

Statement by UN Chief Statisticians

Target 16.1. Many countries have commented on the disaggregation of intentional homicide. This disaggregation, by characteristics of victims, perpetrators and killing mechanisms, is essential to differentiate and assess forms of violence. In the spirit of target 17.18, full disaggregation of this indicator will not need to be available on day 1, but will require adequate capacity building at country level.

Expanding the indicator to other forms of (non-lethal) violence would complete the monitoring of the target, but this requires the consideration of additional indicators since homicides and the prevalence of other forms of violence are based on distinct data sources, such as administrative records and population surveys. Indicators which have been widely tested and are widely used in official statistics and scientific literature related to non-lethal violence are for example the percentage of people who have experienced physical, sexual or psychological violence in the last 12 months. Conflict deaths are an important component for monitoring goal 16 but they lack a standard methodology which the IAEG could consider to develop in the near future. It should be noted that according to the International Classification of Crime for Statistical (ICCS) intentional killings in the context of “conflicts” related to organized crime and drug trafficking are to be considered as homicide and not as conflict deaths.

Target 16.2 UN agencies propose two indicators related to violence against children, physical punishment of children 1-14 by caregivers and percentage of young women and men age 18-24 who have been subjected to sexual violence by age 18, both of which are based on tested methodology and are part of the global UNICEF database. The first one measures the most widely experienced violence against children and is included in the current list. The second one is the most severe form of violence against children and is a major focus of government policy and interventions but is missing from the current list. UN agencies recommend that IAEG members include both indicators of violence against children.

The inclusion of non-detected victims in the indicator on trafficking in persons aimed at making the indicator more ambitious since ultimately the targets refer to all victims of trafficking in persons. The IAEG may consider the adoption of the indicator with the understanding that the global monitoring will initially be based on detected victims while the group works toward the development of a methodology to measure the undetected victims.

Target 16.3. The UNSSO proposed two priority indicators: percentage of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimisation competent authorities (crime reporting rate) and the un-sentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population. The proposed indicator on unreported crime has the advantage of being widely understood, easily measurable, comparable across different contexts, based on an established survey methodology, feasible and having a relatively broad availability in national official statistics. The disadvantage is that it focuses only on one aspect of the justice system. This is way, the UNSSO proposed a second priority indicator and related additional indicator on the average period of

pre-trial detention, which is highly complementary to the proportion of un-sentenced detainees. Indeed, in many contexts, durations of pre-trial detention are more an issue than the proportion of un-sentenced detainees.

Target 16.4. As commented by many countries, the indicator on illicit financial flows, while highly relevant, lacks an agreed standard methodology. Statistical programmes in international organizations stand ready to support the IAEG to initiate a process for developing such a methodology and support the gradual implementation of the indicator in future monitoring. In response to comments highlighting the need to consider illicit flows in the indicator related to firearms, the IAEG may consider the following alternatives: *Number of illicitly manufactured or trafficked firearms seized, traced and investigated* or as a second choice *Percentage of firearms recorded, marked and transferred in accordance with international instruments (and standards)*.

Target 16.5. The disaggregation by type of profession of the indicator on the bribery experience as suggested by many countries is very relevant and easy to accommodate since the underlying data are collected by type of profession. On the feasibility of the indicator, reference is made to a large and growing number of studies based on the measurement of bribery through victimization and population surveys. There is an extensive body of literature and experience accumulated in national statistical systems in undertaking victimization surveys and measuring corruption experience. In addition to the indicator on the 'percentage of persons who had at least one contact with a public official, who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months', the UNSSO recommended a complementary indicator to capture more 'grand corruption', namely 'percentage of businesses that paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months'. Other proposed indicators or concepts for measurement (e.g. harmful actions against the state or other types of corruption) do not yet have an established and tested methodology for measurement. Some indicators suggested are either hard to measure (e.g. cooperation for building capacities) or rely on the measurement of inputs (e.g. expenditures) only, rather than outcomes, as does the proposed indicator.

Target 16.6. In agreement with comments from countries and suggest to replace 16.6.2 with *Share of people reporting a high degree of trust in different public institutions*.

Target 16.7. The IAEG may consider to replace 16.7.2 with: *Turnout as a share of voting-age population (disaggregated by sex, age, disability and other population groups) in and frequency of national elections or referenda or Proportion of non-governmental organisations, trade unions and other associations consulted about government decisions, strategies and policies in their sector*

Target 16.10. The proposed priority indicator related to number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping etc can be identified as yellow or green since data exist and for some categories of people mentioned in the indicator are regularly monitored (e.g. UNESCO, ILO and OHCHR). In addition, to measure more comprehensively the target, an indicator on the "access to information" part of the target would be desirable (see UNESCO's proposal)

Target 16.a. It is conceded that the proposed indicator, which is already proposed by the UNSSO under 16.3, does not capture the full range of concepts related to the target and is only a proxy. It is indeed a strong indicator for whether or not citizens are confident in the capacity of criminal justice institutions. Another indicator prioritised by the UNSSO is the existence of an independent national human rights institution (in compliance with the Paris Principles adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations A/RES/48/134). This indicator, which is not a binary indicator and can change over time, is already available and accessible.