

# **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**

(Updated on 3 March 2016)

## **Table of Contents**

Targets 16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere. ....	2
Target 16.2 End abuse, exploitations, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children.....	11
Target 16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all ....	15
Target 16.4 By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime.....	18
Target 16.5 Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms. ....	21
Target 16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels. ....	23
Target 16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels.....	26
Target 16.8 Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance. ....	29
Target 16.9 By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration. ....	31
Target 16.10 Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements.....	33
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. ....	43
Target 16.b Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development. ....	47

## 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

From UNODC:

<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	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); the rate is defined as the total count of victims of intentional homicide divided by the total resident population, expressed per 100,000 population.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	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 pre-requisite 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 political (including terrorism, hate crime). The interpretation of this indicator is straightforward also for non-specialised users.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	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. UNODC and WHO are working together to harmonize data and procedures to produce joint UNODC-WHO homicide estimates at country, regional and global level. 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). When national data on homicide are not available, estimates are produced by WHO.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	Recommended disaggregations for this indicator are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sex and age of the victim and the perpetrator</li> <li>• relationship between victim and perpetrator(intimate partner, other family member, acquaintance, etc.)</li> <li>• means of perpetration (firearm, blunt object, etc.)</li> <li>• situational context/motivation (organized crime, intimate partner violence, etc.)</li> </ul>
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Murder</li> <li>• Honour killing</li> <li>• Serious assault leading to death</li> <li>• Death as a result of terrorist activities</li> <li>• Dowry-related killings</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Femicide</li> <li>• Infanticide</li> <li>• Voluntary manslaughter</li> <li>• Extrajudicial killings</li> <li>• Killings caused by excessive force by law enforcement/state officials</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>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 (<i>see UNODC Global Study on Homicide, 2013</i>).</p> <p>Data on homicides produced by public health authorities are guided by the International classification of diseases (ICD-10), which is very similar to the definition of intentional homicide provided by the ICCS.</p>
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	When data are properly disaggregated, intentional homicide can be used to quantify gender-based killings, a relevant indicator to monitor violence against women. Currently, 68 countries have reported homicide data disaggregated by type of perpetrator to UNODC (at least one data point after 2009).
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	At international level, data on intentional homicides are routinely collected and disseminated by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the World Health Organization. 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.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	At global level, intentional homicide is the most prevalent type of violent death. In 2012, the ratio between victims of conflict/war and victims of intentional homicide varied between one to five to one to ten (uncertainty due to variability of estimates of deaths related to war/conflict produced respectively by WHO and Uppsala Conflict Data Program).
	Non-intentional homicide is another crime that can provide information on violence prevalence. Though, it mostly refers to cases of killings due to negligent behaviours rather than to intentional violence. For nine countries where data are available to UNODC, 95% of all non-intentional homicide are due to vehicular homicide, so the concept of non-intentional homicide is not relevant for monitoring the target.
<b>References</b>	UNODC homicide database, Global Study on Homicide 2011; UNODC, Global Study on Homicide 2013; WHO-UNDP-UNODC, Global Status Report on Violence Prevention 2014); UNODC, International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, 2015

## From Goal 16 TST Working Group:

### Definition and method of computation

This indicator is a composite indicator constructed by collecting two numbers, deaths from intentional homicides and deaths from conflict to measure “peace” with respect to target 1 – “Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related deaths everywhere.” The rates of intentional homicide and conflict-related deaths should be reported separately, as combining them into one single indicator would risk conflating two distinct phenomena with differing root causes as well as varying levels of precision in measurement. Still, they are useful complements to each other as, by construction, they are exclusive and non-overlapping (ie. By design, their conjunction does not double count violent deaths).

**Intentional homicide** is defined as the unlawful death inflicted upon a person with the intent of cause death or serious injury (Source: International Classification

of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS), 2015).

ICCS recommends that intentional homicides include:

- 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

**Conflict-related deaths** refer to those deaths caused by warring parties, including, but not limited to, those caused by traditional battlefield fighting and bombardments (battle-related deaths<sup>1</sup>). The term conflict-related death is broader than the term “battle-related death” as it includes killings that amount to war crimes, such as targeting of civilians or of military ‘hors combat’, killings associated with a conflict (but not accompanied by a battle between warring parties) such as one-sided killings, pogroms and genocides. Following the ICCS definition (see homicides at left) death as a result of terrorist activities would be included in intentional homicides. For both intentional homicides and conflict-related deaths, rates are defined as the total count in deaths in a calendar year, respectively, divided by the total resident population for the year, expressed per 100,000 population. The denominator (100,000 population) has been adopted globally by law enforcement as the standard for comparable measurement.

#### **Rationale and interpretation**

As described above, this composite indicator is comprised of two forms of violent deaths. Intentional homicides occur in all countries of the world and have global applicability, while conflict-related deaths occur in countries with ongoing conflicts/wars. Peace is a much broader concept than violent deaths, however, it is difficult to measure many aspects of peace (threats and the fear of violence, insecurity, and other forms of violence, including damages to persons and property). Deaths due to violence are universally and easily understood, are frequently monitored and are comparable with only minor discrepancies in interpretation, largely due to the finality of death.

Monitoring **intentional homicides** is necessary to better assess their causes and consequences and, in

---

<sup>1</sup> Battle-related deaths are deaths in battle-related conflicts between warring parties in the conflict dyad (two conflict units that are parties to a conflict). Typically, battle-related deaths occur in warfare involving the armed forces of the warring parties. This includes traditional battlefield fighting, guerrilla activities, and all kinds of bombardments of military units, cities, and villages, etc. The targets are usually the military itself and its installations or state institutions and state representatives, but there is often substantial collateral damage in the form of civilians being killed in crossfire, in indiscriminate bombings, etc. All deaths--military as well as civilian--incurred in such situations, are counted as battle-related deaths (Uppsala Conflict Data Program definition).

the longer term, to develop effective prevention measures. It is based on statistical data routinely produced by law enforcement authorities and/or public health institutions, with a high degree of international comparability.

**Conflict-related deaths** measure the direct impact of conflicts on populations in terms of losses of life.

### Sources and data collection

Sources for both components of the composite indicator vary, largely because intentional homicides are considered in the purview of law enforcement, whereas conflict-related deaths are typically a matter of state.

On **intentional homicide**, 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 annual data collection (UN Crime Trends Survey, UN-CTS); WHO collects and publishes data produced by public health/civil registration.<sup>2</sup> Homicide data can be produced by two separate and independent sources and this can be used 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). Considering data collected by both UNODC and WHO, national data on homicide are available for 174 countries (at least one data point after 2009). Time series data on homicide suitable for monitoring are available for 141 countries (at least 3 data points, the most recent for 2011 or later). When national data on homicide are not available, estimates are produced by WHO. Research projects like the Homicide Monitor (Igarape Institute) and the Global Burden of Armed Violence (Geneva Declaration) collect and report global data on intentional homicides.

Whilst the global risk of violent death in armed conflict is generally lower than the global risk of death due to homicide, armed conflict can have deeper effects, destroying lives, livelihoods and substantial human costs, particularly in protracted internal conflict situations (see the Global Burden of Armed Violence, 2012, 2015).

In general, no national data sources exist on **conflict-related deaths**, for a number of reasons. Often, normal registration systems are heavily affected by the presence of conflict. Additionally, actors on both sides of a conflict may have incentives for misreporting, deflating or inflating casualties. Estimates of conflict-related deaths, often displaying wide variations, are produced at international level: conflict death databases include the IISS Armed Conflict Database, the Armed Conflict Location and Event Database, the Correlates of War Project, the UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset, and WHO estimates of deaths by cause. Data from these sources, though they may vary on estimates, exist for all major (>1000 battle deaths) and minor (>25 battle deaths per year) conflicts since 1945 (see UCDP). The Global Burden of Armed Violence (Geneva Declaration) compares and collects conflict-related deaths from multiple sources. Additionally, at the local and regional level, observatories and other civil society initiatives provide data on conflict incidence and deaths. Ushahidi and CEWARN are two examples, though many more exist. These initiatives can be, *but need not be*, the only way to monitor conflict-related deaths. They have proven working methodologies, that could be adopted by regional, international, multilateral, national or other actors.

---

<sup>2</sup> UNODC and WHO are working together to harmonize data and procedures to produce joint UNODC-WHO homicide estimates at country, regional and global level.

### Disaggregation

On *intentional homicide*, possible disaggregation include:

- sex and age of victim and perpetrator
- 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.)
- by region
- by population group
- by displacement and statelessness status.

On *conflict-related-deaths*, possible disaggregations include:

- sex and age of victim
- population group of victim
- by location
- sex and age of perpetrator (where possible)
- means of death (firearm, explosive device, artillery/heavy weaponry, UAV, etc.)
- civilian versus military status of victim

### Gender equality issues

When properly disaggregated, both forms of violence can be used to quantify gender-based killings (as intentional homicides and as conflict-related deaths), a relevant indicator to monitor violence against women. Currently, 68 countries have reported intentional homicide data disaggregated by type of perpetrator to UNODC (at least one data point after 2009). Both of the composite indicators can inform on targets associated with Global Goal 5.

### Comments, Considerations and limitations

Measuring deaths and their attribution is not easy, but it can be done.<sup>3</sup>

ICCS provides guidance on how to distinguish between intentional homicides, killings directly related to war/conflict and other killings that amount to war crimes. Data on homicides produced by public health authorities are guided by the International classification of diseases (ICD-10), which is very similar to the definition of intentional homicide provided by the ICCS.

Non-intentional homicide is another crime that can provide information on violence prevalence. Though, it mostly refers to cases of killings due to negligent behaviours rather than to intentional violence. For nine countries where data are available, 95% of all non-intentional homicide are due to vehicular homicide.

## Indicator 16.1.2: Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause

### From TST Goal 16 Working Group and OHCHR:

<b>Indicator 16.1.1</b>	<b>Number of intentional homicide and conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people</b>
<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	Goal 16 Target 16.1
<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	Intentional homicide is defined as the unlawful death inflicted upon a person with the intent of cause death or serious injury (Source: International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, 2015). In a narrow sense, conflict-related deaths refer to those deaths caused by warring parties directly related to combat, such as traditional battlefield fighting and bombardments. In a broader sense, conflict-related deaths also include killings that amount to war crimes, such as targeting of civilians or of military 'hors combat'. The rates are defined as the total count of intentional homicides and conflict-related deaths, respectively, divided by the total resident population, expressed per 100,000 population.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	These indicators refer to two forms of violent deaths (intentional homicide and conflict-related deaths). Intentional homicides occur in all countries of the world and have global applicability, while conflict-related deaths occur in countries afflicted by wars. The rates of intentional homicide and conflict-related deaths should be kept separate,

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2015/sep/08/from-syria-to-sudan-how-do-you-count-the-dead?CMP=share\\_btn\\_fb](http://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2015/sep/08/from-syria-to-sudan-how-do-you-count-the-dead?CMP=share_btn_fb)

	<p>as combining them into one single indicator would risk collating two distinct phenomena and unequal sources of data. In particular, the quality of data on conflict-related deaths is inevitably affected by the difficulties of producing accurate statistics in situations of armed conflict.</p> <p>Monitoring intentional homicides is necessary to better assess their causes and consequences and, in the longer term, to develop effective prevention measures. It is based on statistical data routinely produced by law enforcement authorities and/or public health institutions, with a high degree of international comparability.</p> <p>Conflict-related deaths measure the direct impact of conflicts on populations in terms of losses of life. Whilst the global risk of violent death in armed conflict is generally lower than the global risk of homicidal violence, in affected countries armed conflict destroys lives and exerts substantial human costs, particularly in protracted internal conflict situations.</p>
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	<p>On intentional homicide, 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 annual data collection (UN Crime Trends Survey, UN-CTS); WHO collects and publishes data produced by public health/civil registration.</p> <p>UNODC and WHO are working together to harmonize data and procedures to produce joint UNODC-WHO homicide estimates at country, regional and global level.</p> <p>Considering data collected by both UNODC and WHO, national data on homicide are available for 174 countries (at least one data point after 2009) . Time series data on homicide suitable for monitoring are available for 141 countries (at least 3 data points, the most recent for 2011 or later).When national data on homicide are not available, estimates are produced by WHO.</p> <p>In general, no national data sources exist on conflict-related deaths, as normal registration systems are heavily affected by war operations. Estimates of conflict-related deaths, often displaying wide variations, are produced at international level: conflict death databases include the IISS Armed Conflict Database, the UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset, PRIO Battle-Deaths Data and WHO estimates of deaths by cause.</p>
<b>Disaggregation</b>	<p>Recommended disaggregations for this indicator are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By context (intentional homicide and conflict-related deaths)</li> </ul> <p>On intentional homicide, possible disaggregations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sex and age of victim and perpetrator</li> <li>• relationship between victim and perpetrator(intimate partner, other family member, acquaintance, etc.)</li> <li>• means of perpetration (firearm, blunt object, etc.)</li> <li>• situational context/motivation (organized crime, intimate partner violence, etc.)</li> <li>• by region</li> <li>• by population group</li> <li>• by displacement and statelessness status.</li> </ul> <p>On conflict-related-deaths, possible disaggregations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sex and age of victim and perpetrator</li> <li>• civilian versus military status of victim</li> </ul>
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	<p>The ICCS provides important clarifications on the exact definition of intentional homicide for statistical purposes. In particular, it states that the following killings need to be included in the count of homicide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Murder</li> <li>• Honour killing</li> <li>• Serious assault leading to death</li> <li>• Death as a result of terrorist activities</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dowry-related killings</li> <li>• Femicide</li> <li>• Infanticide</li> <li>• Voluntary manslaughter</li> <li>• Extrajudicial killings</li> <li>• Killings caused by excessive force by law enforcement/state officials</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>Homicide data can be produced by two separate and independent sources and this can be used 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 (<i>see UNODC Global Study on Homicide, 2013</i>).</p> <p>Data on homicides produced by public health authorities are guided by the International classification of diseases (ICD-10), which is very similar to the definition of intentional homicide provided by the ICCS.</p> <p>Data on conflict-related deaths are characterised by large variability due to uncertainty of estimates.</p>	
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	When properly disaggregated, intentional homicide can be used to quantify gender-based killings, a relevant indicator to monitor violence against women. Currently, 68 countries have reported homicide data disaggregated by type of perpetrator to UNODC (at least one data point after 2009).	
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	At international level, data on intentional homicides are routinely collected and disseminated by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the World Health Organization. Several regional organizations collect and disseminate homicide data, especially in the Americas (OAS and IDB) and in Europe (Eurostat). Conflict death databases, at the international level, include the IISS Armed Conflict Database, the UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset, and PRIO Battle-Deaths Data and WHO estimates of deaths by cause database. National level datasets exist for some countries.	
<b>Supplementary information</b>	At global level, intentional homicide is the most prevalent type of violent death. In 2012, the ratio between victims of conflict/war and victims of intentional homicide varied between one to five to one to ten (uncertainty due to variability of estimates of deaths related to war/conflict produced respectively by WHO and Uppsala Conflict Data Program).	Non-intentional homicide is another crime that can provide information on violence prevalence. Though, it mostly refers to cases of killings due to negligent behaviours rather than to intentional violence. For nine countries where data are available, 95% of all non-intentional homicide are due to vehicular homicide.
<b>References</b>	UNODC, Global Study on Homicide 2011; UNODC, Global Study on Homicide 2013; WHO-UNDP-UNODC, Global Status Report on Violence Prevention 2014; Igarape Institute, Homicide Monitor, 2015 ( <a href="http://homicide.igarape.org.br/">http://homicide.igarape.org.br/</a> ); UNODC, International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, 2015	

### From United Nations Mine Action Service:

<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	The count of conflict-related deaths caused by mines/ERW should include “individuals killed or injured in incidents involving devices detonated by the presence, proximity, or contact of a person or a vehicle, such as all antipersonnel mines, antivehicle mines, abandoned explosive ordnance (AXO), unexploded ordnance (UXO), and victim-activated IEDs.” <sup>4</sup>
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	The presence of mines/ERW in conflict and post-conflict contexts is devastating for people and communities. These hazards cause grievous injury and death, impede peace operations, and hamper post-conflict reconstruction and development efforts.

<sup>4</sup> Survey Manual of the M&E Mechanism for the UN Strategy for Mine Action 2013-2018. Definition adapted from the Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor 2013.



	Findings from the M&E Mechanism for the UN Strategy 2013-2018 (UN M&E Mechanism) illustrate the deadly risk posed by mines/ERW in affected countries and territories in which the UN operates; in particular, the disproportionate impact of explosive hazards on the civilians who constitute more than half of the casualties from mines/ERW. The regular monitoring of mine/ERW casualty data through the global mechanism of the Sustainable Development Goals will significantly enhance the capacity of affected countries and territories including Member States, UN entities, and civil society to understand the scope of these threats and effectively mitigate the harms they cause.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	Many member states affected by mines/ERW have casualty reporting systems in place. The most common, in use in 80% of mine action programmes globally, is the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA). <sup>5</sup>
<b>Disaggregation</b>	Recommended disaggregation for this indicator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Victim sex and age (Man, Woman, Boy, Girl)</li> <li>• Device type (See below)</li> <li>• Victim type (Civilian, Non-civilian, Operator)</li> </ul> <p>Data from the M&amp;E Mechanism for the UN Strategy for Mine Action 2013-2018 indicates that at least 86% of casualty data is available with sex and age disaggregation in participating countries and territories.</p>
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	Findings from the UN M&E Mechanism align with findings from other research demonstrating the disproportionate impact of mines/ERW on boys and men. Boys and men constitute 91% of mine/ERW casualties in countries participating in the M&E Mechanism. This trend is consistent across civilians, non-civilians, and operators; and it is mirrored across age and gender distribution data among beneficiaries of victim assistance services.
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	The Landmine and Cluster Munitions Monitor provides several research products including annual reports on a variety of indicators related to mines, cluster munitions, and other ERW, including casualty data.
	The UN Interagency Working Group for Mine Action currently tracks casualty data in participating countries and territories as part of the M&E Mechanism for the UN Strategy for Mine Action 2013-2018.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	<i>Different types of devices which cause death/injury:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Antipersonnel mines</li> <li>• Antivehicle mines</li> <li>• Abandoned explosive ordnance (AXO)</li> <li>• Unexploded ordnance (UXO)</li> <li>• Victim-activated improvised explosive devices (IEDs).</li> </ul>
<b>References</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Mechanism for the UN Strategy for Mine Action 2013-2018.</li> <li>• <a href="#">The Landmine and Cluster Munitions Monitor</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining</a></li> </ul>

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

**No metadata received on current indicator formulation**

<sup>5</sup> [Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining](#)

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

**No metadata received on current indicator formulation**

**Target 16.2 End abuse, exploitations, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children.**

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

**No metadata received on current indicator formulation**

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

**From UNODC and OHCHR:**

<p><b>Definition and method of computation</b></p>	<p>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 (The United Nations Protocol to Prevent Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, which is supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime).</p> <p>The number of victims is defined as the number of detected and estimated number of non-detected adult women and men and girls and boys (18-) who have been trafficked for different forms of trafficking in persons. The estimated ratio between the number of detected victims and the estimated number of non-detected victims can be used to estimate the total number of human trafficking victims at national, regional and global levels. In addition, the ratio can be used to measure the efficiency of countries to detect trafficking victims.</p>
<p><b>Rationale and interpretation</b></p>	<p>Human trafficking for different forms of exploitation represents a major violation of victim’s human rights, dignity and inclusion to the society. It has an impact on a person’s health and opportunities, it creates economic inequalities and it is a threat to the personal security. The regular production of figures on this indicator will allow the monitoring of the impact of the anti-trafficking measures to the level of trafficking at national, regional and global levels. It also helps to assess the capacity of countries to detect and consequently support victims of trafficking. It will raise awareness on the most prevalent forms of trafficking in persons in different parts of the world.</p>
<p><b>Sources and data collection</b></p>	<p>Currently, the available and country specific number of detected victims is collected yearly from the Member States using a specific questionnaire. It is published in the UNODC biennial Global Report on Trafficking in Persons. Data are available for about 130 countries, since 2007. The data is disaggregated for age, sex and forms of exploitation. The estimated number of non-detected victims can be established by applying methodologies developed to measure the estimated number of different hidden populations (e.g. Respondent Driven Sampling and Network Scale-up Method). These methodologies have been tested with different forms of trafficking in persons (see comments below).</p>
<p><b>Disaggregation</b></p>	<p>Recommended disaggregation for this indicator is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sex of the victim</li> <li>• age of the victim</li> <li>• form of exploitation</li> </ul>
<p><b>Comments and</b></p>	<p>In 2013 and 2014, UNODC has conducted two Expert Group Meetings with the</p>

<b>limitations</b>	academia on measuring different hidden populations. The work has resulted in a methodology to measure the hidden part of trafficking in persons in order to estimate the number of non-detected victims of trafficking. The methodology has been used in some studies and will be soon tested by UNODC.
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	Trafficking in persons has a negative impact particularly on women. Currently, 70 % of detected victims of trafficking in persons are female: adult women (49%) and girls (21%). The international community stressed this aspect already when they adopted the international instrument to address trafficking which is titled: The UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children.
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	UNODC is the only international organization which is regularly collecting and disseminating data on the number of detected victims of human trafficking at the global level. Selected data on specific forms of trafficking in persons are collected and disseminated by ILO, UNICEF and UNHCR. Regional and geographically defined data is collected by IOM and some regional organizations such as EU. The Academia has developed a list of local studies assessing the hidden part of trafficking for specific geographical areas and forms of exploitation.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	The General Assembly in resolution A/RES/64/293 mandated UNODC to report every two years on trafficking in persons flows and patterns, at the national, regional and international levels. As to the results of current data collection, we can see that between 2007 and 2013, there is a slight increase in the number of detected victims per 100,000 population. There should be a continuous monitoring of this trend and it should be combined with the number of non-detected victims to understand the changes in the severity of trafficking in persons.
<b>References</b>	UNODC Global Report on Trafficking in Persons 2009, 2012 and 2014, <a href="http://www.unodc.org/glotip.html">www.unodc.org/glotip.html</a> UNODC, International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, 2015

### From Goal 16 TST Working Group:

<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	This is an outcome indicator derived from administrative data. The indicator is computed as the total number of identified victims of trafficking divided by population (per 100,000 persons). This indicator directly measures exploitation and trafficking, which are inadequately captured by the other proposed indicators. These human rights abuses affect both adults and children, and States have existing obligations to prevent them for both population groups.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	Trafficking in persons is a universal form of modern-day slavery. Trafficked persons are often victims of physical, sexual and psychological violence. The demand for cheap labour and sexual services, coupled with criminal practices that seek to profit from the exploitation of vulnerable people, is its main driver. Addressing this most egregious violation of human rights would significantly contribute to one of the main priorities of post-2015 namely to “leave no one behind” and has its legal basis in the UN Convention on Transnational Organized Crime and the optional protocol on human trafficking.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	A primary data source will be administrative and judicial records maintained by competent national authorities, which may include police, labour inspectors, health care providers, educational institutions, national human rights institutions and ombudspersons, as well as civil society organizations. Current data sources include the UNODC Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, the U.S. Department of State’s Trafficking in Persons Report; IOM Trafficked Migrants Assistance Database.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	Data for this indicator should be disaggregated by sex, age, population group (ethnicity, minority or indigenous status) and nationality of the victim and, where relevant, perpetrator, by geographic location, and by type of perpetrator (private enterprise, individual, etc.).

<b>Comments and limitations</b>	As it relies upon reports of individual events, this indicator may not be fully reliable. It may underestimate (or sometimes, though more rarely, overestimate) the true number of victims. These human rights abuses are, by their nature, hidden and in most instances, the number of cases reported will depend on awareness of victims of their rights, access to information, motivation and perseverance of civil society organizations and the media. Data are compiled separately for each human rights abuse and aggregated. In order to reduce the total number of global indicators, this indicator is proposed to monitor targets 5.2 (violence against women), 8.7 (elimination of the worst forms of child labour and forced labour), 16.1 (violence), 16.2 (violence against children) and 16.4 (organised crime). Organized crime often includes significant human rights abuses, including trafficking, slavery, exploitation and forced labour, against both children and adults. Victims of such crimes are among the most invisible in official statistics, so it is vital that these abuses are monitored within the SDG framework to ensure that no one is left behind.
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	At the international level, the ILO compiles data on trafficking, slavery, exploitation and forced labour. Data on trafficked persons is published by UNODC in its biennial Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, and in the IOM Human Trafficking Database.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	
<b>References</b>	

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

**From UNICEF:**

#### **Definition and method of computation**

This indicator provides the proportion of young women and men aged 18-24 years who report having experienced any sexual violence by age 18. It is calculated by dividing the number of young women and men aged 18-24 years who report having experienced any sexual violence by age 18 by the total number of young women and men aged 18-24 years, respectively, in the population.

#### **Rationale and interpretation**

While it is recognized that this indicator captures only one of the gravest forms of violence against children rather than being inclusive of all forms, it can be considered a proxy indicator that reflects a key aspect of the change we want to observe in order to achieve the target of elimination of VAC.

The right of children to protection from all forms of violence is enshrined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Optional Protocols. "Sexual violence" as defined in General Comment No. 13 on the Convention of the Rights of the Child, accessible here: [http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/crc/docs/CRC.C.GC.13\\_en.pdf](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/crc/docs/CRC.C.GC.13_en.pdf)

#### **Sources and data collection**

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

### **Disaggregation**

Data are available by age, marital status, place of residence and wealth quintiles.

### **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.

### **Gender equality issues**

As this indicator is disaggregated by sex, it is well-suited for analysis of gender equality issues.

### **Data for global and regional monitoring**

UNICEF has estimates for the percentage of young women aged 18-24 years who report having experienced any sexual violence by age 18, disaggregated by age, marital status, place of residence and wealth quintile by country and for some (flexible) regional groupings with sufficient population coverage. Fully comparable data are currently available for approximately 43 countries.<sup>6</sup> UNICEF has estimates for the percentage of young men aged 18-24 years who report having experienced any sexual violence by age 18, disaggregated by age, marital status, place of residence and wealth quintile by country for approximately 5 countries.<sup>7</sup>

### **Supplementary information and references**

*UNICEF website on sexual violence data:*

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

### **Responsible entities**

UNICEF

---

<sup>6</sup> These data will require additional data processing to recalculate for the age group 18-24 as the standard age groups reported in the DHS are 15-19 and 20-24.

<sup>7</sup> Same comment as above.

## 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

From UNODC and OHCHR:

<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	<p>Number of victims of violent crime (physical or sexual assault) in the previous 12 months who reported their last incident to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms, as a percentage of all victims of crime in the previous 12 months.</p> <p>Competent authorities includes police, prosecutors or other authorities with competencies to investigate certain crimes (such as corruption or fraud), while ‘other officially recognised conflict resolution mechanisms’ may include a variety of institutions with a role in the informal justice or dispute resolution (e.g. tribal or religious leaders, village elders, community leaders), provided their role is officially recognised by state authorities.</p>
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	<p>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.</p>
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	<p>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. According to a recent review conducted by UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence on crime statistics, 72 countries have implemented at least one national victimisation after 2009 (in 43 of these countries the victimisation survey has been conducted by the national statistical office or another public institution/ministry). In addition, 9 African countries have already implemented or are in the process of implementing a victimisation survey module as part of the Strategy for Harmonisation of Statistics for Africa (SHaSA).</p>
<b>Disaggregation</b>	<p>Recommended disaggregations for this indicator are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sex</li> <li>• type of crime</li> <li>• ethnicity</li> <li>• migration background</li> <li>• citizenship</li> </ul>
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	<p>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 16.3.1 covers the aspect of access to justice although 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 could be conducted to test the feasibility to expand the indicator to cover administrative disputes.</p>
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	<p>Independently of the level of violent victimization of women, it provides information on whether there are gender disparities on the attitude to freely and safely report their victimization experiences. For example, female victims of domestic violence are more reluctant to report to authorities their experience for different reasons, including fear of consequences and lack of trust in authorities. An increasing level of reporting indicates that measures have been successful to raise awareness that violent behaviours are unacceptable and/or reporting channels for victims of violent crime have improved and/or trust towards</p>

	authorities has increased; moreover, higher reporting means that criminal justice institutions are in a better position to enforce the law and ensure justice.
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	UNODC collects data on crime reporting rates through the long-standing annual data collection mandated by the UN General Assembly UN-CTS. The UN-CTS has established a network of focal points (presently covering 125 countries and territories). Data on crime reporting rates are currently available for approximately 35 countries..
<b>Supplementary information</b>	Reporting rates of crimes are known to vary widely by type of crime: they are usually higher in relation to property crimes as victims seek to re-obtain stolen goods or for insurance purposes.
<b>References</b>	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

### Indicator 16.3.2: Unsented detainees as proportion of overall prison population

#### From UNODC and Goal 16 TST Working Group:

<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	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. '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'.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	The indicator signifies overall respect for the principle that persons awaiting trial shall not be detained in custody. 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.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	UNODC collects data on prisons through its annual data collection (UN-CTS). 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 70 countries are available, bringing the total to 184 countries).
<b>Disaggregation</b>	Recommended disaggregation for this indicator are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• age and sex</li> <li>• length of pre-trial (unsentenced) detention</li> </ul>
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	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.
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	These data can be disaggregated by sex and indicate whether different levels of unsentenced detention exist for men and women
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	At international level, data on the number of persons held in unsentenced detention are available from the long-standing United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN-CTS). At regional level, data are available from a number of collection initiatives including Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (SPACE) and OAS Observatory on Citizen Security Data Repository.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	The indicator is most commonly measured using data from administrative records. National decisions that need to be taken when collecting data for the indicator include the definition of 'detention', as well as the day of the year on which the data is collected. Data from all individual places of detention (which may be managed by different government authorities) must be aggregated and used for overall calculation of the indicator.



<b>References</b>	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.
-------------------	--

**Target 16.4 By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime.**

**Indicator 16.4.1: Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current United States dollars).**

**From Goal 16 TST Working Group and OHCHR:**

<p><b>Goal and target addressed</b></p>	<p>Goal 16 Target 16.4</p>
<p><b>Definition and method of computation</b></p>	<p>Illicit financial flows (IFFs) are commonly defined as the transferred monies that is earned, transferred or utilized through illicit means, into or out of a country. They include legally earned value, money and monetized instruments that are transferred illicitly or value, money and monetized instruments that are acquired through illegal activities, such as the proceeds of crimes, including corruption and tax evasion. They can also capture tax avoidance and trade misinvoicing.</p> <p>Although the UN Economic Commission for Africa, UNDP, Global Financial Integrity and others have produced global country-by-country estimates for illicit financial flows, more work on methodologies would be required.</p> <p>Overview of the main methods of estimating illicit financial flows (adapted from the Mbeki Report of the High-level Panel on Illicit Financial Flows from Africa (<a href="http://www.uneca.org/iff">http://www.uneca.org/iff</a>)): In terms of the methodologies used to estimate IFFs, several empirical models have been used to estimate both the magnitude of IFFs and their economic implications for developing countries. These models and the analytic methods underlying them deserve further scrutiny. In particular, four methods have dominated the empirical literature: the Hot Money Method, the Dooley Method, the World Bank Residual Method and the IMF Direction of Trade Statistics (DOTS)–based Trade Mispricing Method. The latter two remain the most widely used. The Hot Money Method records IFFs through net errors and omissions in payment balances. The Dooley Method relies on the privately held foreign assets reported in the balance of payments that do not generate investment income. The World Bank Residual Method estimates IFFs as the difference between the source of funds (external debt and foreign direct investment) and the use of funds (current account deficit and reserves). The Trade Mispricing Model assesses IFFs by looking for disparities arising from overinvoicing of imports and underinvoicing of exports after adjusting for ordinary price differences. In this model, imports are generally recorded after adjusting for the cost of insurance and freight, while exports are usually valued free-on-board. To provide the most thorough estimates of IFFs, Global Financial Integrity has combined the World Bank Residual Method and the Trade Mispricing Model in its computations. ECA has used the Trade Mispricing Model (see Mbeki report).</p> <p>An Overview of the Analytical Methodologies Utilized by Global Financial Integrity to Study Illicit Financial Flows (adapted from their website: <a href="http://www.gfintegrity.org/issues/illicit-financial-flows-analytical-methodologies-utilized-global-financial-integrity/">http://www.gfintegrity.org/issues/illicit-financial-flows-analytical-methodologies-utilized-global-financial-integrity/</a>): Global Financial Integrity (GFI) estimates that nearly US\$1 trillion of unrecorded money flows out of developing countries annually. There are three forms of unrecorded money moving across borders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corrupt: Proceeds of bribery and theft by government officials.</li> <li>• Criminal: Proceeds of drug trading, human trafficking, counterfeiting, contraband, and myriad forms of additional activities.</li> <li>• Commercial: Proceeds arising from import and export transactions conducted so as to manipulate customs duties, VAT taxes, income taxes, excise taxes, or other sources of government revenues.</li> </ul>

	<p>In analyzing IFFs, GFI utilizes sources of data and analytical methodologies that have been used by international institutions, governments, and economists for decades. Basically, these data sources and methodologies are providing information on gaps—gaps in balance of payments data and gaps in trade data. Where recorded sources and uses of funds in balance of payments data do not match, the difference is net errors and omissions, indicating an inflow or outflow that was not recorded. Where bilateral trade data does not match (after adjusting for freight and insurance in the data of the importing country) this indicates re-invoicing of transactions between export from one country and import into another country. Some reviewers of GFI’s data sources and analytical methodologies have raised questions, which GFI is pleased to address as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GFI well recognizes that statistics can be flawed, due to errors in collection, recording, or conveying. Precisely the same point can be made about virtually every other economic analysis ever undertaken. GFI uses the best data available, data that has been collected, reported, and recorded by governments for decades according to international guidelines issued by the IMF.</li> <li>• The reliability and accuracy of trade statistics of developing countries are regularly assessed through the IMF’s Data Quality Assessment Framework under the Data component of the Reports on Standards and Codes. These ratings show that for all assessed developing countries (about 72) the quality is “very high” or “high”.</li> <li>• GFI does not suggest that every single unrecorded transaction is illicit; however, the vast majority of unrecorded transactions are illicit.</li> <li>• GFI does not use net illicit outflows and illicit inflows. In countries where unrecorded outflows and unrecorded inflows roughly balance, it would be a mistake to consider that such a country has no problem with unrecorded flows. There is no such concept as “net crime.” Indeed, in GFI’s view, illicit outflows and illicit inflows should be added, since both sides of the equation generally produce harm.</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	<p>The indicator measures an important aspect of target 16.4. The indicator also covers other aspects of this target, such as revenues emanating from illicit arms sales and organized crime.</p>
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	<p>GFI undertakes macroeconomic analyses of IFFs and detailed analyses of trade misinvoicing by commodity groups. GFI consistently use the following:</p> <p>IMF:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Balance of payments data, contributing to the analysis of net errors and omissions.</li> <li>2. Direction of Trade Statistics (DOTS), enabling analyses of discrepancies in trade between pairs of reporting countries.</li> </ol> <p>For other economic and trade analyses, GFI draws from a selection of sources including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• World Bank: Providing data on debt, contributing to the analysis of broad capital flight.</li> <li>• UN COMTRADE: Providing data on bilateral trade in commodity groups.</li> <li>• US Dept. of Commerce: Providing data on trade transactions by Harmonized System coding categories.</li> <li>• European Statistics: Providing data on trade transactions by Harmonized System coding categories.</li> </ul> <p>GFI believes that the estimates arising from these data sources and analytical methodologies are very conservative, for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOTS data records trade in merchandise only. It does not include trade in intangibles, services, licenses, royalties, etc., now estimated to comprise more than 25 percent of all global trade.</li> <li>• DOTS data reveals only transactions that have been re-invoiced between export and import. It does not reveal transactions where price manipulations have been included in the same invoice exchanged between exporters and importers.</li> </ul> <p>None of the data sources adequately reveal cash transactions across borders, particularly those used in criminal pursuits.</p> <p><a href="http://www.gfintegritty.org/issues/data-by-country/">http://www.gfintegritty.org/issues/data-by-country/</a></p>
<b>Disaggregation</b>	<p>Data could be disaggregated, depending on the methodology, to IFFs resulting from trade misinvoicing and other means of transfers.</p>
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	

<b>Gender equality issues</b>	N/A
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	Data is estimate country-by-country and can be aggregated to regional and global levels.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	
<b>References</b>	Global Financial Integrity ( <a href="http://www.gfintegrity.org/issues/data-by-country/">http://www.gfintegrity.org/issues/data-by-country/</a> ) Mbeki Report of the High-level Panel on Illicit Financial Flows from Africa ( <a href="http://www.unece.org/iff">http://www.unece.org/iff</a> )

### From UNODC:

<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	There is no single, agreed definition of illicit financial flows (IFF), but essentially these are financial flows generated by methods, practices and crimes aiming to transfer financial capital in contravention of national or international laws. When analyzing IFF the following components are generally included: proceeds of crime, proceeds of corruption (national or international corruption), money laundering (including from proceeds of crime), tax evasion, theft of state assets, and market and regulatory abuses.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	IFF have a negative impact on society in many respects, including governance, economic growth and human security. The illicit economy generated by IFF can exacerbate conflict for resources, pose impediments to sustainable economic growth and promote human right abuses. For instance, illicit markets are characterized by greater violence and though violence occurs more commonly in connection with illegal than with legal economic activity.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	A global repository of IFF data is not currently available. Some national or global estimates for the volume of illicit financial flows may exist, such as those compiled by the NGO Global Financial Integrity, but these are quite controversial. To establish a global indicator of illicit financial flows, methodologies would have to be further refined and a common definition agreed upon.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	The indicator can have a higher political relevance if it is disaggregated by the broad components which source IFF: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organized crime activities</li> <li>• Corruption</li> <li>• Tax evasion</li> <li>• Other criminal or administrative offences</li> </ul>

### **Indicator 16.4.2: Proportion of seized and small arms and light weapons that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments**

**No metadata received on current indicator formulation**

## 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**

**From UNODC, OHCHR and Goal 16 TST Working Group:**

<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	Percentage of persons who paid at least one bribe (gave a public official money, a gift or counter favour) or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, 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. Bribery is the undue advantage (money, gift or a service) requested/offered by/to a public official in exchange for a special treatment. Administrative bribery is often intended as the type of bribery affecting citizens or businesses in their dealings with public administrations and/or civil servants: this form of bribery affects most countries of the world and can be measured through sample surveys that focus on the experience of bribery.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	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 democratic processes and justice. By providing a direct measure of the experience of bribery, this indicator provides an objective metrics of corruption, a yardstick to monitor progress in the fight against corruption.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	Household corruption surveys and victimisation surveys with module on bribery. The first large scale victimisation surveys were implemented in the 1970s and the programme of International Crime Victimization Surveys (ICVS, 6 waves between 1989 and 2010) contributed to disseminate this instrument worldwide. According to a recent review conducted by UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence on crime statistics, 72 countries have implemented at least one national victimisation survey after 2009 (in 43 of these countries the victimisation survey has been conducted by national statistical office or another public institution/ministry). In addition, 9 African countries have already implemented or are in the process of implementing a victimisation survey module as part of the Strategy for Harmonisation of Statistics for Africa (SHaSA). UNODC collects prevalence data on bribery from surveys (since 2009) through the annual data collection UN-CTS.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	Recommended disaggregation for this indicator are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• age and sex</li> <li>• type of official</li> </ul>
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	This indicator provides solid information on the experience of bribery, typically occurring in the interaction between businesses and the public sector in the context of basic service delivery/transactions, while it does not cover other forms of corruption, such as 'grand corruption', trading in influence or abuse of power.
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	Disaggregation of data by sex of both bribe-payers and public officials is important to assess different behaviours and vulnerability to bribery by sex.
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	Various programmes and initiatives have produced data on the experience of corruption by the population. Programme of surveys on the experience of corruption have been supported by international organizations, including by UNODC, the World Bank and UNDP. Surveys on corruption experience are also implemented by NGOs and the private sector: for example, the 'Global Corruption Barometer' is published annually by Transparency International and it includes survey data on the experience of bribery for a large set of countries. At national level, surveys on the experience of corruption are conducted by an increasing number of countries, sometimes as part of the regular production by official statistics. Data on bribery can also be collected as part of general victimization surveys.
<b>Supplementary</b>	

<b>information</b>	
<b>References</b>	Documentation of corruption surveys (analytical reports and methodological information) is available on the UNODC website. Methodological documentation to develop and implement surveys on corruption can also be found in the UNODC-UNECE Manual on Victimisation surveys. UNODC, International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, 2015

**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**

**No metadata received on current indication formulation.**

## 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)

From Goal 16 TST Working Group:

<b>Indicator 16.6.1</b>	<b>Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget</b>
<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	Goal 16 Target 16.6
<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	This indicator can be based on Indicator PI-2 of the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) dataset: composition of expenditure outturn compared to original approved budget, considers (i) the variation between approved budget and final expenditure for the year for each major function (comparable to a sector) (ii) variation in expenditure from the original budget by economic classification and (iii) the average amount charged to the contingency reserve over the last 3 years.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	PEFA is the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability programme started in 2001 to develop a country-led agenda on public financial management reform, ie. a government-led reform programme for which analytical work, reform design, implementation and monitoring reflect country priorities and are integrated into governments' institutional structures. PEFA Indicator PI-2 on the composition of expenditure out-turn compared to original approved budget works at the administrative level to calculate variance for the main budgetary heads (votes) of ministries, departments and agencies, which are included in the approved budget.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	Data for 149 countries (collected on 398+ occasions) available at <a href="http://www.pefa.org">www.pefa.org</a> .
<b>Disaggregation</b>	This indicator can be disaggregated by different sectoral expenditures (for each major function and by economic classification).
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	Data for 149 countries (collected on 398+ occasions) available at <a href="http://www.pefa.org">www.pefa.org</a> .
<b>Supplementary information</b>	
<b>References</b>	<a href="https://www.pefa.org/en/content/methodological-guidance-and-practical-tools">https://www.pefa.org/en/content/methodological-guidance-and-practical-tools</a>

### Indicator 16.6.2: Percentage of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services

From OHCHR:

Goal and target addressed	This indicator is proposed to monitor targets: 1.4 (access to basic services) 3.8 (access to quality, essential health-care services) 4.1, 4.2 and 4a (quality education, including facilities) 7.1 (access to affordable, reliable energy services) 10.2 (social inclusion) 11.1 (adequate housing) 16.3 (rule of law)
---------------------------	--

	16.6 (effective, accountable and transparent institutions)
Definition and method of computation	The indicator is calculated as the number of respondents replying that they were satisfied or very satisfied with their last experience of accessing a public service divided by the total number of respondents. The data may be weighted to reflect the general population.
Rationale and interpretation	In order to be effective and accountable, institutions must be responsive to the needs of the population. This indicator will require the use of perception-based population surveys and will collect relevant data on the lived experience of individuals seeking access to and obtaining basic public services, such as health care, education, water and sanitation, as well as services provided by the police and judicial system.
Sources and data collection	<p>The main source of data is perception surveys. Such surveys are conducted in an increasing number of countries, and often include a number of measures of quality, which may include physical facilities in which the service was accessed, whether the service met expectations, timeliness, quality and comprehensiveness of information provided, professionalism and courtesy of public officials, responsiveness to queries or complaints, relevant outcomes, affordability/ value for money and specific issues of accessibility for targeted population groups, e.g. physical accessibility or availability of information in minority languages.</p> <p>Such perception surveys include the World Value Survey, Gallup, Afrobarometer and the other Barometers (see below), and surveys conducted by NSOs at the national level.</p>
Disaggregation	Data should be disaggregated by type of public service accessed (e.g. health, education, housing, social services, police, courts). Data should also be disaggregated by geographic location and the ethnicity, sex, age, income, disability status, religion, migratory or displacement status, civil status, minority or indigenous status, sexual orientation and gender identity of the user of the service.
Comments and limitations	
Gender equality issues	The indicator may capture gender differences as they are reflected in the comparative experience of men and women in accessing different sorts of services.
Data for global and regional monitoring	In Africa, the approach has already been applied and reported by several NSOs using the SHaSA questionnaire. Nine countries have already started to collect data using the Harmonised Module on Democratic Governance, with as many as 20 expressing interest. Questions on the Harmonised Module ask specifically about rates of access to, and trust in, the following services/institutions: public service (in general), courts of justice, police, public hospitals and clinics, public schools, tax/customs authorities,



	<p>social security system, state media, Parliament, army, President, Prime Minister (where applicable), Mayor (where applicable).</p> <p>Regional Barometers (e.g. 19 countries in Africa in 2014 amongst 36 in total since the Afrobarometer process started, 10 Arab states in the Arabbarometer, 18 Latin American states in the Latinobarometer, 13 Asian states with three surveys and a further five with at least one survey each) ask about experience of accessing essential government services, including public schools, public clinics and hospitals, registration offices (birth certificate, driver’s licence, passport, voter’s card, permits, etc), water, sanitation and electricity. Questions also ask about ease of access, including the need for bribes, gifts or favours.</p> <p>The World Values Survey asks respondents in 60 countries (for the 6th Wave, 2010-2014) about confidence in institutions including the armed forces, the police, the courts, government and parliament. There are also questions on the extent to which government should take responsibility to ensure that everybody is provided for. Private sector data collectors already conduct surveys in a range of countries – Gallup’s World Poll conducts representative surveys face to face in over 140 countries covering the emerging and developed world, including questions on confidence in the judicial system, in the local police, in the military and in government. Edelman’s Trust Barometer breaks down questions of trust amongst a range of institutions.</p>
Supplementary information	
References	<p>SHaSA Harmonised Module on Democratic Governance.  Global Barometer Study: <a href="http://www.jdsurvey.net/gbs/gbs.jsp">http://www.jdsurvey.net/gbs/gbs.jsp</a>  World Values Survey: <a href="http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp">http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp</a>  Gallup World Poll: <a href="http://www.gallup.com/services/170945/world-poll.aspx">http://www.gallup.com/services/170945/world-poll.aspx</a></p>

## Target 16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels

### Indicator 16.7.1: Proportions of positions (by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions

#### From Goal 16 TST Working Group:

<b>Indicator 16.7.1</b>	<b>Proportions of positions (by sex, disability and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions</b>
<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	Goal 16 Target 16.7.
<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	This indicator focuses on the representativeness aspect of the target, but the presence of diversity also conduces to inclusivity and responsiveness of decision-making.  The indicator is calculated as the number of public service positions held by members of the target group divided by the total number of such positions.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	In order that decision-making be responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative, it is important to ensure diversity in representation at all levels of State institutions (central, regional and local).  Article 25(c) ICCPR provides that citizens should have access, on general terms of equality, to public service in their country. General Comment 25 of the Human Rights Committee elaborates that access to public service should be based on equal opportunity and general principles of merit, and further states that the provision of secured tenure would ensure that persons holding public service positions are free from political interference or pressures.  Article 7(c) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) stipulates that States should take all appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination against women in the political and public life of the country and, in particular, ensure to women, on equal terms with men, the right to participate in the formulation of government policy and the implementation thereof and to hold public office and perform all public functions at all levels of government.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	The primary data source is administrative and employment records at national level in accordance with the obligations arising from ICCPR and CEDAW.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	Disaggregation by sex and disability are most immediately feasible and region of origin could be specified. Population group would be defined at the country level, and could include ethnic or religious groups, indigenous populations, etc. One particular disaggregation compares with Goal 5.5, namely local government by sex. [Comparison to national distributions may require affirmative action in some settings to ensure that certain populations are effectively included.]  Data for this indicator should also be disaggregated by State institution (executive, parliament, government department, judiciary, police, etc.), level of position (senior management, middle management, professional, entry level, support staff) and type of contract (short-term, temporary, permanent).
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	Fairer representation of all population groups in public service positions at all levels renders decision-making by public bodies more legitimate and more responsive to the concerns of the whole population.  While the indicator, particularly disaggregated by seniority and contract type, provides a good indication of progress to overcome historical or ongoing discrimination, it cannot detect tokenism where official job titles mask a lack of influence in practice, or other forms of discrimination within the public service that may affect the ability of members of target populations to influence decision-making. Perception surveys or discrimination testing could

	<p>supplement this indicator to detect such issues.</p> <p>In order to reduce the total number of global indicators, this indicator is proposed to monitor targets 5.5 (women’s full and effective participation), 10.2 (political inclusion), and 16.7 (responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making).</p>
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	The indicator is highly gender –relevant, disaggregation should be possible by sex within more sophisticated systems and so the indicator may capture gender differences as they are reflected in the comparative experience of men and women in representation. The indicator is also relevant for Goal 5.
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	At the international level, the ILO compiles data on female share of employment by occupation, by level of position, and by private/public sector. UN Women and the Inter-Parliamentary Union compile statistical information about women parliamentarians, women members of cabinet and other relevant information.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	
<b>References</b>	

**From OHCHR:**

Goal and target addressed	<p>This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets:</p> <p>5.5 (women’s full and effective participation)</p> <p>10.2 (political inclusion)</p> <p>16.7 (responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making)</p>
Definition and method of computation	<p>Target groups should be identified at national level in an inclusive, participatory process, with the direct involvement of marginalised and minority groups themselves. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) has made clear that identification as a member of a particular ethnic group “shall, if no justification exists to the contrary, be based upon self-identification by the individual concerned.” This principle also applies to other population groups. Target groups may include persons with disabilities, ethnic groups, LGBTI persons, indigenous peoples, religious minorities, linguistic minorities, youth, older persons, or other groups under-represented in the national context.</p> <p>The indicator is calculated as the number of public service positions held by members of the target group divided by the total number of such positions.</p>
Rationale and interpretation	<p>In order that decision-making be responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative, it is important to ensure diversity in representation at all levels of State institutions (central, regional and local).</p> <p>Article 25(c) ICCPR provides that citizens should have access, on general terms of equality, to public service in their country. General Comment 25 of the Human Rights Committee elaborates that access to public service should be based on equal opportunity and general principles of merit, and further states that the provision of secured tenure would ensure that persons holding public service positions are free from political interference or pressures.</p> <p>Article 7(c) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) stipulates that States should take all appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination against women in the political and public life of the country and, in particular, ensure to women, on equal terms with men, the right to participate in the formulation of government policy and the implementation thereof and to hold public office and perform all public functions at all levels of government.</p> <p>In cases where a group is very under-represented or has experienced historical discrimination, temporary special measures including minimum quotas on representation may be introduced to redress such discrimination. In some circumstances, such as linguistic minorities, ensuring access to public services for the group may require over-representation of that group in public service posts.</p>

Sources and data collection	The primary data source is administrative and employment records at national level.
Disaggregation	<p>Data for this indicator should be disaggregated by State institution (executive, parliament, government department, judiciary, police, etc.), level of position (senior management, middle management, professional, entry level, support staff) and type of contract (short-term, temporary, permanent).</p> <p>The indicator should be calculated for women and for each target group. Target groups should be defined at the national level, but could include ethnic groups, older persons, persons with disabilities, religious groups, minorities or indigenous peoples, LGBTI persons, etc.</p>
Comments and limitations	<p>Fairer representation of all population groups in public service positions at all levels renders decision-making by public bodies more legitimate and more responsive to the concerns of the whole population.</p> <p>While the indicator, particularly disaggregated by seniority and contract type, provides a good indication of progress to overcome historical or ongoing discrimination, it cannot detect tokenism where official job titles mask a lack of influence in practice, or other forms of discrimination within the public service that may affect the ability of members of target populations to influence decision-making. Perception surveys or discrimination testing could supplement this indicator to detect such issues.</p>
Gender equality issues	The indicator specifically considers representation of women. Data on each target group should also be disaggregated by sex to ensure that multiple grounds of discrimination can be detected
Data for global and regional monitoring	At the international level, the ILO compiles data on female share of employment by occupation, by level of position, and by private/public sector. UN Women and the Inter-Parliamentary Union compile statistical information about women parliamentarians, women members of cabinet and other relevant information.
Supplementary information	
References	<p>ILO statistics database:  <a href="http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/lang--en/index.htm">http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/lang--en/index.htm</a>  UN Women data on women in government positions :  <a href="http://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/leadership-and-political-participation/facts-and-figures">http://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/leadership-and-political-participation/facts-and-figures</a>  Inter-Parliamentary Union data on women in parliament:  <a href="http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/world.htm">http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/world.htm</a></p>

**Indicator 16.7.2: Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group**

**No metadata received on current indicator formulation.**

## 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

#### From Goal 16 TST Working Group

<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	Goal 16 Target 16.8
<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	<p>Representation and participation of developing countries in international organizations, including international financial institutions, is often below their relative weight in the world. This indicator would measure the representativeness of developing countries in international organizations. This indicator would be easily measurable by way of data collected by international organizations.</p> <p>The indicator would require a list of international organizations that would be included in the calculation. The indicator could be calculated by taking the simple average of the international organizations on the list. The phrase “global governance” in the target would suggest that the list of international organizations should be limited to organizations with a global mandate, which could, for example, include the governing bodies of all agencies, funds and programmes of the UN system (including and the IMF and the World Bank), but also the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO), International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and the World Trade Organization (WTO).</p> <p>This is a global indicator, not a national indicator. National Statistical Offices need not be involved. The rating CBB from the survey is, therefore, odd, especially the C rating because the data on membership and voting rights is readily available, for example, from the IMF and the World Bank.</p> <p>This indicator also relates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target 10.6 (which focuses on global international economic and financial institutions).</li> <li>• Target 16.3 (rule of law at international level).</li> </ul> <p>Target 16.7 (which focuses on inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels)</p>
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	<p>Representation and participation of developing countries in international organizations, including international financial institutions, is often below their relative weight in the world. This indicator would measure the representativeness of developing countries in international organizations.</p> <p>An adjustment could be made to compare the percentage of members or voting rights of developing countries in IFIs to their share in global population (e.g. for governing bodies of UN funds and programmes) or GDP (e.g. for the IMF and World Bank). This would allow compensation for the fact that the indicator should not increase until reaching 100%.</p>
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	Administrative data of international organizations.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	Can be disaggregated by international organization
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	N/A
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	This is a global indicator, not a regional or national indicator.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	

<b>References</b>	
-------------------	--

## **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**

#### **From UNICEF:**

##### **Definition and method of computation**

This indicator provides the proportion of children under the age of five whose births are reported as being registered with the relevant national civil authorities. It is calculated by dividing the number of children under the age of five whose births are reported as being registered with the relevant national civil authorities by the total number of children under the age of five in the population.

##### **Rationale and interpretation**

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.

##### **Sources and data collection**

Censuses, vital registration systems and household surveys such as UNICEF-supported MICS and DHS.

##### **Disaggregation**

Data are available by sex, age, place of residence, wealth quintiles and other background characteristics.

##### **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.

##### **Gender equality issues**

As this indicator is disaggregated by sex, it is well-suited for analysis of gender equality issues.

##### **Data for global and regional monitoring**

UNICEF has estimates for the percentage of children under the age of five whose births are reported as being registered with the relevant national civil authorities, disaggregated by age, sex, place of residence and wealth quintile for the world as a whole and by (flexible) regional groupings. The global and regional estimates are based on available data from 162 countries.

##### **Supplementary information and references**

*UNICEF website on birth registration data:*

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

##### **Responsible entities**

UNICEF

#### **From Goal 16 TST Working Group:**

<b>Indicator 16.9.1</b>	<b>Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority</b>
<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	Goal 16 Target 16.9
<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	The indicator is calculated as the number of children whose births have been registered with a civil authority divided by the total number of children.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	Article 7 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) provides that all children should be registered immediately after birth and have the right from birth to a name and the right to acquire a nationality. Article 8 CRC further provides that, where a child is

	<p>illegally deprived of some or all of the elements of his or her identity, States Parties shall provide appropriate assistance and protection, with a view to re-establishing speedily his or her identity. This indicator is therefore measured for all children, defined as persons under the age of 18.</p> <p>Where births are not registered, children may be unable to obtain a birth certificate, which can result in denial of access to public services including education, health and social services, despite the human rights obligations of States to provide these without discrimination. Lack of registration may also result in early marriage or early entry to the labour market, before the child has reached the minimum legal age. 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.</p>
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	Data for this indicator are currently collected at the international level by UNICEF through the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS), as well as through Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and national civil registry systems. Data are currently available mainly for children under 5.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	The indicator should be disaggregated by sex of the child and age at the time of registration geographic location, .
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	<p>While this indicator measures, and current data availability is concentrated on, children under 5 whose birth have been registered, there is emerging consensus that the collection should allow for disaggregation to identify birth registration of children under 1 as well as overall rates of registration for under 5.</p> <p>Data availability is limited for children over the age of 5, but measuring this indicator for all children is an important element of measuring progress in increasing birth registration, as well as ensuring that older children are not left behind.</p> <p>In order to reduce the total number of global indicators, this indicator is proposed to monitor targets 4.1, 4.2 (universal access to education), and 16.9 (legal identity for all).</p>
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	UNICEF maintains a global database on the issue since 2003. Comparable data are available for more than 160 countries. <a href="http://data.unicef.org/child-protection/birth-registration">http://data.unicef.org/child-protection/birth-registration</a>
<b>Supplementary information</b>	<a href="http://data.unicef.org/child-protection/birth-registration">http://data.unicef.org/child-protection/birth-registration</a>
<b>References</b>	<a href="http://data.unicef.org/child-protection/birth-registration">http://data.unicef.org/child-protection/birth-registration</a>

### From UNFPA:

**Definition:** Percentage of births that are registered within a certain period of time after birth (one month, one year, five years of age) in a civil registration and vital statistics system or from household surveys.

**Numerator:** Number of births registered within a given period of time after birth (a month, a year, 0-4 years) in a given calendar year.

**Denominator:** Total number of births in a given calendaryear.

**Disaggregation:** as agreed by the Sustainable development Agenda and indicators but including at least, place of residence (U/R), sex of the child, mothers education, household wealth.

**Method of measurement:** data should be available and could be obtained from civil registration and vital statistics systems. Civil registration administrative data could be linked to estimates of the expected number of newborns. In countries with deficient CRVS systems, data is collected via household surveys (DHS and MICS). Questions are asked about registration status of children born in the five years preceding the data of the survey. The numerator of this indicator includes children whose birth certificate was seen by the interviewer or whose mother or care-taker says the birth has been registered. Data are also often presented for other age groups such as infants or children under 5 years of age.

**Method of estimation:** currently UNICEF produces and publish estimates of birth registration for children under five using both CRVS and household surveys data. Alternative data sources to be considered are the United Nations Demographic Yearbook and the World Population Prospects produced by UNPD-DESA.

A new methodology and set of procedures need to be put in place to produce the desired estimate of birth registration for under one year of age (see justifications below).

**Measurement frequency:** Annual



**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**

**From OHCHR:**

<b>Number of verified cases of killing, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention, assault and torture of journalists, trade unionists or human rights defenders</b>	
<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	<p>This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.2 (violence against women)</li> <li>16.1 (violence and deaths)</li> <li>16.3 (rule of law)</li> <li>16.6 (accountable institutions)</li> <li>16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms).</li> </ul>
<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	<p>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.</p> <p><i>Human rights defenders</i> 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.</p> <p>Journalists cover ‘journalists, media workers and social media producers who generate a significant amount of public-interest journalism.’ This 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.</p> <p>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.</p>

	<p>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).</p>
<p><b>Rationale and interpretation</b></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Sources and data collection</b></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Information on the number of journalists killed are compiled annually by UNESCO 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 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 at the annual report by the UNESCO Director-General on <i>‘The Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity’</i>.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Disaggregation</b></p>	<p>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</p>

	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.
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	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.
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	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.
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	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.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	
<b>References</b>	<p>Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms: <a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/Declaration.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/Declaration.aspx</a></p> <p>UNITED NATIONS (2004). <i>Human Rights Defenders: Protecting the Right to Defend Human Rights</i>. Geneva. Available from <a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/SRHRDefendersIndex.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/SRHRDefendersIndex.aspx</a>.</p> <p>UNITED NATIONS (2012). <i>Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation</i>. New York and Geneva. Available from <a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx</a>.</p> <p>UNITED NATIONS (2014). <i>The Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity: Report by the Director-General to the Intergovernmental Council of the IPDC (Twenty-Ninth Session)</i>. Paris. Available from <a href="http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002301/230101E.pdf">http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002301/230101E.pdf</a>.</p>

### From Goal 16 TST Working Group:

<b>Indicator 16.10.2</b>	<b>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</b>
<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	Goal 16 Target 16.10
<b>Definition</b>	For this indicator, killing includes intentional homicide and other arbitrary deprivation of life, as

<p><b>and method of computation</b></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Journalists cover ‘journalists, media workers and social media producers who generate a significant amount of public-interest journalism.’ This 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.</p> <p>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. Trade unionists included in this indicator are those whose fundamental freedoms are violated by virtue of their trade union membership or in the exercise of their trade union duties. The computation of this indicator is based on submissions made to the ILO regular system of supervision of International Labour Standards and through complaints submitted to the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association; reports submitted by national and regional trade union organisations to the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) which are compiled on an annual basis in the ITUC Annual Survey on violations of trade union rights; and submissions made by national independent trade unions of journalists to the International Federation of Journalists (IFJ).</p> <p>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).</p>
<p><b>Rationale and interpretation</b></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

	<p>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.</p> <p>Based on submissions and complaints received through the ILO supervisory system as well as on information compiled through the ITUC Annual Survey on violations of trade union rights, one notes that trade unionist represent a specific category whose fundamental freedoms are regularly violated across the globe, thus the importance of this indicator.</p>
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	<p>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. ILO/ITUC collect data for trade unions.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Information on the number of journalists killed are compiled annually by UNESCO 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 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 at the annual report by the UNESCO Director-General on ‘The Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity’.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Disaggregation</b>	<p>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.</p>
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	<p>This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.2 (violence against women)</li> <li>16.1 (violence and deaths)</li> <li>16.3 (rule of law)</li> <li>16.6 (accountable institutions)</li> <li>16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms).</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	<p>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</p>

	protected and supported in their work and, indeed, that such women are fully recognized as human rights defenders.
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>In the 2008 ILO Global Report on “Freedom of association in practice: Lessons learned”, the allegations examined by the CFA concerning denial of civil liberties were broken down by regions. Out of the 533 allegations examined by the CFA between March 2004 and June 2007, 13% concerned denials of civil liberties. The regional breakdown of these denials of civil liberties was as follows: Africa (83 allegations); Americas (292 allegations); Asia and Pacific (109 allegations); Europe (49 allegations). Such monitoring of the respect of fundamental freedoms will continue to be possible in the future.</p>
<b>Supplementary information</b>	<p>The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, available at: <a href="http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/">http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/</a></p> <p>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, <a href="http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx</a></p> <p>ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, available at: <a href="http://www.ilo.org/declaration/lang--en/index.htm">http://www.ilo.org/declaration/lang--en/index.htm</a></p> <p>ILO, Freedom of association in practice: Lessons learned, Global Report under the follow-up to the</p> <p>Webpage of the International Trade Union Confederation, available at: <a href="http://www.ituc-csi.org/">http://www.ituc-csi.org/</a></p> <p>Webpage of the International Federation of Journalists, available at: <a href="http://www.ifj.org/">http://www.ifj.org/</a></p>
<b>References</b>	<p>Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms: <a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/Declaration.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/Declaration.aspx</a></p> <p>UNITED NATIONS (2004). Human Rights Defenders: Protecting the Right to Defend Human Rights. Geneva. Available from <a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/SRHRDefendersIndex.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/SRHRDefendersIndex.aspx</a>.</p> <p>UNITED NATIONS (2012). Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation. New York and Geneva. Available from <a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx</a>.</p> <p>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 <a href="http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002301/230101E.pdf">http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002301/230101E.pdf</a>.</p>

## From UNESCO:

**Definition and method of computation:** 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.

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).

**Rationale and interpretation:** 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.

**Sources and data collection:** 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) ongoing; 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.

**Disaggregations:** 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.

**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.

**Gender equality issues:** 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.

**Data for regional and global monitoring:** 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.

**Supplementary information:** 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.

**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.aspx>

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>

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

### From UNESCO:

**Definition and method of computation:** For this indicator, the operative words are “existence” 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 utilise it effectively.
- The capacity of public bodies to provide information upon request by the public.

This indicator will thus collate data from multiple sources, including National Human Rights Institutions, national and international non-governmental organisations, academic institutions, and national media regulatory



authorities, among others. Such information will be gathered, processed and checked by international organisations - 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 are available for at least 195 countries.

**Rationale and interpretation:** The definition here 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).

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.

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.

The practical guarantee of public access may be partially assessed through dimensions such as those unpacked by The World Bank. In this way, the practical quality of legal provisions can be established by identifying if there are: 1) proactive disclosure provisions in laws that establish a legal duty to disclose; 2) mechanisms for citizens, firms, and others to request information that has not been proactively disclosed but that is relevant to their interests, 3) narrowly-tailored guidelines on exemptions to disclosure, and 4) institutional structures that support disclosure, such as information commissioners, oversight mechanisms, and complaints mechanisms. In some national cases, there is also information on the sources and numbers of requests and the response time taken to process these requests.

UNESCO, within its mandate for the right to freedom of expression, which includes the corollary of the right to freedom of information, already monitors progress and issues in this area through its existing submissions to the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and regularly issued research reports on World Trends on Freedom of Expression and Media Development, including its Media Development Indicators assessments. Collaboration with the World Bank is foreseen, as well as drawing upon work undertaken by ARTICLE 19 in this area.

All these will be considered important aspects of establishing the existence and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information.

- **Sources and data collection:** 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)

**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.

**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.

**Gender equality issues:** This indicator can be disaggregated in terms of the ability by men and women to access public information.

**Data for regional and global monitoring:** With the indicator as proposed above, UNESCO could serve as a lead agency in compiling a periodic global report, including relevant inputs from other UN agencies and other bodies, for submission to the relevant UN body which will ultimately track the progress of SDGs.

For reports submitted directly by countries themselves or through regional peer reviews, data sources for the proposed indicator could include official Human Rights Commissions or Information Commissioner figures where these exist, judicial records, police and civil society statistics, and academic research.

A more qualitative component of reporting on the proposed indicator could include aspects such as the actual impact of the right to information laws on SDG-relevant concerns.

The UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) has collected information on two aspects in a pilot survey on Media Statistics, reinforcing the ‘judicial processes’ dimension of the indicator:

LF17. Is there a legal provision for access to information held by the State?

LF18. Is there a constitutional provision for access to information held by the State?

Data are currently available for 56 countries after two rounds of pilot surveys.

**Supplementary information:** None.

**References:**

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

**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**

**From OHCHR:**

<p><b>Goal and target addressed</b></p>	<p>This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets:          10.3 (eliminate discriminatory laws)          16a (strengthen national institutions)          16b (promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws)</p>
<p><b>Definition and method of computation</b></p>	<p><b>Definition</b>          This indicator measures the proportion of countries that have internationally recognized independent (NHRIs) based on the rules of procedure of the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions (ICC).</p> <p><b>Concepts</b>          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 centres and multiple institutions.</p> <p>An Independent NHRI is an institution with 'A level' accreditation status as benchmarked against the United Nations Paris Principles, which were adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1993.<sup>1</sup> The process of accreditation is conducted through peer review by the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of the ICC. There are three possible types of accreditation:</p> <p>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</p> <p>Accreditation by the ICC 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.</p>

	<p>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.</p> <p>Method of computation The indicator is computed as the accreditation classification, namely A, B or C of the NHRI.</p>
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	<p>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 publicise 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</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	<p>The main source of data on the indicator is administrative records of the Sub-Committee on Accreditation reports of the ICC. 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. This information can be accessed on a continuous basis, including through maps.</p>
<b>Disaggregation</b>	<p>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.</p>
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	<p>The UN Secretary General's (SG) reports to the Human Rights Council (HRC) (A/HRC/13/44) and to the General Assembly (A/65/340, highlighted the value of the overall human rights work by NHRIs and stated that, 'National human rights institutions compliant with the Paris Principles are key elements of a strong and effective national</p>

human rights protection system. They can help ensure the compliance of national laws and practices with international human rights norms; support governments to ensure their implementation; monitor and address at the national level core human rights concerns such as torture, arbitrary detention, human trafficking and human rights of migrants; support the work of human rights defenders; and contribute to eradicate all forms of discrimination', (A/HRC/13/44, par. 108). Cooperation and constructive relationship between NHRIs and the government, parliaments, civil society organisations and other national institutions with a role to promote and protect human rights is encouraged by the SG in his report to the HRC for 2010 (A/HRC/16/76). The important and constructive role of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights has also 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 recognised 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 ICC 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 organisational 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 organisations 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 ICC. 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.
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	NHRIs should have a clear mandate to examine and make recommendations on equality and non-discrimination, including on the ground of gender.
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	ICC and OHCHR are the agencies responsible for compiling these indicators at the international level.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	
<b>References</b>	<p>Data for the indicator are available here:  <a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Countries/NHRI/Pages/NHRIMain.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Countries/NHRI/Pages/NHRIMain.aspx</a>  Maps of the data are available here:  <a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx</a></p> <p>The Paris Principles require NHRIs to: a) Protect human rights, including by receiving, investigating and resolving complaints, mediating conflicts and monitoring activities; and b) Promote human rights, through education, outreach, the media, publications, training and capacity building, as well as advising and assisting the Government. The Paris Principles set out six main criteria that NHRIs require to meet: Mandate and competence: a broad mandate, based on universal human rights norms and standards; Autonomy from Government; Independence guaranteed by statute or Constitution; Pluralism; Adequate resources; and Adequate powers of investigation.</p> <p>UNITED NATIONS (2011). National Human Rights Institutions; History, Principles, Roles and Responsibilities. Geneva. Available from  <a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Countries/NHRI/Pages/NHRIMain.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Countries/NHRI/Pages/NHRIMain.aspx</a></p> <p>UNITED NATIONS (2012). Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation. New York and Geneva. Available from  <a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx</a>.</p>

## Target 16.b Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development.

### Indicator 16.b.1: Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law

#### From Goal 16 TST Working Group:

<b>Indicator 16.b.1</b>	<b>Percentage of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed within the last 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law</b>
<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	Goal 16 Target 16.b
<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	<p>Grounds of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law, as enshrined in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and subsequently elaborated upon by international human rights mechanisms, include ethnicity, sex, age, income, geographic location, disability, religion, migratory or displacement status, civil status, sexual orientation and gender identity. While some grounds are common to all countries and follow standard definitions, such as sex, age or disability, the precise categories to be included under grounds such as ethnicity, geographic location and religion will vary according to national circumstances and should be determined in a participatory process at national level.</p> <p>The indicator is calculated as the percentage of persons reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed within the last 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law. This will be calculated using the full survey results, with techniques of imputation, estimation and data weighting to ensure a representative sample and data reliability.</p>
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	This outcome indicator provides a measure of how well non-discriminatory laws and policies are applied in practice, from the perspective of the population. It is based on personal experience rather than perception to ensure greater validity of data, as perceptions of the experience of others may themselves be affected by stereotyping.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	The primary data source is surveys conducted at the national or regional level.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	Data for this indicator should be disaggregated by ground of discrimination, relationship with the person or entity felt to have discriminated (employer/employee, public official or employee, private enterprise, teacher/student, etc.), and place where the discrimination occurred (work, street, home, school, etc.). This indicator should be also disaggregated by age, sex, region and population group.
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	<p>This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 10.2 (inclusion) 10.3 (equal opportunities) 16.3 (rule of law)</p> <p>Because the indicator measures the percentage of the population reporting discrimination during the time period, each victim is counted only once, irrespective of the number of times discrimination or harassment was experienced. Without this information, the indicator does not therefore permit estimates of incidence of discrimination.</p> <p>In many national contexts, surveys may exclude the homeless or low-income groups without access to telephones. Face-to-face surveys often exclude non-urban populations or members of linguistic minorities. There is evidence to suggest that the most marginalised populations are less likely to respond to surveys, but this effect is reduced by ensuring their participation in the preparation of the survey.</p>
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	Data for the indicator should be disaggregated by sex, sexual orientation and gender identity. Multiple grounds of discrimination (e.g. women members of an ethnic minority who have suffered discrimination based on both sex and ethnicity) should be noted.
<b>Data for global and regional</b>	Data for this indicator are collected in an increasing number of countries. At the regional level, the EU Fundamental Rights Agency has collected the data for 27 EU Member States. Relevant data is also collected in Eurobarometer and Afrobarometer surveys, and this

<b>monitoring</b>	question could easily be added.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	
<b>References</b>	FRA survey data and methodology: <a href="http://fra.europa.eu/en/survey/2012/eu-midis-european-union-minorities-and-discrimination-survey">http://fra.europa.eu/en/survey/2012/eu-midis-european-union-minorities-and-discrimination-survey</a>