated problem, but automatically triggers the involvement of resources from related agencies, including the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Health, and local executive bodies, within a unified protocol.

THE CURRENT LAW ENFORCEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE IS ORIENTED TOWARDS THE FORMAL EXECUTION OF PUNISHMENT, THEREBY CREATING A «RECIDIVISM TRAP». IT IS PROPOSED TO INTRODUCE A TWO-LEVEL SYSTEM OF NORMATIVE REGULATION:

1. Legislative level — Penal Enforcement Code / Law «On Probation»
To establish the principle of «effectiveness of resocialisation» and the obligation of the state to ensure inter-agency support.

2. Subordinate regulatory level — Inter-Agency Order / Standard
To approve the methodology for calculating the integrated reintegration indicator and the monitoring regulation.

Operational definition: successful reintegration means the achievement of a stable threshold of social security across five key domains within the first 180 days after release, in the absence of any critical failures.

To prevent formalism, a KPI system should be introduced, divided into basic mandatory indicators and extended indicators.

Domain	Key Indicator	Critical Failure / Trigger
Legal	Availability of an identity document / IIN and registration	Absence of documents or registration by day 30
Housing	Safe and stable place of residence	Homelessness or residence with an aggressor
Economic	Lawful income or employment pathway	Absence of income and employment trajectory by day 60
Medical	Registration with primary health care and initial screening	Failure to provide assistance despite high need
Institutional	Individual Reintegration Plan and active referral	Formal supervision without actual referrals

The methodology for calculating the integrated indicator of successful reintegration is based on domain-based assessment using a 0–2 point scale. For each of the five domains — legal, housing, economic, social-medical, and institutional — the status of the case is recorded as follows:

0 points — the domain is not closed and there is no progress;
1 point — the domain is in the process of being closed; actions have been initiated, but the result has not yet been achieved;
2 points — the domain is closed and the result has been confirmed.

The final score is calculated by summing the points, with a maximum score of 10.
A case is recognised as successful where it reaches a score of at least 7/10, provided that there are no critical failures, meaning no 0-point score in any domain. The presence of a critical failure automatically excludes the case from the successful category, regardless of the overall score, and triggers an enhanced response protocol.

In the penitentiary and probation system of England, structured risk and needs assessment is applied across separate sections, including housing, employment, substance use, «thinking and behaviour», and other domains. A summary assessment is then produced and used for planning work with the convicted person and managing risks.

The federal correctional system of Canada relies on a reintegration model in which community partners play a significant role by providing housing, support, and programmes. Reintegration is therefore treated as an inter-agency and intersectoral chain of services.

The Inter-Agency Referral Matrix and risk management framework constitute a strict action protocol linked to risk levels from R0 to R3. The principle of the matrix is that a risk in one domain is treated not as an isolated difficulty, but as a basis for launching an inter-agency pathway with pre-defined actions, responsible actors, and timelines. The response algorithm for R2/R3 risks provides that, where a trigger is identified — for example, lack of housing, threat of violence, or risk of exploitation — the probation case manager immediately initiates the R3 protocol, records the event in the case file, and sends mandatory requests or referrals to related agencies.

Within the framework of an SLA — Service Level Agreement — maximum response times are established to ensure predictability and manageability of the process. For the housing domain, placement of a woman in a crisis centre or another safe place of residence should be ensured within 24–48 hours.

For the legal domain, the first action to restore documents — including arranging an application to the Public Service Centre and initiating the documentation procedure — must be ensured within 24 hours from the moment the risk is identified.

For the economic domain, an employment pathway should be formed within 7 days, including referral to the Employment Centre and initial routing into employment programmes.

Compliance with SLA timelines should be monitored through an escalation mechanism. If related agencies fail to meet the response deadlines, the case manager initiates an official escalation to the leadership level of the local executive body, with recording of the reasons for delay and assignment of corrective measures.

The implementation roadmap proposes a package of regulatory steps aimed at transforming the model from a predominantly control-supervisory one into a service-oriented reintegration model.

First, the conceptual framework must be закрепед in the normative field through the introduction of definitions such as «case management», «critical failure», and «reintegration domain». This would allow for the unification of implementation practice and the development of a common assessment methodology.

Second, inter-agency data exchange should be digitalised. This requires the creation of a secure data exchange channel between the Probation Information System and the databases of local executive bodies and the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection, in order to eliminate repeated document requests and reduce administrative barriers.

Third, it is advisable to pilot the model in three regions with different socio-economic profiles for a period of 6–9 months, in order to validate procedures, workload, and outcomes.

Fourth, the KPI management system should be based not on quantitative reporting, but on measurable results: the median time required to close critical R3 risks and the proportion of successful reintegrations according to the integrated indicator.
Draft formulations for regulatory acts may be set out as follows.

On the effectiveness assessment norm:

«The effectiveness of probation bodies shall be assessed by achievement of the integrated indicator of successful reintegration of the convicted person, recorded upon expiry of 180 days from the date of registration».

On referral and routing:

«Where a critical risk (R3) is identified in any reintegration domain, authorised bodies shall implement the roadmap measures within the established SLA timeframes, including ensuring safety and temporary housing within a period not exceeding 48 hours».

The proposed model transfers resocialisation from the category of a desirable outcome to the category of a manageable and measurable process. Transition to an SLA system and domain-based risk management would allow the state to optimise expenditure on the penitentiary system and significantly reduce social tension and reoffending.

INTENSIVE SUPPORT PROTOCOL / CASE MANAGEMENT

To minimise the risks of repeated criminalisation during the critical post-release period, it is proposed to introduce an Intensive Support Protocol, based on case management.

Objectification of the process

An obligation should be established for the Probation Service to develop an Individual Reintegration Plan no later than 3 working days from the date of registration.

Institutional responsibility

A probation officer should be assigned the function of inter-agency cooperation coordinator, with the authority to promptly refer the beneficiary to authorised bodies.

Performance indicators

The effectiveness of territorial units should be assessed not by the number of home inspections, but by the proportion of persons who achieve target indicators in the Documents, Housing, and Employment domains within 90 days.

REMOVING BARRIERS RELATED TO THE ABSENCE OF IDENTITY DOCUMENTS AND REGISTRATION

To eliminate barriers related to the absence of identity documents and registration, the following measures are required.

Preventive verification

The procedure for restoring identity cards should be formalised and carried out by the administration of the correctional institution six months before the actual release of the convicted person.

Legal mechanism for address registration

Amendments should be introduced into the rules on citizen registration, providing for the possibility of temporary registration at the address of Social Adaptation Centres or NGO partners for the duration of the Individual Reintegration Plan.

Elimination of administrative duplication

A one-stop-shop principle should be introduced through Public Service Centres for persons released from places of deprivation of liberty, with priority consideration of applications.

Quotas and preferences

A mechanism of tax incentives should be developed for private business entities that employ women under probation supervision for a period of at least six months.

Professional continuity

Continuity of education started in places of deprivation of liberty should be ensured by integrating departmental training centres with state short-term vocational training programmes.

Social contract

Mechanisms of social assistance based on a contract should be used more actively, where the condition for receiving payments is active job search or participation in training.

ENSURING CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO HOUSING AND HEALTH PROTECTION

Guaranteed temporary accommodation

Local executive bodies should be required to reserve places in crisis centres for women without housing for a period of up to 90 days.

Medical-social screening

The list of mandatory services of the Probation Service should include initial referral within the compulsory social health insurance system for medical examination and psychological assistance during the first 30 days.

Protection of the interests of the child

Legal support should be provided for procedures related to the restoration of parental rights and family reunification, based on the principle of the best interests of the child and subject to mandatory verification of the safety of the family environment.

STAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the proposed measures requires a phased approach.

Stage I — Normative and organisational stage

Development and approval of an inter-agency regulation on cooperation between internal affairs bodies, justice authorities, health care bodies, labour and social protection bodies.

Stage II — Pilot testing

Launch of the model in reference regions, followed by an audit of business processes.

Stage III — Legalisation

Introduction of amendments to the Penal Enforcement Code and the Law «On Probation» based on the results of the pilot.

Key Performance Indicator / KPI

The proportion of women who successfully complete the reintegration programme without committing administrative or criminal offences during the reporting year.

Transformation of the Probation System from a Supervisory to a Restorative Model

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE PROBATION SYSTEM FROM A SUPERVISORY MODEL INTO A RESTORATIVE MODEL IS BASED ON THREE FUNDAMENTAL PILLARS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW:

- The UN Bangkok Rules
  United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders;

- The UN Tokyo Rules
  United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures;

- The European Probation Rules
  Council of Europe Probation Rules, Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)1.

1. Compliance with the UN Bangkok Rules

The proposed package of measures directly implements the requirements of the UN Rules concerning the treatment of women prisoners, namely the Bangkok Rules, 2010.

Gender specificity — Rules 43–44.
The Bangkok Rules require resocialisation programmes to take into account gender-specific needs, including the presence of children and prior traumatic experience. The proposed measures, in particular Measure 6 on family-related matters and Measure 5 on psychosocial support, implement this standard by creating a safe pathway for family reunification.

Preparation for release — Rules 46–47.
The standards require the reintegration process to begin well before release. Measure 2, concerning the restoration of documents before release, and Measure 1, concerning support during the first 90 days after release, constitute direct implementation of these requirements by addressing the institutional vacuum that often arises at the point of release from a correctional institution.

2. Transition from a Punitive Paradigm to a Restorative Justice Model

The effectiveness of the proposed measures is demonstrated by the shift in focus from repressive control to addressing criminogenic needs.

Risk–Need–Responsivity Theory / RNR Model. It is well established that mere supervision, as a punitive measure, does not by itself reduce reoffending. Reoffending is reduced by targeted responses to individual deficits and needs. The proposed domain-based approach, covering housing, employment, and health, is an internationally recognised tool for reducing criminal activity through social stabilisation.

The international evidence base in probation and re-entry confirms that the reduction of repeated criminal activity is achieved by addressing key domains of social stabilisation, including housing, employment, and behavioural health, within the logic of criminogenic needs under the RNR model. These effects are most sustainable where the domains are not addressed in isolation, but through structured support and inter-agency service coordination.

Social capital and desistance theory.
Measure 3, concerning employment, and Measure 6, concerning family, are aimed at creating socially constructive ties for women. Criminological research indicates that lawful income and responsibility towards family are among the strongest protective factors against reoffending, often more effective than fear of punishment.

3. Specification of Public Safety Mechanisms

A restorative model provides a higher level of public safety than a purely punitive model for the following reasons.

Transparency and control through services.
When a woman is included in a support system under Measure 1, she remains in regular contact with state and community-based services. This enables deeper and more qualitative monitoring of her situation than a simple requirement to report to the police.

Neutralisation of crime triggers.
Many offences committed by women are acquisitive in nature, such as theft and fraud, or are linked to substance dependency. Addressing problems related to documents under Measure 2 and housing under Measure 4 reduces the acute need that may push a woman towards new offences during the first weeks after release.

4. Economic Justification / Cost-Benefit Analysis

For the state, a punitive model is more costly. The detention of one convicted person in a correctional institution entails significant monthly expenditure from the public budget.

The implementation of a resocialisation package, even taking into account the costs of subsidies and housing, pays for itself within 12–18 months because the woman becomes a taxpayer and her children are less likely to enter state residential care.

In this sense, the proposed model is not only rights-based and humane, but also fiscally rational: it reduces the costs of repeated prosecution, re-incarceration, child institutionalisation, and long-term social dependency.

Conclusions

International experience demonstrates that the restorative, or reintegration-oriented, model is not only a human rights standard, but also an instrument of fiscal efficiency. Reducing reoffending and reliance on deprivation of liberty lowers the state's direct expenditure on the penitentiary system and supervision, while also reducing the socio-economic harm caused by repeat offending.

Empirical assessments, including those by WSIPP and RAND, demonstrate a positive benefit-cost ratio for rehabilitation and educational interventions. Strategies in the United States and Australia institutionalise the logic that reducing the prison population and releasing public resources should lead to investment in reintegration.

Within the British legal and law enforcement architecture of sentencing, a consistent position is advanced that community-based disposals, in comparable categories of offences and offender profiles, often demonstrate greater cost-effectiveness than short-term imprisonment. They are less costly for the public budget and, where properly resourced, may produce stronger outcomes in reducing reoffending.

This position is reflected both in government materials and analytical reports of the Ministry of Justice, which present findings on the comparative effectiveness of community orders and other measures in relation to short custodial sentences, and in parliamentary sources noting a growing evidence base in favour of such sanctions as a tool for reducing reoffending and relieving pressure on the penitentiary system.

From a doctrinal perspective, this is framed as an argument in favour of rationalising penal policy on the basis of evidence-based sentencing and the principle of economical and targeted use of public funds, while preserving the objectives of punishment.

Under a punitive model, the state bears recurring costs for maintaining one convicted woman in penal enforcement institutions: food, clothing provision, utilities, security, medical care, and administration of the regime. At the national level, these costs form substantial budget allocations which, by their nature, do not create added value and do not translate into socially beneficial outcomes beyond the system of detention itself.

Additional indirect losses are also generated. While a woman is held in a correctional institution, the state is often required to compensate for the consequences of disrupted family ties: expenditure on social benefits, guardianship, and child maintenance increases, including institutional forms of care. The social disintegration of the family intensifies intergenerational risks: children become more vulnerable and may, in the longer term, be more likely to enter the criminal justice system, thereby reproducing costs in a new cycle.

The restorative model, by contrast, is a model of short-term investment. Expenditure on resocialisation — subsidised employment, temporary safe housing, case management support, and access to medical and psychological assistance — constitutes time-limited investment aimed at returning women to lawful economic and social participation.

The economic rationale of this model lies in moving a person from the category of «budget recipient» to that of «taxpayer» and participant in the formal economy. Within the proposed concept, the payback period for such investments is estimated at 12–18 months, as this is the period during which the key domains — income, housing, documents, health, and institutional connectivity — can be stabilised.

The mechanisms of payback are measurable.

First, there is tax return.
Employment of women after probation generates revenue in the form of individual income tax and social contributions, which over time offset the administrative costs of support and inter-agency referral.

Second, there is a social multiplier effect.
Keeping a mother within the family and preventing the institutionalisation of children reduces the budgetary burden, since the costs of maintaining a child in residential care may be comparable to the costs of an intensive rehabilitation programme for an adult. Accordingly, one successful reintegration may potentially prevent the doubling or tripling of costs that the state would otherwise incur in the event of family breakdown and subsequent institutionalisation of the child.

Third, the cost of reoffending is reduced.
Every new offence entails new cyclical expenditure on investigation, trial, expert examinations, enforcement of punishment, and repeated detention in the penal enforcement system. A domain-based approach aimed at addressing root causes — lack of housing, income, documents, and access to basic services — makes it possible to break this cycle and avoid recurring budgetary expenditure.

It is important to emphasise that the restorative paradigm also performs a public safety function. A punitive approach primarily isolates the symptom, but does not

address criminogenic needs. The restorative model works with the foundations of risk: where lawful income and safe housing are available, the basic motivators for property-related offences are reduced, the likelihood of involvement in exploitative practices decreases, and social stabilisation increases the predictability of behaviour.
The restoration of identity documents returns a woman to the legal field and makes her «visible» to state services. This simultaneously expands access to services and improves the manageability of the support pathway through lawful mechanisms of control.

Support for family and children creates natural social control and sustainable protective factors which, in practice, may be more effective than formal supervision without a social support base.

Based on the analysis of empirical materials, the following conclusions and recommendations are formulated.

First, a systemic deficit has been identified.
The current probation model is overloaded with supervisory functions and insufficiently supported by social assistance resources. This corresponds with the research data, according to which a significant proportion of women identify employment as a key barrier to reintegration and also report persistent stigma as an obstacle to restoring status and social ties.

Second, gender-specific vulnerability has been confirmed.
The high proportion of mothers in the sample requires the introduction of specialised «mother and child» protocols and inter-agency solutions that protect the interests of children while simultaneously supporting the resocialisation of women. In the current procedures, this component exists only in a fragmented form and does not ensure a predictable outcome.

Third, the need for SLA standards has been demonstrated.
Resocialisation cannot depend on the personal initiative or «goodwill» of individual officials. It must be structured as a regulated service with clear response timelines, transparent referral pathways, and measurable outcomes recorded through KPIs across five domains.

The final recommendation is that the proposed package of measures — from a unified support pathway during the first 90 days to the introduction of an inter-agency risk matrix and domain-based KPIs — should be launched through immediate pilot implementation.
This would allow the Republic of Kazakhstan to strengthen compliance with its

international obligations, including standards on the treatment of women in the criminal justice system, in particular the principles enshrined in the UN Bangkok Rules. It would also support a transition towards a modern, economically rational, and humane justice system in which public safety is achieved through successful social and legal adaptation, rather than through repeated and costly isolation.