

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.a: Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime

[Indicator 16.a.1: Existence of independent national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles](#)

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

This indicator Existence of independent national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles measures the compliance of existing national human rights institutions with the Principles relating to the Status of National Institutions (The Paris Principles), which were adopted by the General Assembly (resolution 48/134) based on the rules of procedure of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI, formerly the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights or ICC).

### Rationale:

This indicator measures the global continual efforts of countries in setting up independent national institutions, through international cooperation, to promote inclusive, peaceful and accountable societies. The creation and fosterage of a NHRI indicates a State's commitment to promote and protect the human rights provided in international human rights instruments. Compliance with the Paris Principles vest NHRIs with a broad mandate, competence and power to investigate, report on the national human rights situation, and publicize human rights through information and education. While NHRIs are essentially state funded, they are to maintain independence and pluralism. When vested with a quasi-judicial competence, NHRIs handle complaints and assist victims in taking their cases to courts making them an essential component in the national human rights protection system. These fundamental functions that NHRIs play and their increasing participation in the international human rights fora make them important actors in the improvement of the human rights situation, including the elimination of discriminatory laws and the promotion and enforcement of non-discriminatory laws. At the national level reporting, the better the accreditation classification of the NHRI reflects that it is credible, legitimate, relevant and effective in promoting human rights at the national level.

## **Concepts:**

A National Human Rights Institution is an independent administrative body set up by a State to promote and protect human rights. NHRIs are State bodies with a constitutional and/or legislative mandate to protect and promote human rights. They are part of the State apparatus and are funded by the State. However, they operate and function independently from government. While their specific mandate may vary, the general role of NHRIs is to address discrimination in all its forms, as well as to promote the protection of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. Core functions of NHRIs include complaint handling, human rights education and making recommendations on law reform. Effective NHRIs are an important link between government and civil society, in so far as they help bridge the 'protection gap' between the rights of individuals and the responsibilities of the State. Six models of NHRIs exist across all regions of the world today, namely: Human rights commissions, Human rights ombudsman institutions, Hybrid institutions, Consultative and advisory bodies, Institutes and centers and multiple institutions. An Independent NHRI is an institution with 'A level' accreditation status as benchmarked against the Paris Principles. The process of accreditation is conducted through peer review by the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of the GANHRI. There are three possible types of accreditation:

A: Compliance with Paris Principles

B: Observer Status – Not fully in compliance with the Paris Principles or insufficient information provided to make a determination

C: Non-compliant with the Paris Principles

Accreditation by the GANHRI entails a determination whether the NHRI is compliant, both in law and practice, with the Paris principles, the principal source of the normative standards for NHRIs, as well as with the General Observations developed by the SCA. Other international standards may also be taken into account by the SCA, including the provisions related to the establishment of national mechanisms in the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment as well as in the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Likewise, the SCA looks at any NHRI-related recommendation from the international human rights mechanisms, notably, the Treaty Bodies, Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and special procedures. The process also looks into the effectiveness and level of engagement with international human rights systems.

The Principles relating to the Status of National Institutions (The Paris Principles) adopted by General Assembly, Resolution 48/134 of 20 December 1993 provide the international benchmarks against which NHRIs can be accredited by the GANHRI.

## **Comments and limitations:**

The important and constructive role of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights has been acknowledged in different United Nations instruments and resolutions, including the Final Document and Programme of Action of the 1993 World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna, GA resolutions A/RES/63/172 (2008) and A/RES/64/161 (2009) on National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights. In addition, creation and strengthening of NHRIs have also been encouraged. For example, the 1993 GA resolution 48/134 'affirms the priority that should be accorded to the development of appropriate arrangements at the national level to ensure the effective

implementation of international human rights standards' while the 2008 GA resolution A/RES/63/169 encouraged states 'to consider the creation or the strengthening of independent and autonomous Ombudsman, mediator and other national human rights institutions'. The Human Rights Council (HRC resolution 5/1, 2007) also called for the effective participation of national human rights institutions in its institution building package, which provides elements to guide its future work.

UN treaty bodies have also recognized the crucial role that NHRIs represent in the effective implementation of treaty obligations and encouraged their creation (e.g. CERD General Comment 17, A/48/18 (1993); CESCR General Comment 10, E/C.12/1998/25; and CRC General Comment 2, CRC/GC/2002/2). A compilation of various recommendations and concluding observations relevant to NHRIs emanating from the international human rights mechanisms in the United Nations is available at: <http://www.universalhumanrightsindex.org/>.

The GANHRI is an international association of NHRIs which promotes and strengthens NHRIs to be in accordance with the Paris Principles and provides leadership in the promotion and protection of human rights (ICC Statute, Art. 5). Decisions on the classifications of NHRIs are based on their submitted documents such as: 1) copy of legislation or other instrument by which it is established and empowered in its official or published format (e.g. statute, and /or constitutional provisions, and/or presidential decree, 2) outline of organizational structure including details of staff and annual budget, 3) copy of recent published annual report; 4) detailed statement showing how it complies with the Paris Principles. NHRIs that hold 'A' and 'B' status are reviewed every five years. Civil society organizations may also provide relevant information to OHCHR pertaining to any accreditation matter.

Accreditation of NHRIs shows that the government supports human rights work in the country. However their effectiveness should also be measured based on their ability to gain public trust and the quality of their human rights work. In this context, it would also be worthwhile to look into the responses of the NHRI to the recommendations of the GANHRI. Likewise, the inputs from the NHRI while engaging with the international human rights mechanisms (i.e. submissions to the Human Rights Council, including UPR, and to the treaty bodies) represent a valuable source of information on how NHRIs carry out their mandate in reference to international human rights instruments.

## Methodology

---

### **Computation Method:**

In terms of method of computation, the indicator is computed as the accreditation classification, namely A, B or C of the NHRI.

### **Disaggregation:**

While disaggregation of information is not applicable for this indicator, it may be desirable to highlight the type of NHRI, whether Ombudsman, human rights commission, advisory body, research-based institute, etc.

**Treatment of missing values:**

- [At country level](#)

All country data are available and there is no Treatment of missing values.

- [At regional and global levels](#)

All country data are available and there is no Treatment of missing values.

**Sources of discrepancies:**

The country counterpart has the possibility to appeal the decision on the level of compliance with the Paris Principles received from the international mechanism. The appeal needs to be supported by at least 4 other national human rights institutions (all members of the international bureau) and 2 regional networks of national human rights institutions.

## Data Sources

---

**Description:**

The main source of data on the indicator is administrative records of the Sub-Committee on Accreditation reports of the GANHRI. OHCHR compiles the data into a global directory of NHRI status accreditation updated every six months, after the Sub-committee on Accreditation submits its report.

**Collection process:**

An international survey is sent to national human rights institution, which fill it in and send it back to the international mechanism. The latter also use complementary information, if available, received from civil society organizations.

National human rights institutions seeking accreditation have to submit detailed information about their practices and how they directly promote compliance with the Paris Principles, namely the Principles relating to the Status of National Institutions that were adopted by the General Assembly (resolution 48/134). Information to be submitted relates to:

- 1) Guarantee of tenure for members of the National Human Rights Institution decision-making body;
- 2) full-time members of a National Human Rights Institution;
- 3) Guarantee of functional immunity;
- 4) Recruitment and retention of National Human Rights Institution staff;
- 5) Staffing of the National Human Rights Institution by secondment;
- 6) National Human Rights Institutions during the situation of a coup d'état or a state of emergency;
- 7) Limitation of power of National Human Rights Institutions due to national security;
- 8) Administrative regulation of National Human Rights Institutions;
- 9) Assessing National Human Rights Institutions as National Preventive and National Monitoring Mechanisms;
- 10) The quasi-judicial competency of National Human Rights Institutions (complaints-handling).

Based on the information received, the process of accreditation is conducted through peer review by the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of GANHRI.

## Data Availability

---

**Description:**

196 countries

Asia and Pacific – 56

Africa – 54

Latin America and the Caribbean – 33

Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan – 53

**Time series:**

From 2000 to 2015

## Calendar

---

**Data collection:**

From November 2016

**Data release:**

December 2016

## Data providers

---

**Name:**

National human rights institution

**Description:**

National human rights institution (e.g. national human rights commissions, human rights ombudsman institutions, hybrid institutions, consultative and advisory bodies, institutes and centers and multiple institutions)

## Data compilers

---

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI).

## References

---

**URL:**

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx>

**References:**

[http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/Metadata\\_16.a.1\\_3\\_March2016.pdf](http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/Metadata_16.a.1_3_March2016.pdf)

<http://nhri.ohchr.org/EN/Pages/default.aspx>

<http://ohchr.org/EN/Countries/NHRI/Pages/NHRIMain.aspx>

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/StatusOfNationalInstitutions.aspx>

## Related indicators

---

10.3:

Progress towards sustainable forest management

16.b:

Progress towards sustainable forest management

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.a: Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime

[Indicator 16.a.1: Existence of independent national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles](#)

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

This indicator Existence of independent national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles measures the compliance of existing national human rights institutions with the Principles relating to the Status of National Institutions (The Paris Principles), which were adopted by the General Assembly (resolution 48/134) based on the rules of procedure of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI, formerly the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights or ICC).

### Rationale:

This indicator measures the global continual efforts of countries in setting up independent national institutions, through international cooperation, to promote inclusive, peaceful and accountable societies. The creation and fosterage of a NHRI indicates a State's commitment to promote and protect the human rights provided in international human rights instruments. Compliance with the Paris Principles vest NHRIs with a broad mandate, competence and power to investigate, report on the national human rights situation, and publicize human rights through information and education. While NHRIs are essentially state funded, they are to maintain independence and pluralism. When vested with a quasi-judicial competence, NHRIs handle complaints and assist victims in taking their cases to courts making them an essential component in the national human rights protection system. These fundamental functions that NHRIs play and their increasing participation in the international human rights fora make them important actors in the improvement of the human rights situation, including the elimination of discriminatory laws and the promotion and enforcement of non-discriminatory laws. At the national level reporting, the better the accreditation classification of the NHRI reflects that it is credible, legitimate, relevant and effective in promoting human rights at the national level.

## **Concepts:**

A National Human Rights Institution is an independent administrative body set up by a State to promote and protect human rights. NHRIs are State bodies with a constitutional and/or legislative mandate to protect and promote human rights. They are part of the State apparatus and are funded by the State. However, they operate and function independently from government. While their specific mandate may vary, the general role of NHRIs is to address discrimination in all its forms, as well as to promote the protection of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. Core functions of NHRIs include complaint handling, human rights education and making recommendations on law reform. Effective NHRIs are an important link between government and civil society, in so far as they help bridge the 'protection gap' between the rights of individuals and the responsibilities of the State. Six models of NHRIs exist across all regions of the world today, namely: Human rights commissions, Human rights ombudsman institutions, Hybrid institutions, Consultative and advisory bodies, Institutes and centers and multiple institutions. An Independent NHRI is an institution with 'A level' accreditation status as benchmarked against the Paris Principles. The process of accreditation is conducted through peer review by the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of the GANHRI. There are three possible types of accreditation:

A: Compliance with Paris Principles

B: Observer Status – Not fully in compliance with the Paris Principles or insufficient information provided to make a determination

C: Non-compliant with the Paris Principles

Accreditation by the GANHRI entails a determination whether the NHRI is compliant, both in law and practice, with the Paris principles, the principal source of the normative standards for NHRIs, as well as with the General Observations developed by the SCA. Other international standards may also be taken into account by the SCA, including the provisions related to the establishment of national mechanisms in the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment as well as in the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Likewise, the SCA looks at any NHRI-related recommendation from the international human rights mechanisms, notably, the Treaty Bodies, Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and special procedures. The process also looks into the effectiveness and level of engagement with international human rights systems.

The Principles relating to the Status of National Institutions (The Paris Principles) adopted by General Assembly, Resolution 48/134 of 20 December 1993 provide the international benchmarks against which NHRIs can be accredited by the GANHRI.

## **Comments and limitations:**

The important and constructive role of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights has been acknowledged in different United Nations instruments and resolutions, including the Final Document and Programme of Action of the 1993 World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna, GA resolutions A/RES/63/172 (2008) and A/RES/64/161 (2009) on National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights. In addition, creation and strengthening of NHRIs have also been encouraged. For example, the 1993 GA resolution 48/134 'affirms the priority that should be accorded to the development of appropriate arrangements at the national level to ensure the effective

implementation of international human rights standards' while the 2008 GA resolution A/RES/63/169 encouraged states 'to consider the creation or the strengthening of independent and autonomous Ombudsman, mediator and other national human rights institutions'. The Human Rights Council (HRC resolution 5/1, 2007) also called for the effective participation of national human rights institutions in its institution building package, which provides elements to guide its future work.

UN treaty bodies have also recognized the crucial role that NHRIs represent in the effective implementation of treaty obligations and encouraged their creation (e.g. CERD General Comment 17, A/48/18 (1993); CESCR General Comment 10, E/C.12/1998/25; and CRC General Comment 2, CRC/GC/2002/2). A compilation of various recommendations and concluding observations relevant to NHRIs emanating from the international human rights mechanisms in the United Nations is available at: <http://www.universalhumanrightsindex.org/>.

The GANHRI is an international association of NHRIs which promotes and strengthens NHRIs to be in accordance with the Paris Principles and provides leadership in the promotion and protection of human rights (ICC Statute, Art. 5). Decisions on the classifications of NHRIs are based on their submitted documents such as: 1) copy of legislation or other instrument by which it is established and empowered in its official or published format (e.g. statute, and /or constitutional provisions, and/or presidential decree, 2) outline of organizational structure including details of staff and annual budget, 3) copy of recent published annual report; 4) detailed statement showing how it complies with the Paris Principles. NHRIs that hold 'A' and 'B' status are reviewed every five years. Civil society organizations may also provide relevant information to OHCHR pertaining to any accreditation matter.

Accreditation of NHRIs shows that the government supports human rights work in the country. However their effectiveness should also be measured based on their ability to gain public trust and the quality of their human rights work. In this context, it would also be worthwhile to look into the responses of the NHRI to the recommendations of the GANHRI. Likewise, the inputs from the NHRI while engaging with the international human rights mechanisms (i.e. submissions to the Human Rights Council, including UPR, and to the treaty bodies) represent a valuable source of information on how NHRIs carry out their mandate in reference to international human rights instruments.

## Methodology

---

### **Computation Method:**

In terms of method of computation, the indicator is computed as the accreditation classification, namely A, B or C of the NHRI.

### **Disaggregation:**

While disaggregation of information is not applicable for this indicator, it may be desirable to highlight the type of NHRI, whether Ombudsman, human rights commission, advisory body, research-based institute, etc.

**Treatment of missing values:**

- [At country level](#)

All country data are available and there is no Treatment of missing values.

- [At regional and global levels](#)

All country data are available and there is no Treatment of missing values.

**Sources of discrepancies:**

The country counterpart has the possibility to appeal the decision on the level of compliance with the Paris Principles received from the international mechanism. The appeal needs to be supported by at least 4 other national human rights institutions (all members of the international bureau) and 2 regional networks of national human rights institutions.

## Data Sources

---

**Description:**

The main source of data on the indicator is administrative records of the Sub-Committee on Accreditation reports of the GANHRI. OHCHR compiles the data into a global directory of NHRI status accreditation updated every six months, after the Sub-committee on Accreditation submits its report.

**Collection process:**

An international survey is sent to national human rights institution, which fill it in and send it back to the international mechanism. The latter also use complementary information, if available, received from civil society organizations.

National human rights institutions seeking accreditation have to submit detailed information about their practices and how they directly promote compliance with the Paris Principles, namely the Principles relating to the Status of National Institutions that were adopted by the General Assembly (resolution 48/134). Information to be submitted relates to:

- 1) Guarantee of tenure for members of the National Human Rights Institution decision-making body;
- 2) full-time members of a National Human Rights Institution;
- 3) Guarantee of functional immunity;
- 4) Recruitment and retention of National Human Rights Institution staff;
- 5) Staffing of the National Human Rights Institution by secondment;
- 6) National Human Rights Institutions during the situation of a coup d'état or a state of emergency;
- 7) Limitation of power of National Human Rights Institutions due to national security;
- 8) Administrative regulation of National Human Rights Institutions;
- 9) Assessing National Human Rights Institutions as National Preventive and National Monitoring Mechanisms;
- 10) The quasi-judicial competency of National Human Rights Institutions (complaints-handling).

Based on the information received, the process of accreditation is conducted through peer review by the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of GANHRI.

## Data Availability

---

### Description:

196 countries

Asia and Pacific – 56

Africa – 54

Latin America and the Caribbean – 33

Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan – 53

### Time series:

From 2000 to 2015

## Calendar

---

### Data collection:

From November 2016

### Data release:

December 2016

## Data providers

---

### Name:

National human rights institution

### Description:

National human rights institution (e.g. national human rights commissions, human rights ombudsman institutions, hybrid institutions, consultative and advisory bodies, institutes and centers and multiple institutions)

## Data compilers

---

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI).

## References

---

**URL:**

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx>

**References:**

[http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/Metadata\\_16.a.1\\_3\\_March2016.pdf](http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/Metadata_16.a.1_3_March2016.pdf)

<http://nhri.ohchr.org/EN/Pages/default.aspx>

<http://ohchr.org/EN/Countries/NHRI/Pages/NHRIMain.aspx>

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/StatusOfNationalInstitutions.aspx>

## Related indicators

---

10.3:

Progress towards sustainable forest management

16.b:

Progress towards sustainable forest management

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.1: Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere

Indicator 16.1.1: Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by sex and age

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

The indicator is defined as the total count of victims of intentional homicide divided by the total population, expressed per 100,000 population.

Intentional homicide is defined as the unlawful death inflicted upon a person with the intent to cause death or serious injury (Source: International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, ICCS 2015); population refers to total resident population in a given country in a given year.

### Rationale:

This indicator is widely used at national and international level to measure the most extreme form of violent crime and it also provides a direct indication of lack of security. Security from violence is a prerequisite for individuals to enjoy a safe and active life and for societies and economies to develop freely. Intentional homicides occur in all countries of the world and this indicator has a global applicability.

Monitoring intentional homicides is necessary to better assess their causes, drivers and consequences and, in the longer term, to develop effective preventive measures. If data are properly disaggregated (as suggested in the ICCS), the indicator can identify the different type of violence associated with homicide: inter-personal (including partner and family-related violence), crime (including organized crime and other forms of criminal activities) and socio-political (including terrorism, hate crime).

### Concepts:

In the ICCS intentional homicide is defined as the “Unlawful death inflicted upon a person with the intent to cause death or serious injury”. This definition contains three elements characterizing the killing of a person as intentional homicide:

1. The killing of a person by another person (objective element);
2. The intent of the perpetrator to kill or seriously injure the victim (subjective element);
3. The unlawfulness of the killing, which means that the law considers the perpetrator liable for the unlawful death (legal element).

This definition states that, for statistical purposes, all killings corresponding to the three criteria above should be considered as intentional homicides, irrespective of definitions provided by national legislations or practices.

**Comments and limitations:**

The ICCS provides important clarifications on the definition of intentional homicide. In particular, it states that the following killings are included in the count of homicide:

- Murder
- Honour killing
- Serious assault leading to death
- Death as a result of terrorist activities
- Dowry-related killings
- Femicide
- Infanticide
- Voluntary manslaughter
- Extrajudicial killings
- Killings caused by excessive force by law enforcement/state officials

Furthermore, the ICCS provides indications on how to distinguish between intentional homicides, killings directly related to war/conflict and other killings that amount to war crimes.

The fact that homicide data are typically produced by two separate and independent sources at national level (criminal justice and public health) represents a specific asset of this indicator, as the comparison of the two sources is a tool to assess accuracy of national data. Usually, for countries where data from both sources exist, a good level of matching between the sources is recorded (see UNODC Global Study on Homicide, 2013).

Data on homicides produced by public health authorities are guided by the International classification of diseases (ICD-10), which provides a definition of 'Death by assault' that is very close to the definition of intentional homicide of the ICCS.

## Methodology

---

**Computation Method:**

The indicator is calculated as the total number of victims of intentional homicide recorded in a given year divided by the total resident population in the same year, multiplied by 100,000.

In several countries, two separate sets of data on intentional homicide are produced, respectively from criminal justice and public health/civil registration systems. When existing, figures from both data sources are reported. Population data are derived from annual estimates produced by the UN Population Division.

**Disaggregation:**

Recommended disaggregation for this indicator are:

- sex and age of the victim and the perpetrator (suspected offender)
- relationship between victim and perpetrator (intimate partner, other family member, acquaintance, etc.)
- means of perpetration (firearm, blunt object, etc.)
- situational context/motivation (organized crime, intimate partner violence, etc.)

**Treatment of missing values:**

- [At country level](#)

WHO produces estimates for countries where national data on homicide are not available from neither criminal justice nor from public health/civil registration. These estimates are used when compiling the global dataset and produce estimates of missing values (for information on the methodology, see WHO-UNDP-UNODC, Global Status Report on Violence Prevention 2014).

- [At regional and global levels](#)

WHO produces estimates for countries where national data on homicide are not available from neither criminal justice nor from public health/civil registration. These estimates are used when compiling the global dataset and produce estimates of missing values (for information on the methodology, see WHO-UNDP-UNODC, Global Status Report on Violence Prevention 2014).

UNODC and WHO are working together to develop a common approach to produce joint UNODC-WHO homicide data series at country, regional and global level.

**Regional aggregates:**

Global and regional estimates are calculated as weighted averages of national data, with weights provided by the national resident population.

**Sources of discrepancies:**

Discrepancies might exist between country produced and internationally reported counts of intentional homicides as national data might refer to national definition of intentional homicide while data reported by UNODC aim to comply with the definition provided by the ICCS (approved in 2015 by Member States in the UN Statistical Commission and the UN Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice). UNODC makes special efforts to count all killings falling under the ICCS definition of intentional homicide, while national data may still be compiled according to national legal systems rather than the statistical classification. . The gradual implementation of ICCS by countries should improve quality and consistency of national and international data.

Intentional homicide rates may also differ due to the use of different population figures.

## Data Sources

---

### **Description:**

Two separate sources exist at country level: a) criminal justice system; b) public health/civil registration. UNODC collects and publishes data from criminal justice systems through its long-lasting annual data collection mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN Crime Trends Survey, UN-CTS); WHO collects and publishes data produced by public health/civil registration. The data collection through the UN-CTS is facilitated by a network of over 130 national Focal Points appointed by responsible authorities.

Currently, when national data on homicide are not available from neither of the two types of source above, estimates produced by WHO are used.

UNODC and WHO are working together to develop a common approach to produce joint UNODC-WHO homicide data series at country, regional and global level.

### **Collection process:**

At international level, data on intentional homicides are routinely collected by UNODC through the annual UN-CTS data collection. As requested by the UN Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, over 130 Member States have already appointed a UN-CTS national focal point that delivers UN-CTS data to UNODC. In most cases these focal points are national institutions responsible for data production in the area of crime and criminal justice (National Statistical Offices, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice, etc.). For countries that have not appointed a focal point, the request for data is sent to permanent missions in Vienna. When a country does not report to UNODC, other official sources such as authoritative websites, publications, or other forms of communication are used. Homicide estimates from WHO are currently used when no other source on homicide is available. Once consolidated, data are shared to countries to check their accuracy.

When data and related metadata are available, some adjustments are made to data in order to assure compliance with the definition of intentional homicide as provided by the ICCS. National data on types of killings that are considered as intentional homicide by the ICCS, while being classified under a different crime at country level, are added to national figures of intentional homicide. This can be done only when detailed data on such types of killings (e.g. serious assault leading to death, honor killing, etc.) are available.

As for UNODC data dissemination policy, data for SDG monitoring will be sent to countries for consultation prior to publication.

## Data Availability

---

### Description:

Considering data collected by both UNODC and WHO, national data on homicide are available for 174 countries (at least one data point between 2009-2013) . Time series data on homicide suitable for monitoring are available for 141 countries (at least 3 data points, the most recent between 2011-2013).

### Time series:

2010-2014

## Calendar

---

### Data collection:

III-IV quarter 2016

### Data release:

Second quarter 2017 (data for 2015)

## Data providers

---

### Name:

Data on intentional homicide are sent to UNODC by member states, usually through national UN-CTS Focal Points which in most cases are national institutions responsible for data production in the area of crime and criminal justice (National Statistical Offices, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice, etc.). The primary source on intentional homicide is usually an institution of the criminal justice system (Police, Ministry of Interior, general Prosecutor Office, etc.). Data produced by public health/civil registration system are sent to WHO through national health authorities.

### Description:

Data on intentional homicide are sent to UNODC by member states, usually through national UN-CTS Focal Points which in most cases are national institutions responsible for data production in the area of crime and criminal justice (National Statistical Offices, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice, etc.). The primary source on intentional homicide is usually an institution of the criminal justice system (Police, Ministry of Interior, general Prosecutor Office, etc.). Data produced by public health/civil registration system are sent to WHO through national health authorities.

## Data compilers

---

**Name:**

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC),WHO

**Description:**

At international level, data on intentional homicides are routinely collected and disseminated by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) through the annual UN-Crime Trend Survey (CTS) data collection. UNODC partners with regional organizations in the collection and dissemination of homicide data, respectively with Eurostat in Europe and with the Organisation of American States in the Americas. WHO collects data on intentional homicide in the framework of regular data collection on causes of death . In this context, data on deaths by assault are considered as intentional homicides.

## References

---

**URL:**

[www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)

**References:**

UNODC Homicide Database (<https://data.unodc.org/>), UNODC, Global Study on Homicide 2013; WHO-UNDP-UNODC, Global Status Report on Violence Prevention 2014); UNODC, International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes - ICCS, 2015

## Related indicators

---

Target 5.2 and Goal 11:

Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.1: Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere

[Indicator 16.1.3: Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months](#)

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

The total number of persons who have been victim of physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months, as a share of the total population.

### Rationale:

This indicator measures the prevalence of victimization from physical, sexual (and, possibly, psychological) violence. It is globally relevant as violence in various forms occurs in all regions and countries of the world. Given that acts of violence are heavily underreported to the authorities, this indicator needs to be based on data collected through sample surveys of the adult population.

### Concepts:

This indicator measures the prevalence of victimization from physical, psychological or sexual violence

**Physical violence:** This concept is equivalent to the concept of physical assault, as defined in the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS): the intentional or reckless application of physical force inflicted upon the body of a person. This includes serious and minor bodily injuries and serious and minor physical force. According to the ICCS, these are defined as:

**Serious bodily injury,** at minimum, includes gunshot or bullet wounds; knife or stab wounds; severed limbs; broken bones or teeth knocked out; internal injuries; being knocked unconscious; and other severe or critical injuries.

**Serious physical force,** at minimum, includes being shot; stabbed or cut; hit by an object; hit by a thrown object; poisoning and other applications of force with the potential to cause serious bodily injury.

**Minor bodily injury,** at minimum, includes bruises, cuts, scratches, chipped teeth, swelling, black eye and other minor injuries.

Minor physical force, at minimum, includes hitting, slapping, pushing, tripping, knocking down and other applications of force with the potential to cause minor bodily injury.

Sexual violence (ICCS): Unwanted sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, or contact or communication with unwanted sexual attention without valid consent or with consent as a result of intimidation, force, fraud, coercion, threat, deception, use of drugs or alcohol, or abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability. This includes rape and other forms of sexual assault.

Psychological violence: There is as yet no consensus at the international level of the precise definition of psychological violence and there is as yet no generally well-established methodology to measure psychological violence.

#### **Comments and limitations:**

Crime victimization surveys are able to capture experience of violence suffered by adult population of both sexes; however, due to the complexity of collecting information on experiences of violence, it is likely that not all experiences of violence are duly covered by these surveys, which aim to cover several types of crime experience. Other dedicated surveys on violence usually focus on selected population groups (typically women, children or the elderly) or in specific contexts (domestic violence, schools, prisons, etc.), but they are not able to portray levels and trends of violence in the entire population.

While there are already international standards on measuring physical and sexual violence through survey instruments, there is currently no international standard on the measurement of psychological violence. One practical option could be to limit psychological violence to threatening behaviour, which does have an established methodology of measurement in victimization surveys. Threatening behaviour, at minimum, is an intentional behaviour that causes fear of injury or harm.

Finally, indicators on prevalence of physical and sexual violence are usually produced and reported separately; the production of data on the prevalence of physical or sexual violence requires ad-hoc data collection.

Victimization surveys (as dedicated surveys or as modules of household surveys) are usually restricted to the general population living in households above a certain age (typically 15 or 18 years of age), while sometimes an upper age limit is also applied (typically 65, 70 or 75 years of age).

## Methodology

---

#### **Computation Method:**

Number of survey respondents who have been victim of physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months, divided by the total number of survey respondents.

#### **Disaggregation:**

By sex and age  
Income level

Education  
Citizenship  
Ethnicity

**Treatment of missing values:**

- [At country level](#)

Missing values are left blank

- [At regional and global levels](#)

Missing values are left blank. Global estimates are currently not produced.

**Regional aggregates:**

Global estimates are currently not produced.

**Sources of discrepancies:**

UNODC currently compiles data from national sources.

## Data Sources

---

**Description:**

This indicator is derived from surveys on crime victimization or from other household surveys with a module on crime victimization.

The indicator refers to individual experience of the respondent, who is randomly selected among the household members, while experience of other members is not to be included. Experience of violent victimization is collected through a series of questions on concrete acts of violence suffered by the respondent.

UNODC collects data on the prevalence of physical and sexual assault through its annual data collection (UN-CTS). The data collection through the UN-CTS is facilitated by a network of over 130 national Focal Points appointed by responsible authorities.

**Collection process:**

There is a consolidated system of annual data collection on crime and criminal justice (UN- Crime Trends Survey, UN-CTS) which represents the basis of data on intentional homicide. The UN-CTS data collection is largely based on the network of national Focal Points, which are institutions/officials appointed by countries and having the technical capacity and role to produce data on crime and criminal justice (around 130 appointed Focal Points as of 2016).

The UN-CTS collects data on reporting rate by victims of “physical assault” and “sexual assault”. The current data collection will be reviewed to collect more precise data on this indicator.

Data for SDG monitoring will be sent to countries for consultation prior to publication.

## Data Availability

---

### Description:

Data Availability refers to country reporting in UN-CTS only: (phys = prevalence of physical assault; (sex) = prevalence rate of sexual assault

Data Availability (2010 to present)

Asia and Pacific: 1 (phys) + 3 (sex) 4

Africa: 0 (phys) + 2 (sex) 2

Latin America and the Caribbean: 1 (phys) + 4 (sex) 5

Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 10 (phys) + 12 (sex) 22

Data Availability (2000-2009)

Asia and Pacific: 1 (phys) + 2 (sex) 3

Africa: 2 (phys) + 0 (sex) 2

Latin America and the Caribbean: 1 (phys) + 4 (sex) 5

Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 8 (phys) + 14 (sex) 22

See also available data and metadata at:

<https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/crime-and-criminal-justice.html>

### Time series:

2006-2014

## Calendar

---

### Data collection:

III – IV quarter 2016

### Data release:

II quarter 2017

## Data providers

---

National Statistical Offices, Police, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Interior, Prosecutor’s Office

## Data compilers

---

UNODC

## References

---

**URL:**

[www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)

**References:**

UNODC collects data on the prevalence of crime and violence in its annual data collection on crime and criminal justice (UN- Crime Trends Survey, UN-CTS).

## Related indicators

---

16.2, 16.3, 16.a, 5.2

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.1: Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere

Indicator 16.1.4: Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

This indicator refers to the proportion of the population (adults) who feel safe walking alone in their neighbourhood.

### Rationale:

The concept of 'fear of crime' has been used in dozens of crime victimization surveys and the standard formulation used here has been seen as effective in different cultural contexts. It is important to understand that 'fear of crime' is a phenomenon that is separate from the prevalence of crime and that may be even largely independent from actual experience, as the perception of crime and the resulting fear of it is mediated by a number of factors, such as the awareness of crime, the public discussion and the media and personal circumstances. Nevertheless, the 'fear of crime' is an important indicator in itself as a high level of fear can negatively influence well-being and lead to reduced contacts with the public, reduced trust and activities and thus an obstacle to development.

### Concepts:

The question measures the feeling of fear of crime in a context outside the house and refers to the immediate experience of this fear by the respondent by limiting the area in question to the "neighbourhood" or "your area" (various formulations depending on cultural, physical and language context).

### Comments and limitations:

While the measurement of fear of crime is widely applied in crime victimization surveys around the world, different practices exist in the operationalization of this indicator – for example, by not requiring the person to "walk alone" or limiting the walking to "at night". Further guidance on measuring the indicator are currently elaborated by UNODC in collaboration with victimization survey experts.

In 2010 UNODC-UNECE published a Manual on Victimization Surveys that provides technical guidance on the implementation of such surveys, on the basis of good practices developed at country level. UNODC-

UNECE Manual on Victimization Surveys (2010), available at: [https://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/Crime-statistics/Manual\\_on\\_Victimization\\_surveys\\_2009\\_web.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/Crime-statistics/Manual_on_Victimization_surveys_2009_web.pdf)

Victimization surveys (as dedicated surveys or as modules of household surveys) are usually restricted to the general population living in households above a certain age (typically 15 or 18 years of age), while sometimes an upper age limit is also applied (typically 65, 70 or 75 years of age).

## Methodology

---

### Computation Method:

The question used in victimization surveys is: How safe do you feel walking alone in your area/neighbourhood? Answer: Very safe/fairly safe/bit unsafe/very unsafe/ I never walk alone after dark/don't know. The proportion of population that feel safe is calculated by summing up the number of respondents who feel "very safe" and "fairly safe" and dividing the total by the total number of respondents.

### Disaggregation:

By age and sex

### Treatment of missing values:

- [At country level](#)

Missing values are left blank

- [At regional and global levels](#)

Missing values are left blank. Global estimates are not made on the basis of national reporting rates.

### Regional aggregates:

No global estimates have been made on the basis of national reporting rates.

### Sources of discrepancies:

UNODC only compiles data from national sources, therefore no differences among the values should exist.

## Data Sources

---

### **Description:**

Data are collected through sample surveys among the general population, most often through crime victimization surveys.

UNODC collects data on crime and criminal justice through its annual data collection (UN-CTS). The data collection through the UN-CTS is facilitated by a network of over 130 national Focal Points appointed by responsible authorities. Data on 'fear of crime' are not yet collected in the UN-CTS, however, it is expected that data collection on this indicator can be included in the next major revision of the UN-CTS planned for 2017.

### **Collection process:**

There is a consolidated system of annual data collection on crime and criminal justice (UN- Crime Trends Survey, UN-CTS) managed by UNODC. The UN-CTS data collection is largely based on the network of national Focal Points, which are institutions/officials appointed by countries and having the technical capacity and role to produce data on crime and criminal justice (around 130 appointed Focal Points as of 2016). As decided in a recent meeting of Focal Points, the UN-CTS will be reviewed to include indicator 16.1.4

## Data Availability

---

Reference is made to (non-official) data from the International Crime Victimization Survey – ICVS

Countries have at least 1 data point between 2000 and 2010 for this indicator

Asia and Pacific: 6

Africa: 14

Latin America and the Caribbean: 6

Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 37"

## Calendar

---

### **Data collection:**

III-IV quarter 2017

### **Data release:**

II quarter 2018

## Data providers

---

National Statistical Offices, Police, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Interior, Prosecutor's Office

## Data compilers

---

UNODC

## References

---

### URL:

[www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)

### References:

UNODC collects data on the prevalence of crime and violence in its annual data collection on crime and criminal justice (UN- Crime Trends Survey, UN-CTS). In close consultation with national UN-CTS Focal Points, a major revision process for the UN-CTS has is planned for 2017 allowing for the inclusion of new indicators such as 16.1.4. on the perception of safety.

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.2: End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children

Indicator 16.2.1: Proportion of children aged 1-17 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

Proportion of children aged 1-17 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month is currently being measured by the Proportion of children aged 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month.

### Rationale:

All too often, children are raised using methods that rely on physical force or verbal intimidation to punish unwanted behaviours and encourage desired ones. The use of violent discipline with children represent a violation of their rights. Physical discipline and psychological aggression tend to overlap and frequently occur together, exacerbating the short- and long-term harm they inflict. The consequences of violent discipline range from immediate effects to long-term damage that children carry well into adulthood. Violent discipline is the most widespread, and socially accepted, type of violence against children.

### Concepts:

In Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), psychological aggression refers to the action of shouting, yelling or screaming at a child, as well as calling a child offensive names, such as 'dumb' or 'lazy'. Physical (or corporal) punishment is an action intended to cause physical pain or discomfort, but not injuries. Physical punishment is defined as shaking the child, hitting or slapping him/her on the hand/arm/leg, hitting him/her on the bottom or elsewhere on the body with a hard object, spanking or hitting him/her on the bottom with a bare hand, hitting or slapping him/her on the face, head or ears, and beating him/her over and over as hard as possible.

### **Comments and limitations:**

There is an existing, standardized and validated measurement tool (the Parent-Child version of the Conflict Tactics Scale, or CTSPC) that is widely accepted and has been implemented in a large number of countries, including high-income countries.

Definitions of both physical punishment and psychological aggression will need to be very clearly defined for countries but this should not be a problem as there is a wealth of available literature and research on the violent punishment of children and General Comment No.13 on the Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC) also provides a definition for “corporal” or “physical” punishment as well as "mental violence".

## **Methodology**

---

### **Computation Method:**

Number of children aged 1-17 years who are reported to have experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month divided by the total number of children aged 1-17 in the population multiplied by 100

### **Disaggregation:**

Sex, age, income, place of residence, geographic location

### **Treatment of missing values:**

- [At country level](#)

When data for a country are entirely missing, UNICEF does not publish any country-level estimate.

- [At regional and global levels](#)

The regional average is applied to those countries within the region with missing values for the purposes of calculating regional aggregates only, but are not published as country-level estimates.

### **Regional aggregates:**

Global aggregates are weighted averages of all the sub-regions that make up the world. Regional aggregates are weighted averages of all the countries within the region.

## Data Sources

---

### Description:

Household surveys such as UNICEF-supported MICS and DHS that have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since around 2005. In some countries, such data are also collected through other national household surveys.

### Collection process:

UNICEF undertakes an annual process to update its global databases, called Country Reporting on Indicators for the Goals (CRING). This exercise is done in close collaboration with UNICEF country offices with the purpose of ensuring that UNICEF global databases contain updated and internationally comparable data. UNICEF Country Offices are invited to submit, through an online system, any updated data for a number of key indicators on the well-being of women and children. Updates sent by the country offices are then reviewed by sector specialists at UNICEF headquarters to check for consistency and overall data quality of the submitted estimates. This review is based on a set of objective criteria to ensure that only the most recent and reliable information is included in the databases. Once reviewed, feedback is made available on whether or not specific data points are accepted, and if not, the reasons why. New data points that are accepted are then entered into UNICEF's global databases and published in the State of the World's Children statistical tables, as well as in all other data-driven publications/material. The updated databases are also posted online at [data.unicef.org](http://data.unicef.org).

UNICEF also searches throughout the year for additional sources of data that are vetted by the UNICEF country office before they are included in the global databases.

## Data Availability

---

Nationally representative and comparable prevalence data are currently available for a sub-sample of children aged 1-14 years for 73 low- and middle-income countries

## Calendar

---

NA

## Data providers

---

National Statistical Offices (for the most part)

## Data compilers

---

**Name:**

UNICEF

## References

---

**URL:**

[data.unicef.org](http://data.unicef.org)

**References:**

<http://data.unicef.org/child-protection/violent-discipline.html>

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.2: End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children

Indicator 16.2.2: Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population, by sex, age and form of exploitation

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

The indicator is defined as the ratio between the total number of victims of trafficking in persons detected or living in a country and the population resident in the country, expressed per 100,000 populations.

According to Article 3, paragraph (a) of the UN Trafficking in Persons Protocol, trafficking in persons is defined as “the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs”.

Article 3, (b) states “the consent of a victim of trafficking in persons to the intended exploitation set forth in subparagraph (a) of this article shall be irrelevant where any of the means set forth in subparagraph (a) have been used”;

Article 3, (c) states “the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of a child for the purpose of exploitation shall be considered trafficking in persons even if this does not involve any of the means set forth in subparagraph (a);”

### Rationale:

The rationale is measuring the prevalence of the number of victims of trafficking according to the victims profile and the forms of exploitation.

### **Concepts:**

According to the definition given in the Trafficking in Persons Protocol, trafficking in persons has three constituent elements; The Act (Recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons), the Means

(Threat or use of force, coercion, abduction, fraud, deception, abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability, or giving payments or benefits to a person in control over another person) and the Purpose (at minimum exploiting the prostitution of others, sexual exploitation, forced labour, slavery or similar practices and the removal of organs).

The definition implies that the exploitation does not need to be in place, as the intention by traffickers to exploit the victim is sufficient to define a trafficking offence. Furthermore, the list of exploitative forms is not limited, which means that other forms of exploitation may emerge and they could be considered to represent additional forms of trafficking offences.

### **Comments and limitations:**

The count of detected victims of trafficking has the benefit of referring to victims as defined by the UN Protocol where the act, the mean and the purpose of trafficking have been identified by the national authorities. However it does not cover the dark number of crime, i.e. the number of victims non detected by the authorities. While information on detected victims can provide valuable information to monitor sex and age profile of detected victims, as well as on forms of exploitation ,trafficking flows, the number of detected victims per se doesn't monitor the level of trafficking of persons so interpretation of trends should be done with caution, as changes in detected victims of trafficking can be due to multiple factors such as intensity of trafficking flows but also to changes of law enforcement practices, changes in legislation, or changes in victims attitudes,.

## **Methodology**

---

### **Computation Method:**

This numerator of this indicator is composed of two parts: detected and undetected victims of trafficking in persons. The detected part of trafficking victims, as resulting from investigation and prosecution activities of criminal justice system, is counted and reported by national law enforcement authorities.

Methodology to estimate the number of undetected victims of trafficking in persons is under development: some methods have been identified , but further testing is needed to produce a consolidated and agreed upon approach. The method to estimate undetected victims will have to allow the estimation of victims characteristics (sex and age) and the forms of exploitation suffered.

The indicator will be calculated as the ratio between the sum of detected and undetected victims of trafficking and the population resident in the country, multiplied by 100,000

**Disaggregation:**

"Recommended disaggregations for this indicator are:

- sex and age of victims
- form of exploitation"

**Treatment of missing values:**

- [At country level](#)

Data on detected victims of trafficking are not estimated, if not provided by national authorities.

Methods to estimate undetected victims of trafficking are currently being tested by UNODC.

- [At regional and global levels](#)

Missing values are not imputed.

**Regional aggregates:**

Regional and global aggregates of number of victims of trafficking are currently not produced.

**Sources of discrepancies:**

Data on detected victims of trafficking used at international level correspond to those produced at national level.

## Data Sources

---

**Description:**

Data on detected victims of trafficking are typically provided by national authorities competent in detecting trafficking victims, law enforcement institutions, or services assisting the victims. Data are collected by UNODC through a questionnaire sent to national authorities through their Permanent Missions to the United Nations in Vienna (or any other competent authority designated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and published in the UNODC Global Report on Trafficking in Persons every two years.

**Collection process:**

UNODC collects data from national authorities competent in detecting victims of trafficking through a common questionnaire. Once consolidated, before publication data are shared with countries to check their accuracy.

## Data Availability

---

### Description:

Currently UNODC has regular data collection on detected victims of trafficking in persons for about 130 countries.

### Time series:

Information available since 2003 (limited to detected victims of trafficking)

## Calendar

---

### Data collection:

Data collection is conducted every year, starting in the II quarter.

### Data release:

The next edition of the Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, with most up-to date data until 2014, is scheduled on November 2016. The Report is published every two years. ( November 2016)

## Data providers

---

UNODC collects data from national authorities (normally designated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) competent in detecting victims of trafficking, either law enforcement institutions or national agencies responsible for assisting victims of trafficking

## Data compilers

---

UNODC

## References

---

### URL:

[www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)

### References:

[www.unodc.org/glotip.html](http://www.unodc.org/glotip.html)

UNODC, Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, 2014

## Related indicators

---

**Target 5.2 and 8.7 refer to trafficking in persons:**

Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities

**Comments:**

Target 5.2 and 8.7 refer to trafficking in persons

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.2: End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children

Indicator 16.2.3: Proportion of young women and men aged 18-29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

Proportion of young women and men aged 18-29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18

### Rationale:

Sexual violence is one of the most unsettling of children's rights violations. Experiences of sexual violence in childhood hinder all aspects of development: physical, psychological/emotional and social. Apart from the physical injuries that can result, researchers have consistently found that the sexual abuse of children is associated with a wide array of mental health consequences and adverse behavioural outcomes in adulthood.

The issue is universally relevant and the indicator captures one of the gravest forms of violence against children. The right of children to protection from all forms of violence is enshrined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and its Optional Protocols.

### Concepts:

Definition from General Comment No. 13 on the Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC):

Sexual violence comprises any sexual activities imposed by an adult on a child against which the child is entitled to protection by criminal law. This includes: (a) The inducement or coercion of a child to engage in any unlawful or psychologically harmful sexual activity; (b) The use of children in commercial sexual exploitation; (c) The use of children in audio or visual images of child sexual abuse; and (d) Child prostitution, sexual slavery, sexual exploitation in travel and tourism, trafficking for purposes of sexual exploitation (within and between countries), sale of children for sexual purposes and forced marriage.

Sexual activities are also considered as abuse when committed against a child by another child if the offender is significantly older than the victim or uses power, threat or other means of pressure.

Consensual sexual activities between children are not considered as sexual abuse if the children are older than the age limit defined by the State Party.

**Comments and limitations:**

The availability of comparable data remains a serious challenge in this area as many data collection efforts have relied on different study methodologies and designs, definitions of sexual violence, samples and questions to elicit information. A further challenge in this field is underreporting, especially when it comes to reporting on experiences of sexual violence among boys and men.

## Methodology

---

**Computation Method:**

Number of young women and men aged 18-29 years who report having experienced any sexual violence by age 18 divided by the total number of young women and men aged 18-29 years, respectively, in the population multiplied by 100.

**Disaggregation:**

Sex, age, income, place of residence, geographic location, marital status, education

**Treatment of missing values:**

- [At country level](#)

When data for a country are entirely missing, UNICEF does not publish any country-level estimate.

- [At regional and global levels](#)

The regional average is applied to those countries within the region with missing values for the purposes of calculating regional aggregates only, but are not published as country-level estimates.

**Regional aggregates:**

Global aggregates are weighted averages of all the sub-regions that make up the world. Regional aggregates are weighted averages of all the countries within the region.

## Data Sources

---

**Description:**

Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s.

### Collection process:

UNICEF undertakes an annual process to update its global databases, called Country Reporting on Indicators for the Goals (CRING). This exercise is done in close collaboration with UNICEF country offices with the purpose of ensuring that UNICEF global databases contain updated and internationally comparable data. UNICEF Country Offices are invited to submit, through an online system, any updated data for a number of key indicators on the well-being of women and children. Updates sent by the country offices are then reviewed by sector specialists at UNICEF headquarters to check for consistency and overall data quality of the submitted estimates. This review is based on a set of objective criteria to ensure that only the most recent and reliable information is included in the databases. Once reviewed, feedback is made available on whether or not specific data points are accepted, and if not, the reasons why. New data points that are accepted are then entered into UNICEF's global databases and published in the State of the World's Children statistical tables, as well as in all other data-driven publications/material. The updated databases are also posted online at [data.unicef.org](http://data.unicef.org).

UNICEF also searches throughout the year for additional sources of data that are vetted by the UNICEF country office before they are included in the global databases.

## Data Availability

---

Nationally representative and comparable data are currently available for women from 34 low- and middle-income countries and for men from 5 low- and middle-income countries.

## Calendar

---

NA

## Data providers

---

National Statistical Offices (for the most part) or line ministries/other government agencies that have conducted national surveys on sexual violence against women and men.

## Data compilers

---

UNICEF

## References

---

### URL:

[data.unicef.org](http://data.unicef.org)

**References:**

<http://data.unicef.org/child-protection/sexual-violence.html>

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.3: Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all

[Indicator 16.3.1: Proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms](#)

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

Number of victims of violent crime in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms, as a percentage of all victims of violent crime in the previous 12 months

### Rationale:

Reporting to competent authorities is the first step for crime victims to seek justice: if competent authorities are not alerted they are not in a condition to conduct proper investigations and administer justice. However, lack of trust and confidence in the ability of the police or other authorities to provide effective redress, or objective and subjective difficulties in accessing them, can influence negatively the reporting behaviour of crime victims. As such, reporting rates provide a direct measure of the confidence of victims of crime in the ability of the police or other authorities to provide assistance and bring perpetrators to justice. Reporting rates provide also a measure of the 'dark figure' of crime, that is the proportion of crimes not reported to the police. Trends in reporting rates of violent crime can be used to monitor public trust and confidence in competent authorities on the basis of actual behaviours and not perceptions.

### Concepts:

Competent authorities includes police, prosecutors or other authorities with competencies to investigate relevant crimes, while 'other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms' may include a variety of institutions with a role in the informal justice or dispute resolution process (e.g. tribal or religious leaders, village elders, community leaders), provided their role is officially recognized by state authorities

### Comments and limitations:

The target relates to the multidimensional concepts of rule of law and access to justice and at least two indicators are required to cover the main elements of access to justice and efficiency of the justice

system. The indicator 16.3.1 covers an important aspect of victim's access to criminal justice, while it doesn't cover civil or administrative disputes. The indicator as formulated is a standard indicator widely published when a victimization survey is undertaken, but further work is required to enhance a consistent interpretation and application of this indicator. In particular, some important elements of this indicator needs methodological guidance, such as the type of violent crime to include beyond physical assault; counting rules regarding reporting rates (e.g. prevalence-based, incidence-based, based on last victimization experience) and the type of competent authorities to consider.

Methodological guidance on these issues is currently under development.

## Methodology

---

### Computation Method:

Number of victims of violent crime in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms, divided by the number of all victims of violent crime in the previous 12 months (also called the 'crime reporting rate')

Both the number of victims of violent crime as well as the number of all victims of violent crime are measured through sample surveys of the general population, most often dedicated crime victimization surveys.

### Disaggregation:

Recommended disaggregations for this indicator are:

- sex
- type of crime
- ethnicity
- migration background
- citizenship

### Treatment of missing values:

- [At country level](#)

Missing values are left blank

- [At regional and global levels](#)

Missing values are left blank. Global estimates are currently not made.

### Regional aggregates:

Global estimates are currently not made

**Sources of discrepancies:**

UNODC compiles data from national sources.

## Data Sources

---

**Description:**

Victimisation surveys provide direct information on this indicator, as they collect information on the experience of violent crime and on whether the victim has reported it to competent authorities.

UNODC collects data on reporting rates for violent crime through its annual data collection (UN-CTS). The data collection through the UN-CTS is facilitated by a network of over 130 national Focal Points appointed by responsible authorities.

**Collection process:**

There is a consolidated system of annual data collection on crime and criminal justice (UN- Crime Trends Survey, UN-CTS) which represents the basis of data on intentional homicide, criminal justice outputs, penitentiary statistics and prevalence of victimization. The UN-CTS data collection is largely based on the network of national Focal Points, which are institutions/officials appointed by countries and have the technical capacity and role to produce data on crime and criminal justice (around 130 appointed Focal Points as of 2016).

The UN-CTS collects data on reporting rate by victims respectively of “physical assault” and “sexual assault”. The current data collection is currently reviewed to collect data on this indicator.

Data for SDG monitoring will be sent to countries for consultation prior to publication

## Data Availability

---

**Description:**

"Countries have at least 1 data point after 2010 for this indicator

Asia and Pacific: 6

Africa: 2

Latin America and the Caribbean: 10

Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 15

Countries have at least 1 data point between 2000 and 2010 for this indicator

Asia and Pacific: 2

Africa: 1

Latin America and the Caribbean: 8

Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 17"

**Time series:**

2006-2014

## Calendar

---

**Data collection:**

III-IV quarter 2016

**Data release:**

III-IV quarter 2016

## Data providers

---

National Statistical Offices, Police, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Interior, Prosecutor's Office

## Data compilers

---

UNODC

## References

---

**URL:**

[www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)

**References:**

In 2010 UNODC-UNECE published a Manual on Victimization Surveys, that provides technical guidance on the implementation of such surveys, on the basis of good practices developed at country level.

UNODC, International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, 2015

## Related indicators

---

16.6:

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.3: Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all

[Indicator 16.3.2: Unsented detainees as a proportion of overall prison population](#)

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

The total number of persons held in detention who have not yet been sentenced, as a percentage of the total number of persons held in detention, on a specified date.

### Rationale:

The indicator signifies overall respect for the principle that persons awaiting trial shall not be detained in custody unnecessarily. This, in turn, is premised on aspects of the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty. From a development perspective, extensive use of pre-sentence detention when not necessary for reasons such as the prevention of absconding, the protection of victims or witnesses, or the prevention of the commission of further offences, can divert criminal justice system resources, and exert financial and unemployment burdens on the accused and his or her family. Measuring the relative extent to which pre-sentence detention is used can provide the evidence to assist countries in lowering such burdens and ensuring its proportionate use.

### Concepts:

‘Sentenced’ refers to persons subject to criminal proceedings who have received a decision from a competent authority regarding their conviction or acquittal. For the purposes of the indicator, persons who have received a ‘non-final’ decision (such as where a conviction is subject to appeal) are considered to be ‘sentenced’.

### Comments and limitations:

The target relates to the multidimensional concepts of rule of law and access to justice and at least two indicators are required to cover the main elements of access to justice and efficiency of the justice system. The proposed indicator 16.3.2 covers the efficiency of the justice system.

## Methodology

---

### Computation Method:

The total number of unsentenced persons held in detention divided by the total number of persons held in detention, on a specified date.

### Disaggregation:

Recommended disaggregation for this indicator are:

- age and sex
- length of pre-trial (unsentenced) detention

### Treatment of missing values:

- [At country level](#)

If all values for a given period and country are missing, then the missing values are left blank. If only certain years in the period are missing, then missing values for that year are left blank and are not taken into account when computing the three year average for that country.

- [At regional and global levels](#)

Missing values are left blank and are not taken into account when computing regional averages.

### Regional aggregates:

Weighted averages are the preferred method for calculating regional and global average rates. For this purpose, regional averages of the proportion of unsentenced detainees are obtained by adding up the number of unsentenced persons held in the region and dividing the total by the sum of the total number of persons held in detention in the region. Similarly, global averages of the proportion of unsentenced detainees are obtained by adding up the number of unsentenced persons held globally and dividing the total by the sum of the total number of persons held in detention globally.

### Sources of discrepancies:

UNODC only compiles data from national sources, therefore no differences among the values should exist.

## Data Sources

---

### Description:

UNODC collects data on prisons through its annual data collection (UN-CTS). The data collection through the UN-CTS is facilitated by a network of over 130 national Focal Points appointed by responsible

authorities. Data on unsentenced and total detainees from the UN-CTS are available for 114 countries. The country coverage can improve if other sources (research institutions and NGOs) are included (data for additional 60 countries are available, bringing the total for the period 2012-2014 to 174 countries). Data for two points in time (2003-2005 and 2012-2014 three year averages) are available for 144 countries.

**Collection process:**

There is a consolidated system of annual data collection on crime and criminal justice (UN- Crime Trends Survey, UN-CTS) which represents the basis of data on unsentenced detainees. The UN-CTS data collection is largely based on the network of national Focal Points, which are institutions/officials appointed by countries and having the technical capacity and role to produce data on crime and criminal justice (around 130 appointed Focal Points as of 2016). In addition, these data are supplemented for countries with missing values with official data collected by the Institute for Criminal Policy Research (World Prison Brief), which collects data directly from national prison administrations or from the websites of Ministries of Justice or other official agencies. For future SDG reporting data will be sent to countries for consultation prior to publication.

## Data Availability

---

**Description:**

The target relates to the multidimensional concepts of rule of law and access to justice and at least two indicators are required to cover the main elements of access to justice and efficiency of the justice system. The proposed indicator 16.3.2 covers the efficiency of the justice system.

**Time series:**

2003-2014

## Calendar

---

**Data collection:**

III-VI quarter 2016

**Data release:**

II quarter 2017 (data for 2015)

## Data providers

---

National prison authority, through UN-CTS Focal Point

## Data compilers

---

UNODC

## References

---

**URL:**

[www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)

**References:**

Definitions and other metadata are provided in the UN-Crime Trends Survey (UN-CTS) Guidance on collection of information on detained persons, as well as example data collection sheets, are provided in the United Nations Manual for the Development of a System of Criminal Justice Statistics, as well as (for children), in the UNODC/UNICEF Manual for the Measurement of Juvenile Justice Indicators.

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.5: Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms

Indicator 16.5.1: Proportion of persons who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials, during the previous 12 months

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

This indicator is defined as the percentage of persons who paid at least one bribe (gave a public official money, a gift or counter favour) to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, in the last 12 months, as a percentage of persons who had at least one contact with a public official in the same period.

### Rationale:

Corruption is an antonym of equal accessibility to public services and of correct functioning of the economy; as such, it has a negative impact on fair distribution of resources and development opportunities. Besides, corruption erodes public trust in authorities and the rule of law; when administrative bribery becomes a recurrent experience of large sectors of the population and businesses, its negative effects have an enduring negative impact on the rule of law, democratic processes and justice. By providing a direct measure of the experience of bribery, this indicator provides an objective metric of corruption, a yardstick to monitor progress in the fight against corruption

### Concepts:

In the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS), bribery is defined as: 'Promising, offering, giving, soliciting, or accepting an undue advantage to or from a public official or a person who directs or works in a private sector entity, directly or indirectly, in order that the person act or refrain from acting in the exercise of his or her official duties'. This definition is based on definitions of bribery of national public officials, bribery of foreign public officials and official of international organisations and bribery in the private sector that are contained in the United Nations Convention against Corruption (articles 15, 16, and 21).

While the concept of bribery is broader, as it includes also actions such as promising or offering, and it covers both public and private sector, this indicator focuses on specific forms of bribery that are more measurable (the giving and/or requesting of bribes) and it limits the scope to the public sector.

The concept of undue advantage is operationalized by reference to giving of money, gifts or provision of a service requested/offered by/to a public official in exchange for a special treatment.

This indicator captures the often called 'administrative bribery', which is often intended as the type of bribery affecting citizens in their dealings with public administrations and/or civil servants.

For this indicator, public official refers to persons holding a legislative, executive, administrative or judicial office. In the operationalization of the indicator, a list of selected officials and civil servants is used.

#### **Comments and limitations:**

In the experience of several surveys conducted at national and international level, the so-called bribery prevalence rate is defined as the percentage of persons who paid at least one bribe (gave a public official money, a gift or counter favour) to a public official in the last 12 months, as a percentage of persons who had at least one contact with a public official in the same period. In this formulation the share of population who was asked a bribe but did not give it is not included. Available data at national and international level usually refers to this formulation, while the collection of data according to the formulation included in the SDG framework will depend on the adaptation of relevant survey tools and the calculation by national authorities. It is expected that data according to the current definition will become available gradually.

On a more general level, it should be noted that this indicator provides solid information on the experience of bribery occurring in the interaction between citizens and the public sector in the context of service delivery/transactions, while it does not cover other forms of corruption, such as 'grand corruption', trading in influence or abuse of power

## Methodology

---

#### **Computation Method:**

The indicator is calculated as the total number of persons who paid at least one bribe to a public official in the last 12 months, or were asked for a bribe in the same period, over the total number of persons who had at least one contact with a public official in the same period, multiplied by 100.

#### **Disaggregation:**

Recommended disaggregation for this indicator are:

age and sex of bribe-givers

type of official

income level of bribe-givers

education attainment of bribe-givers

**Treatment of missing values:**

- [At country level](#)

Missing values are not imputed

- [At regional and global levels](#)

Missing values are not imputed. Global and regional estimates will be produced when data availability will improve.

**Regional aggregates:**

Global and regional estimates will be produced when data availability will improve.

**Sources of discrepancies:**

For the time being, only data from national sources are used.

## Data Sources

---

**Description:**

This indicator is derived from household surveys on corruption experience and/or victimisation surveys with a module on bribery.

The indicator refers to individual experience of the respondent, who is randomly selected among the household members, while experience of bribery by other members is not to be included. Experience of bribery is collected through a series of questions on concrete contacts and experiences of bribery with a list of public official and civil servants.

The denominator refers only to those persons that had at least one direct interaction with a public official/civil servant as they form the population group at risk of experiencing bribery.

UNODC collects data on the prevalence of bribery through its annual data collection (UN-CTS). The data collection through the UN-CTS is facilitated by a network of over 130 national Focal Points appointed by responsible authorities.

**Collection process:**

At international level, data are collected by UNODC through the annual UN-CTS data collection. Data are on bribery indicator are sent to UNODC by member states, usually through national UN-CTS Focal Points (around 130 appointed Focal Points as of 2016) which in most cases are national institutions responsible for data production in the area of crime and criminal justice (National Statistical Offices, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice, etc.). When necessary, other data sources are used, including from websites, publications, other forms of communication.

Data for SDG monitoring will be sent to countries for consultation prior to publication.

## Data Availability

---

Countries that have at least 1 data point after 2010 for the indicator on bribery prevalence (see point 7.1) are:

Asia and Pacific: 2

Africa: 8

Latin America and the Caribbean: 2

Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 9

Countries have at least 1 data point between 2000 and 2009 for this indicator:

Asia and Pacific: 0

Africa: 0

Latin America and the Caribbean: 4

Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 2"

## Calendar

---

### Data collection:

III-IV quarter 2016

### Data release:

II quarter 2017

## Data providers

---

Data on bribery are sent to UNODC by member states, usually through national UN-CTS Focal Points which in most cases are national institutions responsible for data production in the area of crime and criminal justice (National Statistical Offices, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice, etc.). The primary source of data on the indicator of bribery experience is usually the institution responsible for surveys on corruption/victimisation surveys (National Statistical Office, Anti-Corruption Agency, etc.).

## Data compilers

---

### Name:

UNODC

**Description:**

UNODC, through the annual UN Crime Trends Survey (UN-CTS)

## References

---

**URL:**

[www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)

**References:**

UNODC, International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, 2015

## Related indicators

---

16.3

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.5: Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms

Indicator 16.5.2: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials during the previous 12 months

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

World Bank (WB)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

Proportion of firms asked for a gift or informal payment when meeting with tax officials.

In every Enterprise Survey ([www.enterprisesurveys.org](http://www.enterprisesurveys.org)), there is a standard question which asks the survey respondent if they were inspected by or required to meet with tax officials. If the respondent indicates 'yes', then there is a follow-up question which asks if the respondent was expected to provide a gift or an informal payment during these inspections/meetings. The response options include "yes", "no", "don't know", and "refuse".

Enterprise Surveys are firm-level surveys conducted in World Bank client countries. The survey focuses on various aspects of the business environment as well as firm's outcome measures such as annual sales, productivity, etc. The surveys are conducted via face-to-face interviews with the top manager or business owner. For each country, the survey is conducted approximately every 4-5 years.

### Rationale:

The rationale for this indicator is to ascertain whether firms are solicited for gifts or informal payments (i.e. bribes) when meeting with tax officials. Paying taxes are required of formal firms in most countries and hence the rationale for this indicator is to measure the incidence of corruption during this routine interaction. The key strength of the Enterprise Survey is that most of the questions in the survey pertain to the actual, day-to-day experiences of the firm; this question regarding corruption during tax inspections/meetings is not an opinion-based question but rather a question grounded in the firm's reality.

### Concepts:

The respondents to the Enterprise Survey are firms- either manufacturing or services establishments. These are registered (formal) firms with 5+ employees. The firms are either fully or partially private (100% state-owned firms are ineligible for the Enterprise Survey). More information on the survey methodology can be found on the Methodology page of the website: [www.enterprisesurveys.org/methodology](http://www.enterprisesurveys.org/methodology)

A gift or an informal payment is considered a 'bribe'.

### **Comments and limitations:**

The key strength of the Enterprise Survey is that most of the questions in the survey pertain to the actual, day-to-day experiences of the firm; this question regarding corruption during tax inspections/meetings is not an opinion-based question but rather a question grounded in the firm's reality.

The limitations include that some countries' data is almost 10 years old (e.g. South Africa and Brazil). This is due to the fact that these face-to-face survey projects can be expensive in some countries and hence due to budget limitations, the World Bank hasn't been able to update some of the Enterprise Surveys data in a subset of countries. Another limitation is that the surveys are done mostly in World Bank client countries and hence most high-income countries are not covered by the surveys (US, Canada, Western European countries, Japan, GCC countries, etc.).

Another limitation may be the sensitive nature of corruption. In some countries/cultures, firms may not be comfortable answering questions on corruption. Although the data is collected under the context of confidentiality, firms may refuse to answer the question if they have been subject to bribery solicitations. Hence, in some countries, the actual incidence of this particular type of corruption may be higher than the calculated indicator value.

## **Methodology**

---

### **Computation Method:**

The indicator is calculated for each country, by looking at the proportion of firms which answered 'yes' to the survey question. For all Enterprise Survey projects conducted since 2006, the resulting dataset has sampling weights. Hence the indicator value, which is computed using Stata, incorporates these sampling weights as well as the design strata.

### **Disaggregation:**

The Enterprise Survey captures several descriptive characteristics of the respondent firms including: gender of top manager, primary business activity of the firm, subnational location of the firm, exporting status, number of employees, degree of foreign ownership, and several other characteristics. Hence the indicator can be disaggregated by the levels of these individual characteristics.

### **Treatment of missing values:**

- [At country level](#)

The indicator value is not imputed for countries which do not have an Enterprise Survey.

- [At regional and global levels](#)

Regional and global aggregates of the indicator are derived from completed surveys. A single point estimate is created for each country and a global/regional aggregate takes a simple average of every country's point estimate (when there is available data for that country). For example the East Asia Pacific average (point estimate) for the indicator does not include Japan since there is no Enterprise Survey for Japan.

**Regional aggregates:**

Regional and global aggregates are computed by taking the simple average of the indicator value for all relevant countries. When producing regional and global aggregates as presented on the Enterprise Surveys website, note that only surveys posted during years 2010 onwards are used.

**Sources of discrepancies:**

We are unaware of any country-produced data on this indicator.

**Methods and guidance available to countries for the compilation of the data at the national level:**

We recommend users consult the Enterprise Surveys website to learn about the overall survey methodology and learn which countries are available for benchmarking purposes.

<http://www.enterprisesurveys.org/methodology>

**Quality assurance:**

When conducting our survey projects, the implementing fieldwork team must send periodic batches of completed interviews to the World Bank so that we can run our own quality control programs on the data. After running these programs, we provide the QC feedback to the implementing fieldwork team so that survey data, which has been flagged, can be verified and continuously improved. This is how we continuously monitor the survey data while the projects are in the field.

The World Bank collects this survey data for the public good of information. For an individual survey project, once the data is collected and considered finalized (after our own internal QC processes), the survey data is published on the World Bank's Enterprise Surveys website.

## Data Sources

---

**Description:**

The website for Enterprise Surveys ([www.enterprisesurveys.org](http://www.enterprisesurveys.org)) provides all metadata, including survey questionnaires and implementation reports for all Enterprise Surveys. The implementation reports indicate the sample size, sample frame used, dates/duration of fieldwork, the response rates, etc.

Registration to the Enterprise Survey's website is free and the website's data portal allows users to access the raw data and survey documentation for each survey.

**Collection process:**

The World Bank conducts the Enterprise Surveys in client countries. The surveys are comparable as the survey methodology is applied in a consistent manner across countries: obtaining suitable sample frames, eligibility criteria for respondent firms, survey sample design, core questionnaire elements across every country, standardized QC checks on the received data, standardized computation of sampling weights, etc.

## Data Availability

---

**Description:**

Data Availability 2010 to present (in terms of countries having at least 1 data point after 2010 for this indicator):

Asia and Pacific: 28; Africa: 25; Latin America and Caribbean: 30; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 22.

## Calendar

---

**Data collection:**

The Surveys are ongoing. Information on current projects can be found at:  
<http://www.enterprisesurveys.org/Methodology/Current-projects>

**Data release:**

The indicators on the Enterprise Surveys website are updated whenever a new survey has been completed and uploaded to the website. For each country, only the most recently completed survey is used when calculating the indicator.

## Data providers

---

The indicator is derived from Enterprise Surveys which are conducted by the World Bank. The World Bank usually hires a private contractor (typically a market research company) to conduct the survey fieldwork.

## Data compilers

---

**Name:**

World Bank

## References

---

**URL:**

[www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)

**References:**

- [www.enterprisesurveys.org](http://www.enterprisesurveys.org)
- [www.enterprisesurveys.org/methodology](http://www.enterprisesurveys.org/methodology)
- <http://www.enterprisesurveys.org/data/exploretopics/corruption>

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

Indicator 16.6.1: Primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget, by sector (or by budget codes or similar)

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

World Bank (WB)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

Primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget

This indicator measures the extent to which aggregate budget expenditure outturn reflects the amount originally approved, as defined in government budget documentation and fiscal reports. The coverage is budgetary central government (BCG) and the time period covered is the last three completed fiscal years.

### Rationale:

The indicator attempts to capture the reliability of government budgets: do governments spend what they intend to and do they collect what they set out to collect. It is a simple and intuitive indicator that is easily understood and the methodology is transparent and every rating easily verifiable.

### Concepts:

Aggregate expenditure includes actual expenditures incorporating those incurred as a result of unplanned or exceptional events—for example, armed conflicts or natural disasters. Expenditures financed by windfall revenues, including privatization, should be included and noted in the supporting fiscal tables and narrative. Expenditures financed externally by loans or grants should be included, if covered by the budget, along with contingency vote(s) and interest on debt. Expenditure assigned to suspense accounts is not included in the aggregate. However, if amounts are held in suspense accounts at the end of any year that could affect the scores if included in the calculations, they can be included. In such cases the reason(s) for inclusion must be clearly stated.

Actual expenditure outturns can deviate from the originally approved budget for reasons unrelated to the accuracy of forecasts—for example, as a result of a major macroeconomic shock. The calibration of this indicator accommodates one unusual or “outlier” year and focuses on deviations from the forecast which occur in two of the three years covered by the assessment.

Very detailed resources are available at: <http://www.pefa.org/en/content/pefa-2016-framework>. The document “Framework for assessing public financial management” is extremely useful ([https://www.pefa.org/sites/pefa.org/files/attachments/PEFA%20Framework\\_English.pdf](https://www.pefa.org/sites/pefa.org/files/attachments/PEFA%20Framework_English.pdf)). There are seven Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) Performance pillars containing a total of 31 indicators. The pillar containing this indicator is part of Pillar I which measures Budget reliability.

## Comments and limitations:

Although not all countries have used the methodology on an annual basis for this indicator, the methodology relies on standard data sets for approved and final budget outturns which are commonly produced at least annually in every country. The countries that have not used the methodology to date are primarily highly developed countries which would have less difficulty in providing the necessary data than those in the lower and middle income categories that have been primary users of Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) to date.

One limitation of the indicator is that it is an aggregate indicator of budget reliability. While it can be disaggregated across regions, it is not disaggregated across various budget subcomponents. Different indicators are used for assessing changes in expenditure composition in the PEFA framework. Also, while this indicator is intended to measure budget reliability it should be understood that actual expenditure outturns can deviate from the originally approved budget for reasons unrelated to the accuracy of forecasts—for example, as a result of a major macroeconomic shock. However, the calibration of this indicator accommodates one unusual or “outlier” year and focuses on deviations from the forecast which occur in two of the three years covered by the assessment. Therefore, single year shocks are discounted allowing a more balanced assessment.

The broader context in which the indicator was developed is as follows. PEFA is a tool for assessing the status of public financial management and reporting on the strengths and weaknesses of Public Financial Management (PFM). A PEFA assessment provides a thorough, consistent and evidence-based analysis of PFM performance at a specific point in time and can be reapplied in successive assessments to track changes over time. The PEFA framework provides the foundation for evidence-based measurement of countries’ PFM systems using 31 performance indicators that are further disaggregated into 94 dimensions. A PEFA assessment measures the extent to which PFM systems, processes and institutions contribute to the achievement of desirable budget outcomes: aggregate fiscal discipline, strategic allocation of resources, and efficient service delivery.

## Methodology

---

### Computation Method:

The methodology for calculating this indicator is provided in a spreadsheet (titled “En PI-1 and PI-2 Exp Calculation-Feb 1 2016 (xls)”) on the PEFA website (<http://www.pefa.org/en/content/pefa-2016-framework>). It is also detailed in part 2 of the document “Framework for assessing public financial management” ([https://www.pefa.org/sites/pefa.org/files/attachments/PEFA%20Framework\\_English.pdf](https://www.pefa.org/sites/pefa.org/files/attachments/PEFA%20Framework_English.pdf)).

Scoring is at the heart of the indicator. A country is scored separately on a four-point ordinal scale: A, B, C, or D, according to precise criteria:

- (A) Aggregate expenditure outturn was between 95% and 105% of the approved aggregate budgeted expenditure in at least two of the last three years.
- (B) Aggregate expenditure outturn was between 90% and 110% of the approved aggregate budgeted expenditure in at least two of the last three years.
- (C) Aggregate expenditure outturn was between 85% and 115% of the approved aggregate budgeted expenditure in at least two of the last three years.
- (D) Performance is less than required for a C score.

In order to justify a particular score, every aspect specified in the scoring requirements must be fulfilled. If the requirements are only partly met, the criteria are not satisfied and a lower score should be given

that coincides with achievement of all requirements for the lower performance rating. A score of C reflects the basic level of performance for each indicator and dimension, consistent with good international practices. A score of D means that the feature being measured is present at less than the basic level of performance or is absent altogether, or that there is insufficient information to score the dimension.

The D score indicates performance that falls below the basic level. 'D' is applied if the performance observed is less than required for any higher score. For this reason, a D score is warranted when sufficient information is not available to establish the actual level of performance. A score of D due to insufficient information is distinguished from D scores for low-level performance by the use of an asterisk—that is, D\* at the dimension level. The asterisk is not included at the indicator level.

The coverage is budgetary central government (BCG) and requires data for three consecutive years as a basis for assessment. The data would cover the most recent completed fiscal year for which data is available and the two immediately preceding years.

**Disaggregation:**

This is an aggregate national level figure. However, subnational figures can be obtained for countries with decentralized government systems.

**Treatment of missing values:**

- [At country level](#)

Not imputed.

**Regional aggregates:**

Not applicable.

**Sources of discrepancies:**

Not applicable as all figures are obtained from national budget data.

## Data Sources

---

**Description:**

The Budget Laws of countries is the usual source of the approved budget of countries. The end-of-year fiscal reports (/budget execution reports) are the sources of the actual spending. This data is typically obtained from websites of the Ministry of Finance (MoF) or the national Parliament, or data are collected through communication with the MoF.

**Collection process:**

Not applicable.

## Data Availability

---

### Description:

Data Availability 2010 to present (in terms of how many countries have at least 1 data point after 2010 for this indicator)

Asia and Pacific: 23; Africa: 41; Latin America and Caribbean: 24; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 19

Data Availability 2000-2009:

Asia and Pacific: 28; Africa: 52; Latin America and Caribbean: 28; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 17

## Calendar

---

### Data collection:

Continuously

### Data release:

Continuously

## Data providers

---

Ministry of Finances of countries

## Data compilers

---

World Bank

## References

---

### URL:

[www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)

### References:

Very detailed resources are available at: <http://www.pefa.org/en/content/pefa-2016-framework>.

The document "Framework for assessing public financial management" is extremely useful ([https://www.pefa.org/sites/pefa.org/files/attachments/PEFA%20Framework\\_English.pdf](https://www.pefa.org/sites/pefa.org/files/attachments/PEFA%20Framework_English.pdf)).

There are seven PEFA (Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability) Performance pillars and this indicator is part of Pillar I which measures Budget reliability.

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.8: Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance

Indicator 16.8.1: Proportion of members and voting rights of developing countries in international organizations

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

Financing for Development Office, DESA (FFDO)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

The indicator Proportion of members and voting rights of developing countries in international organizations has two components, the developing country proportion of voting rights and the developing country proportion of membership in international organisations. In some institutions these two components are identical.

The indicator is calculated independently for eleven different international institutions: The United Nations General Assembly, the United Nations Security Council, the United Nations Economic and Social Council, the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Trade Organisation, and the Financial Stability Board.

### Rationale:

The UN is based on a principle of sovereign equality of all its Member States (Article 2, UN Charter). This indicator aims to measure the degree to which States enjoy equal representation in international organizations.

### Concepts:

There is no established convention for the designation of "developed" and "developing" countries or areas in the United Nations system. In common practice, Japan in Asia, Canada and the United States in Northern America, Australia and New Zealand in Oceania, and Europe are considered "developed" regions or areas. The aggregation across all institutions is currently done according to the United Nations M.49 statistical standard which includes designation of "developed regions" and "developing regions", while an ongoing review seeks to reach agreement on how to define these terms for the purposes of SDG monitoring. The designations "developed" and "developing" are intended for statistical convenience and do not necessarily express a judgement about the stage reached by a particular country or area in the development process.

**Comments and limitations:**

Cross institutional comparisons needs to pay attention to the different membership of the institutions. Voting rights and membership in their institutions are agreed by the Member States themselves. As a structural indicator, there will be only small changes over time to reflect agreement on new States joining as Members, suspension of voting rights, membership withdrawal and negotiated voting rights changes.

## Methodology

---

**Computation Method:**

The computation uses each institutions' own published membership and voting rights data from their respective annual reports. The proportion of voting rights is computed as the number of voting rights allocated to developing countries, divided by the total number of voting rights. The proportion of membership is calculated by taking the number of developing country members, divided by the total number of members.

**Disaggregation:**

Data is calculated and presented separately for each international organization.

## Data Sources

---

**Description:**

Annual reports, as presented on the website of the institution in question, are used as sources of data. Sources of information by institution:

United Nations General Assembly: website of the General Assembly

United Nations Security Council: Report of the Security Council for the respective year

United Nations Economic and Social Council: Report of the Economic and Social Council for the respective year

International Monetary Fund: Annual Report for the respective year

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: Management's Discussion & Analysis and Financial Statements for the respective year

International Finance Corporation: Annual Report (volume 2) for the respective year

African Development Bank: Annual Report for the respective year

Asian Development Bank: Annual Report for the respective year

Inter-American Development Bank: Annual Report for the respective year

World Trade Organisation: WTO Annual Report 2015

Financial Stability Board: Charters of the Financial Stability Board

**List:**

General Assembly website; Report of the Security Council; Report of the Economic and Social Council, Report of the International Monetary Fund; IBRD's Management's Discussion & Analysis and Financial Statements; IFC Annual Report (volume 2); AfDB Annual Report; ADB Annual Report; IADB Annual Report; WTO Annual Report; Charters of the Financial Stability Board

## Data Availability

---

Available for all countries.

## Calendar

---

**Data collection:**

From May-17

**Data release:**

United Nations General Assembly: continuous  
United Nations Security Council: annually in September  
United Nations Economic and Social Council: annually in October  
International Monetary Fund: annually in October  
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: annually in September  
International Finance Corporation: annually in September  
African Development Bank: annually in May  
Asian Development Bank: annually in April  
Inter-American Development Bank: annually in April  
World Trade Organisation: annually in May  
Financial Stability Board: annually in January

Next release: UNGA: continuous; UNSC: September 2016; ECOSOC: October 2016; IMF: October 2016; IBRD: September 2016; IFC: September 2016; AfDB: May 2017; ADB: April 2017; IADB: April 2017; WTO: May 2017; FSB: January 2017.

## Data providers

---

**Name:**

UNGA, UNSC, ECOSOC, IMF, IBRD, IFC, AfDB, ADB, IADB, WTO, FSB.

**Description:**

The United Nations General Assembly, the United Nations Security Council, the United Nations Economic and Social Council, the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Trade Organisation, and the Financial Stability Board.

## Data compilers

---

**Name:**

FFD/UN-DESA

**Description:**

The data is compiled and the proportions calculated by the Financing for Development Office, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

## References

---

**URL:**

<https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/>

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.9: By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration

Indicator 16.9.1: Proportion of children under 5 years of age whose births have been registered with a civil authority, by age

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

Proportion of children under 5 years of age whose births have been registered with a civil authority.

### Rationale:

Registering children at birth is the first step in securing their recognition before the law, safeguarding their rights, and ensuring that any violation of these rights does not go unnoticed.

Children without official identification documents may be denied health care or education. Later in life, the lack of such documentation can mean that a child may enter into marriage or the labour market, or be conscripted into the armed forces, before the legal age. In adulthood, birth certificates may be required to obtain social assistance or a job in the formal sector, to buy or prove the right to inherit property, to vote and to obtain a passport.

Children's right to a name and nationality is enshrined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) under Article 7.

### Comments and limitations:

The number of children who have acquired their right to a legal identity is collected mainly through censuses, civil registration systems and household surveys. Civil registration systems that are functioning effectively compile vital statistics that are used to compare the estimated total number of births in a country with the absolute number of registered births during a given period. However, the systematic recording of births in many countries remains a serious challenge. In the absence of reliable administrative data, household surveys have become a key source of data to monitor levels and trends in birth registration. In most low- and middle-income countries, such surveys represent the sole source of this information.

## Methodology

---

### Computation Method:

Number of children under age of five whose births are reported as being registered with the relevant national civil authorities divided by the total number of children under the age of five in the population multiplied by 100

### Disaggregation:

Sex, age, income, place of residence, geographic location

### Treatment of missing values:

- [At country level](#)

When data for a country are entirely missing, UNICEF does not publish any country-level estimate

- [At regional and global levels](#)

The regional average is applied to those countries within the region with missing values for the purposes of calculating regional aggregates only, but are not published as country-level estimates

### Regional aggregates:

Global aggregates are weighted averages of all the sub-regions that make up the world. Regional aggregates are weighted averages of all the countries within the region

## Data Sources

---

### Description:

Censuses, household surveys such as MICS and DHS and national vital registration systems

### Collection process:

UNICEF undertakes an annual process to update its global databases, called Country Reporting on Indicators for the Goals (CRING). This exercise is done in close collaboration with UNICEF country offices with the purpose of ensuring that UNICEF global databases contain updated and internationally comparable data. UNICEF Country Offices are invited to submit, through an online system, any updated data for a number of key indicators on the well-being of women and children. Updates sent by the country offices are then reviewed by sector specialists at UNICEF headquarters to check for consistency and overall data quality of the submitted estimates. This review is based on a set of objective criteria to ensure that only the most recent and reliable information is included in the databases. Once reviewed, feedback is made available on whether or not specific data points are accepted, and if not, the reasons

why. New data points that are accepted are then entered into UNICEF's global databases and published in the State of the World's Children statistical tables, as well as in all other data-driven publications/material. The updated databases are also posted online at [data.unicef.org](http://data.unicef.org).

UNICEF also searches throughout the year for additional sources of data that are vetted by the UNICEF country office before they are included in the global databases.

## Data Availability

---

Nationally representative and comparable data are currently available for around 167 low- middle- and high-income countries

## Calendar

---

NA

## Data providers

---

National Statistical Offices (for the most part) and line ministries/other government agencies responsible for maintaining national vital registration systems

## Data compilers

---

**Name:**

UNICEF and UNSD

**Description:**

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF); United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD)

## References

---

**URL:**

[data.unicef.org](http://data.unicef.org)

**References:**

<http://data.unicef.org/child-protection/birth-registration.html>

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.10: Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements

Indicator 16.10.1: Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

For this indicator, killing includes intentional homicide and other arbitrary deprivation of life, as formulated in Article 6(1) ICCPR. Enforced disappearance is defined as the arrest, detention, abduction or any other form of deprivation of liberty, followed by a refusal to acknowledge the deprivation of liberty or by concealment of the fate or whereabouts of the disappeared person, which place such a person outside the protection of the law (International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, adapted to account for disappearances perpetrated by non-State actors). Arbitrary detention is detention without due process and safeguards, as outlined in Article 9(1) ICCPR. Torture means any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession, punishing him for an act he or a third person has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or coercing him or a third person, or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity (Convention against Torture). Assault means physical attack against the body of another person resulting in serious bodily injury.

Human rights defenders is a term used to describe people who, individually or with others, act to promote or protect human rights. Human rights defenders are identified above all by what they do and it is through a description of their actions and of some of the contexts in which they work that the term can best be explained. The definition of human rights defenders may include journalists and trade unionists, but each individual case is counted only once. Other examples may include a student campaigning to end torture in prisons, a politician who takes a stand against endemic corruption or witnesses in court cases on human rights abuses.

Journalists cover ‘journalists, media workers and social media producers who generate a significant amount of public-interest journalism.’ This conceptualisation, has been agreed by UNESCO Member States, and could include a wide range of actors, including professional full-time reporters and analysts, foreign correspondents and local journalists, as well as bloggers and other social media producers who engage in forms of self-publication in print, on the Internet or elsewhere, journalists from ‘traditional media’ and those who work across multiple media.

The term “trade unionist” refers to an individual employed or accredited by a trade union, and other elected representatives of workers, including workers in the informal sector.

#### **Rationale:**

Data on human rights violations committed against journalist, trade unionists and human rights defenders is required to know if fundamental freedoms, including the right to freedom of opinion and expression, which includes the right to receive information, and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association are protected in accordance with international law. The State is obliged to respect the human rights of all persons under its jurisdiction, in that it must refrain from infringement on rights, as well as an obligation to protect individuals against acts of third parties. The indicator therefore measures all such cases, but where the killing, disappearance, detention, assault or torture is perpetrated by an agent of the State or any other person acting under government authority or with its complicity, tolerance or acquiescence, or where the State fails to adequately investigate, punish or redress an offence committed by a third party, this will constitute a violation of human rights.

Killing, disappearance, arbitrary detention, assault and torture of journalists, trade unionists or human rights defenders may have a chilling effect on freedom of expression and other fundamental freedoms. In order to have a full picture of the extent of protection of fundamental freedoms, it is advisable to also have a basket of indicators at national level including on access to information, other aspects of the rights to freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of assembly and association, notably the right to communicate with international human rights mechanisms, and other types of human rights violations often committed against journalists, trade unionists and human rights defenders, which may include intimidation, harassment, prosecution, defamation, and restricting mobility.

#### **Comments and limitations:**

Estimates of the number of violations are particularly sensitive to the completeness of reporting of individual events. Such data may underestimate (or sometimes, though more rarely, overestimate) the true number of cases. In most instances, the number of cases reported will depend on the access to information, motivation and perseverance of civil society organizations and the media.

While this indicator does not cover every aspect of this particular target, it does identify one of the most salient and measurable dimensions that impacts on the whole. Further, it is an indicator that draws upon existing UN agreements and mechanisms for data collection.

## **Methodology**

---

#### **Computation Method:**

The indicator is calculated as the total number of reported cases of killing, disappearance, arbitrary detention, assault and torture of journalists, trade unionists or human rights defenders during the reporting period which are verified by an independent entity (in this case OHCHR and UNESCO).

**Disaggregation:**

The data on the indicator is disaggregated by type of violation, profession/area of work, ethnicity, sex, age, income, geographic location, disability, religion, migratory or displacement status, minority or indigenous status, sexual orientation and gender identity of the victim, and relevant characteristics of the perpetrator, where known (public official, private individual, agent of another entity, sex, age). The indicator could also distinguish on the basis of political opinion of the victim where this has been expressed.

Women human rights defenders have faced all the types of violations included in this indicator. However, their particular situation and role require special awareness and sensitivity both to the ways in which they might be affected differently by such pressures and to some additional challenges. It is essential to ensure that women human rights defenders as well as men are protected and supported in their work and, indeed, that such women are fully recognized as human rights defenders.

**Treatment of missing values:**

- [At country level](#)  
NA
- [At regional and global levels](#)  
NA

**Regional aggregates:**

UNESCO and OHCHR are the agencies responsible for compiling these indicators at the international level. This is a forward-looking indicator, for which full methodologies will be developed in the course of implementation of the SDGs. UNESCO and OHCHR will first publish data on killings, and then on the other human rights violations included in the indicator.

**Sources of discrepancies:**

NA

## Data Sources

---

**Description:**

This indicator collates data from multiple sources, including National Human Rights Institutions, national non-governmental organisations, associations of journalists, trades unions, ILO, and international non-governmental organisations including, for example Reporters without Borders, Article 19, and the Human

Rights Observatory. Regional human rights Commissions, Courts and organisations also receive reports of such violations.

Information on the number of such violations committed against human rights defenders will be compiled annually by OHCHR from these data sources and further data collected through individual complaints to human rights treaty bodies, and Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council, including the Special Rapporteurs on human rights defenders, on freedom of opinion and expression, torture, the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, and the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention. Additional data from OHCHR field offices and UN Country Teams will also be included. These data will be verified, cross-checked to ensure no duplication, and compiled in line with the agreed international definitions outlined above.

Information on the number of journalists killed are compiled annually by UNESCO, on a mandate by its Member States, from data collected through multi-sourced research, including press reports, information from monitoring groups, direct reports, and information from UNESCO field offices and other UN bodies. Reports of killings and impunity compiled by UNESCO are then transmitted for clarification on the status of judicial investigation to Member States and categorized into the following: 1) no information received so far; 2) on-going; 3) resolved; 4) killed in cross-fire; and 5) others. This information can be found on an annual basis, within the reports by the UNESCO Director-General on 'The Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity' and in the UNESCO study titled World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development.

UNESCO and OHCHR will serve as the lead agencies that will compile and validate data from these multiple sources. These agencies will develop a methodology of adjusting data taking into account data quality issues and to ensure the comparability of different data sources.

**Collection process:**

NA

## Data Availability

---

**Description:**

NA

**Time series:**

NA

## Calendar

---

**Data collection:**

NA

**Data release:**

NA

## Data providers

---

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

## Data compilers

---

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

## References

---

### URL:

### References:

Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms:

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/Declaration.asp>

United Nations (2004). Human Rights Defenders: Protecting the Right to Defend Human Rights. Geneva. Available from <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/SRHRDefendersIndex.aspx>.

United Nations (2012). Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation. New York and Geneva. Available from <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx>.

United Nations (2014). The Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity: Report by the Director-General to the Intergovernmental Council of the IPDC (Twenty-Ninth Session). Paris. Available from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002301/230101E.pdf>.

United Nations (2015) World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development. Paris. Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/world-media-trends>

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.10: Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements

Indicator 16.10.2: Number of countries that adopt and implement constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information

## Institutional information

---

### Organization(s):

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

## Concepts and definitions

---

### Definition:

Number of countries that adopt and implement constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information

The focus of this indicator is thus on the status of adoption and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information.. The definition relates directly to “public access to information”, which is wider than, but is also very much based upon, the established fundamental freedoms of expression and association. Conversely, these freedoms also both impact on the environment for public access to information.

### Rationale:

As suggested by the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) and UNESCO in earlier presentations to the UN Technical Support Team (UN TST), this is a relevant and measurable indicator.

It also responds to the growing number of UN member states that have already adopted legal guarantees, and many others that are currently considering relevant legislation or regulation in the field.

The rationale for assessing the implementation dimension is to assess the relevance of legal steps to practical information accessibility. It is not a composite indicator, but a logical linkage of laws and policies to practical impact that is relevant to SDG concerns.

For this indicator, the operative words are “adoption” and “implementation”. As such, it establishes: (a) whether a country (or at the global level, the number of countries) has constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information; (b) the extent to which such national guarantees reflect ‘international agreements’ (e.g. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, etc.); and (c) the implementation mechanisms in place for such guarantees, including the following variables:

- Government efforts to publicly promote the right to information.
- Citizens’ awareness of their legal right to information and their ability to utilize it effectively.

- The capacity of public bodies to provide information upon request by the public.

This indicator thus collates data from multiple sources, including National Human Rights Institutions, national and international non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, and national media regulatory authorities, among others. Such information will be gathered, processed and checked by international organizations - UNESCO and World Bank.

UNESCO collects some aspects of this data using the Media Development Indicators, in addition to the biennial World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development report.

Data on the existence of freedom of information laws are available for at least 195 countries.

### **Concepts:**

Conceptually, 'public access to information' refers to "the presence of a robust system through which information is made available to citizens and others." Such a system represents a combination of intellectual, physical, and social elements that affect the availability of information to individuals. In other words, in discussing the issue of public access to information, it is important to recognize that any measurement of its practical outworking needs to take into account how individuals perceive the quality of information in the public domain, the nature of the communicative infrastructure in place to facilitate access, and how that information is ultimately utilized by individuals as members of a particular polity.

In general, then, these are the issues that go into legislation and policy on public access. More specifically, such legislation and policy take the form of Freedom of Information laws (FOI laws) which are aimed at allowing access by the general public to data held by national governments and, increasingly, by private companies whose work intersect with government operations.

The emergence of freedom of information legislation was a response to increasing dissatisfaction with the secrecy surrounding government policy development and decision making. They establish a "right-to-know" legal process by which requests may be made for government-held information, to be received freely or at minimal cost, barring standard exceptions.

Such a formulation has a basis in international agreements. For example, the right to freedom of expression, which is not only recognized as a basic human right in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), is also upheld in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), the European Convention on Human Rights (1950), the American Convention on Human Rights (1969) and the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981), thus lending itself to universal political recognition and application. More specifically, in the European context, reference may be made to the Council of Europe Convention on Access to Official Documents, adopted on 18 June 2009. In the Americas, the Organization of American States' Inter-American Juridical Committee developed a set of Principles on the Right of Access to Information in 2008.

### **Comments and limitations:**

This indicator does not assess the totality of "public access to information" component of the full Target of 16.10. Nevertheless, it focusses on a key determinant of the wider information environment.

# Methodology

---

## Computation Method:

The method of computation is both quantitative and qualitative, with data generated from a global review of existing surveys (e.g. UNESCO's World Trends in Freedom of Expression & Media Development reports, etc.), administrative records, expert assessments (e.g. World Justice Open Government Index), etc. More specifically, the following key variables will be assessed:

1. Does a country have constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information?
2. Do those constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees reflect known international agreements (e.g. the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, etc.)?
3. What implementation mechanisms are in place to ensure that such guarantees work optimally?

To address these questions, the following will serve as performance sub-indicators:

- National law or constitutional guarantee on the right to information
- Country has signed and ratified relevant treaty obligations, with no significant exemptions, and these are reflected, to the extent possible, in domestic FOI legislation
- Public is aware of and exercises right to access official information
- Public bodies release information both pro-actively and on demand
- Effective and efficient appeals mechanism via independent administrative body e.g. information commissioner or ombudsman
- Any restriction on grounds of protection of personal privacy is narrowly defined so as to exclude information in which there is no justifiable public interest.

The means of verification will include:

- Any law or policy on right to information that accords with international standards
- Reports from credible agencies/experts about right to information guarantees and the extent to which they reflect international standards/agreements
- Policies of public bodies concerning release of information (which ensure readily, freely available public access to information, including online)
- Evidence of state commitment to open government e.g. publication and dissemination of laws, court decisions, parliamentary proceedings, spending programmes (*vis-à-vis* SDG undertakings)
- Statistical information about public requests for official information and their fulfilment or rejection
- Statistical information about appeals or complaints over information requests that have been refused

## Disaggregation:

The indicator can be disaggregated in terms of the extent to which the residence of citizens affects their ability to access information (e.g. how do rural, peri-rural, urban and peri-urban dwellers access information from public bodies). It can also be disaggregated in terms of whether gender influences ability to access information. Furthermore, aspects of how disability affects public access to information can also be assessed.

### Treatment of missing values:

- **At country level**

An expert assessment of state-of-the-art literature on FOI laws establishes:

- (1) the number of countries currently with FOI laws/policies;
- (2) the extent to which they reflect 'international agreements'; and
- (3) the effectiveness of the implementation mechanisms

- **At regional and global levels**

An expert assessment of state-of-the-art literature on FOI laws, along with in-country data from UNESCO ACIs (Advisors for Communication and Information) in the field, establishes:

- (1) the number of countries currently with FOI laws/policies;
- (2) the extent to which they reflect 'international agreements'; and
- (3) the effectiveness of the implementation mechanisms

### Regional aggregates:

An expert assessment of state-of-the-art literature on FOI laws, along with in-country data from UNESCO ACIs (Advisors for Communication and Information) in the field, establishes:

- (1) the total number of countries currently with FOI laws/policies;
- (2) the extent to which these laws/policies reflect 'international agreements'; and
- (3) the effectiveness of the implementation mechanisms in place (This aspect is measured in terms of surveys undertaken by different international organizations active in this field)

## Data Sources

---

### Description:

UNESCO and World Bank reports

Other UN bodies, such as UNDP

National bodies such as commissioners responsible for right to information implementation

Media regulators

Academic and research institutions

Media support NGOs (national and international)

Methods used for data collection for this data are varied, drawing upon both quantitative and qualitative ones, including:

- Qualitative expert assessments (World Justice Open Government Index, launched in 2015 and covering 102 countries);
- Administrative records (e.g. number of requests for information; number of requests process in the last 12 months; number of women who submit such requests, etc.)
- Surveys (e.g. UNESCO World Trends in Freedom of Expression & Media Development and Media Development Indicators (MDI) reports; Open Society Foundation's series of surveys on 'access to information laws and practices'; the World Values Survey [[www.worldvaluessurvey.org](http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org)]; IPU

data on access-to-information legislation and constitutional guarantees of access to information; World Values Survey on trust of news media]; etc.)

UN or relevant regional bodies that carry details of each treaty, including countries that have signed, ratified or registered any exemptions to their obligations, together with the treaty bodies' general comments on implementation.

Various international and regional rapporteurs on freedom of expression issue country-specific reports.

For data on national laws and constitutional guarantees, sources include: national libraries, law commissions, official records of parliament and government records.

**List:**

UNESCO and World Bank reports; Other UN bodies; National bodies; World Justice Open Government Index, Administrative records, World Justice Open Government Index, UNESCO World Trends in Freedom of Expression & Media Development and Media Development Indicators (MDI) reports; Open Society Foundation's, World Values Survey [[www.worldvaluessurvey.org](http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org)]; IPU data on access-to-information legislation and constitutional guarantees of access to information; World Values Survey on trust of news media]; etc.)

**Collection process:**

UNESCO uses a triangulated method to compare data for global monitoring, which includes (1) databases maintained by other international agencies; (2) own international surveys carried out in countries by independent entities and (3) modelled and estimated data, based on other data sources. More specifically, UNESCO analyses data inputs from a variety of sources to produce a consensus list of countries with freedom of information laws or equivalent. Among those organizations and experts that make available their data are: Freedominfo.org, Fringe Special by Robert Vleugels, Open Society Justice Initiative, Right to Information Rating, by Access Info Europe and the Centre for Law and Democracy, ARTICLE 19. Others include international agencies and UN bodies, such as: The World Bank, The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, The UN Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression.

## Data Availability

---

**Description:**

Data on the existence of freedom of information laws are available for at least 195 countries. However, for future data collection and analysis, efforts are underway to ensure that the data is analyzed to yield information on aspects relating to how FOI laws are actually "implemented", rather than just their existence.

## Calendar

---

**Data collection:**

From Jan-17 to Jul-17

**Data release:**

1-Oct-2017

## Data providers

---

**Name:**

UNESCO, World Bank, UNDP, and other UN bodies; National bodies, Academic and research institutions, Media support NGOs

**Description:**

UNESCO, represented by National Programme Officers and regional Advisors for Communication and Information in the field offices; Other UN bodies, such as World Bank, UNDP, etc.; National bodies such as commissioners responsible for right to information implementation; Media regulators; Academic and research institutions; Media support NGOs (national and international)

## Data compilers

---

UNESCO

## References

---

**URL:**

<http://en.unesco.org/>

**References:**

1. UNESCO Media Development Indicators: Framework for assessing media development.  
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0016/001631/163102e.pdf>
2. World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development:  
<http://www.unesco.org/new/en/world-media-trends>

3. Universal Periodic Review: [UNESCO contributes data on freedom of expression, including constitutional guarantees thereof, in addition to tracking killings of journalists].  
<http://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/upr/pages/BasicFacts.aspx>
4. World Justice Project. 2015. Open government and freedom of information: advancing the global conversation. Available [0]:  
[http://worldjusticeproject.org/sites/default/files/open\\_government\\_and\\_freedom\\_of\\_information\\_bote-ro-ponce\\_may\\_2015.pdf](http://worldjusticeproject.org/sites/default/files/open_government_and_freedom_of_information_bote-ro-ponce_may_2015.pdf).
5. Open Society Justice Initiative. 2006. Transparency & Silence: A Survey of Access to Information Laws and Practices in Fourteen Countries. Available [0]:  
[https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/sites/default/files/transparency\\_20060928.pdf](https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/sites/default/files/transparency_20060928.pdf).
6. Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU). 2009. Freedom of Expression and the Right to Information (Resolution adopted by consensus by the 120th IPU Assembly, Addis Ababa, 10 April 2009). Available [0]:  
[http://www.right2info.org/resources/publications/ngo-statements/ngo-statements\\_ipu-declaration](http://www.right2info.org/resources/publications/ngo-statements/ngo-statements_ipu-declaration)
7. Article 19. 1999. The Public's Right to Know Principles on Freedom of Information Legislation. Available [0]: [http://www.ipu.org/splz-e/sfe/foi\\_ps.pdf](http://www.ipu.org/splz-e/sfe/foi_ps.pdf).