

Quantitative indicators for the World Programme of Action for Youth

Report of the expert group
New York, 12-13 December 2011



United Nations
New York, 2012

DESA

The Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat is a vital interface between global policies in the economic, social and environmental spheres and national action. The Department works in three main interlinked areas: (i) it compiles, generates and analyses a wide range of economic, social and environmental data and information on which Member States of the United Nations draw to review common problems and take stock of policy options; (ii) it facilitates the negotiations of Member States in many intergovernmental bodies on joint courses of action to address ongoing or emerging global challenges; and (iii) it advises interested Governments on the ways and means of translating policy frameworks developed in United Nations conferences and summits into programmes at the country level and, through technical assistance, helps build national capacities.

Note

The designations employed in this report and the material presented in it do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures.

This publication has been issued without formal editing.

Suggested citation:

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Social Policy and Development (2011).
Quantitative indicators for the World Programme of Action for Youth: Report of the expert group (United Nations, 2012)

Contents

		Para	Page
I.	Background to the meeting.....	1-4	5
II.	Opening.....	5-8	6
III.	Objective of the meeting.....	9-13	6
IV.	Quantitative Indicators Linked to Youth and Education.....	14-19	7
V.	Quantitative Indicators Linked to Youth and Employment.....	20-25	10
VI.	Quantitative Indicators Linked to Youth and Poverty.....	26-32	12
VII.	Quantitative Indicators Linked to Youth and Health.....	33-36	15
	A. Youth and Health.....	37-43	16
	B. Youth and HIV/AIDS.....	44-46	19
VIII.	Quantitative Indicators Linked to Youth and Information and Communication Technologies.....	47-52	19
IX.	Quantitative Indicators Linked to Juvenile Delinquency and Drug Abuse.....	53	22
	A. Criminal Justice and Youth in Conflict with the Law.....	54-55	22
	B. Youth and Substance Abuse.....	55-57	24
X	Quantitative Indicators Linked to Youth and Globalization	58-62	25
XI.	General Debate.....	63-76	26
XII.	Recommendations and Closing.....	77-79	28
	A. General conclusions.....	77-78	28
	B. Recommended indicators in each priority area.....	79	29
Annex I	Meeting agenda.....	-	33
Annex II	List of participants.....	-	34

Explanatory notes

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures.

The following abbreviations are used in this document:

AIDS	Acquired immune deficiency syndrome
BMI	Body Mass Index
DALY	Disability-adjusted life years
DHS	Demographic and Health Surveys
ESPAD	European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs
EU	European Union
GSHS	Global school-based student health survey
HCT	HIV counselling and testing
HIV	Human immunodeficiency virus
ICT	Information and communication technologies
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPB	ICT price basket
ITU	International Telecommunications Union
KILM	ILO's Key Indicators of the Labour Market database
LAMP	UNESCO's Literacy Assessment and Monitoring Programme
LLECE	Latin American Laboratory for Assessment of the Quality of Education
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MedSPAD	Mediterranean School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs
MICS	Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys of the United Nations Children's Fund
MICS-4	The fourth round of Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys
NEET	Youth not in education, employment, or training
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PASEC	Program on the Analysis of Education Systems
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
SACMEQ	Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality
STEPS	WHO's STEPwise approach to surveillance of non-communicable diseases
TIMSS	Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study
UIS	UNESCO's Institute for Statistics
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
WHO	World Health Organization
WMHS	WHO World Mental Health Survey

I. Background to the meeting

1. The expert group meeting “Quantitative indicators for the World Programme of Action for Youth” was held at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 12 to 13 December 2011, organized by the Division for Social Policy and Development of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DSPD/DESA) of the United Nations Secretariat, in collaboration with the United Nations Statistics Division and the United Nations Population Division of DESA. The final meeting agenda is attached as annex I.

2. The meeting was attended by experts from Australia, France, South Africa, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. Experts also participated from the International Labour Organization, the International Telecommunications Union, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Population Fund, the World Health Organization, the Commonwealth Secretariat and the Inter-American Development Bank and DESA.

3. The meeting was convened in the context of General Assembly resolution 65/312, in which the General Assembly adopted the outcome document of their High-level Meeting on Youth: Dialogue and Mutual Understanding, held on 25-26 July 2011. The outcome document enumerated several requests to the Secretary-General, one of which was to propose a set of possible indicators for the World Programme of Action for Youth and the proposed goals and targets, in order to assist Member States in assessing the situation of youth, encouraging continued consultations with Member States (A/RES/65/312, para. 27).

4. The World Programme for Action for Youth was adopted by the General Assembly in its resolutions 50/81 of 14 December 1995 and 62/126 of 18 December 2007. It provides an international framework for general policy and practical guidelines for national action and international support to improve the situation of young people. The Programme for Action outlines 15 priority areas of youth development to be addressed, with corresponding proposals for action. These priority areas are interrelated, and fall within three main clusters: youth and the global economy, youth and civil society, as well as youth and their well-being.

Priority area clusters	Programme of Action priority areas
Youth and the global economy	Education / Employment / Hunger and poverty / Globalization
Youth and civil society	Environment / Leisure-time activities / Full and effective participation of youth in the life of society and in decision-making / Information and communication technologies / Intergenerational issues
Youth and their well-being	Health / Drug abuse / Juvenile delinquency / Girls and young women / HIV and AIDS / Armed conflict

II. Opening

5. Ms. Daniela Bas, Director of the Division for Social Policy and Development (DSPD/DESA), opened the meeting by welcoming the experts and thanking them for their participation, which would provide essential inputs to the Division's increasingly important and widely recognized work on implementation of the World Programme of Action for Youth.

6. Mr. Jean-Pierre Gonnot, Chief of the Social Integration Branch of the Division for Social Policy and Development also welcomed the participants and expressed appreciation for the experts' participation at this busy time of year and for the significant contributions of the Statistics Division and the Population Division of DESA for their valuable contributions to the preparation of the meeting.

7. Ms. Nicola Shepherd, the United Nations Focal Point on Youth/Division for Social Policy and Development, noted the new trends emerging in youth development over the recent years. The numbers of young people worldwide aged 15-24 years has reached 1.8 billion and accounts for approximately a quarter of the global population, and almost 9 in 10 of young people globally live in the developing world.

8. Ms. Shepherd stated that the series of global financial and economic crises, recent events of youth engagement in political change, the revolution of social media and networking platform, have all, amongst others, caused youth issues to gain momentum in the international development debate. She continued to stress that more than ever before, there is a need to undertake a meaningful assessment of the situation of youth, and to monitor the progress made towards implementing the World Programme of Action for Youth.

III. Objective of the meeting

9. Mr. Gonnot explained that work had been ongoing on the preparation of a set of indicators to monitor the World Programme of Action for Youth. This present expert group meeting is a response to the sense of urgency expressed by Member States in their request to the Secretary-General to propose a list of indicators for the World Programme of Action for Youth, made at the High-Level Meeting of the General Assembly, held in July of 2011, in resolution A/RES/65/312.

10. The expert meeting therefore aimed to agree on a reliable and realistic set of indicators that can assess progress towards implementing of the World Programme of Action on for Youth. Mr. Gonnot also informed the group that the outcome of the meeting would be made available at a side event of the 43rd session of the Statistical Commission to be held in New York, 28 February to 3 March, and to the 45th session of the Commission on Population and Development, to be held in New York 23-27 April, which will have "adolescents and youth" as its theme. The final draft list will be presented at the Commission for Social Development in 2013, in light of the needs expressed by countries for quantitative indicators to measure progress in implementing the Programme of Action.

11. Mr Gonnot emphasized that the present meeting could not be expected to cover all of the priority areas in the World Programme of Action for Youth in the time available, so those that lent themselves most directly to quantification by Member States should be considered first. Additional areas for indicators could be noted in the experts group's report, which should be considered a stepping stone for future work.

12. The list should be focused, robust, policy-relevant and concentrate on indicators which are of direct relevance to the World Programme of Action for Youth and for which national capacities and experience in compilation exist, including necessary documentation on concepts and methods.

13. Mr. Gonnot asked the experts to consider, during their deliberations, indicators that allow for short-term pragmatic use of existing data, be precise, timely, comprehensive and comparable, best reflect the current key aspects of youth development as reflected in the relevant proposals for action of the World Programme of Action, and not place a reporting burden on Member States. He emphasized that the indicators to be proposed were for use by interested countries, for their selection and adaptation in monitoring and implementation of the Programme of Action, not for international reporting. Naturally there would be wide variation among Member States in social and economic circumstances and data collection programmes in place affecting national-level use and refinement of the list for their own monitoring programmes.

IV. Quantitative Indicators Linked to Youth and Education

14. This session was moderated by Mr. Said Ould Voffal, expert on education indicators and data analysis at the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS). The agenda item was discussed on the basis of a presentation by Mr. Voffal, who noted the impressive fact that global trends in educational participation among young people have been overwhelmingly positive in the past three decades to the extent that by 2009 some 531million students were enrolled in secondary education worldwide. Enrolment in tertiary education, as well, grew more than five-fold over the past four decades resulting in 165 million students enrolled in tertiary education in 2009. However, despite these impressive signs of progress, some 127 million young people still lacked basic literacy skills in 2009 while 67 million primary school-aged children and 72 million lower secondary school-aged children were out-of-school globally. Additionally there was great variation in these statistics across regions and between men and women.

15. Mr. Voffal mentioned several current concerns in education worldwide, among them limitations in educational opportunities available to girls and young women, migrants, refugees, displaced persons, street children, indigenous and minority youth, rural youth and young people with disabilities. Economic and social conditions and especially educational funding structures that place much of the burden of educational funding on households, especially in parts of the developing world, were cited as another barrier to more widespread participation in education on the part of young people and youth. He also noted concerns about the quality of educational systems, whether education systems teach skills necessary for participation in the workplace and civic life, and the need to further develop education

and training systems and tertiary education systems in particular in many parts of the world.

16. For the education priority area in the World Programme of Action on Youth, the following indicators were proposed for discussion:

Core indicators

1. Youth literacy rates
2. Transition rates from primary education to secondary education
3. Gross enrolment ratios for secondary education
4. Net enrolment rates for secondary education
5. Gross enrolment ratio in tertiary education
6. Enrolment rates for the age group 15-24
7. Entry rates in secondary and tertiary education
8. Graduation ratios from secondary education
9. Share of enrolment in vocational programmes in upper secondary education
10. Graduation ratios from tertiary education
11. Proportion of students who benefit from public scholarships/loans

Supplementary indicators

1. Proficiency in reading, mathematics and science (from existing testing programmes)
2. Cumulative educational attainment of the population 25 years and older by level of education
3. Expenditure per student
4. Public subsidies for households/students as percentage of total public expenditure on education

17. Mr. Voffal noted that the core indicators had been chosen because they provided important insights into the situation of youth development and educational opportunity at the country level. Most of the proposed core indicators could be disaggregated for women and men and were available from existing national data sources in most countries, therefore imposing little if any additional data collection burden for youth monitoring in countries. It was acknowledged, however, that data for the supplemental indicators are less widely available and that compiling them in countries could be more difficult and potentially more costly than compiling data for the proposed core indicators.

18. Members of the expert group raised a number of issues in regard to this set of indicators.

- (a) Several experts expressed their desire for an indicator that would capture youth participation in vocational education or other training outside of formal education, in recognition of the importance that such non-formal educational experiences have for youth opportunities in the workplace;
- (b) Others inquired about the possibility of tailoring the indicator of the cumulative educational attainment of the adult population to fit the 15-24 age

group. It was acknowledged that collecting data for this indicator in many countries would be difficult, especially given the limited availability of reliable estimates of the 15-24 year-old population in many countries, a data problem which is exacerbated by youth migration. Furthermore, measuring attainment through household surveys can be expensive for countries that do not already administer such surveys regularly. However, it was suggested that data on educational attainment among youth could be determined from existing Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) and national census resources in many countries;

- (c) Concerns were raised about the quality of existing data on youth literacy. Mr. Voffal replied that improvements to these data would soon be realized as a result of the on-going work of UNESCO's Literacy Assessment and Monitoring Programme (LAMP), initial results of which would be available in 2012;
- (d) Experts raised the issue of school-to-work transitions and whether or not an indicator could be included that would capture this. It was acknowledged that while this data may be available for some countries in the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), it was not widely collected in most developing countries. However, the International Labour Organization (ILO) had a project on-going which would provide data on school-to-work transitions for more countries in the near future;
- (e) In relation to the enrolment indicators proposed by Mr. Voffal, some experts expressed a concern that these enrolment rates may be inflated by official enrolment counts that include students who do not actually attend school. Mr. Voffal informed the group of UNESCO's recommendation that countries collect enrolment data several months into the school year. UNESCO felt that enrolment ratios are a reasonably good measure of educational participation;

19. At the end of the session, the group came to the following conclusions:

- (a) Some of the enrolment ratios were unnecessary and net enrolment rates at the secondary level could be replaced by the enrolment rate among youth ages 15-24;
- (b) While the importance of considering the financing of education was acknowledged, the group decided that the proposed supplemental indicators on educational expenditure per student and public subsidies for households/students as percentage of total public expenditure on education, could be dropped;
- (c) Furthermore, although coverage was acknowledged to be restricted to countries that make use of existing international surveys learning achievement such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), Program on the Analysis of Education Systems (PASEC), the Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ) and the Latin American Laboratory for Assessment of the Quality of Education (LLECE), it

was agreed to retain proficiency in reading, mathematics and in science as one of the supplementary indicators.

V. Quantitative Indicators Linked to Youth and Employment

20. This agenda item was considered on the basis of a presentation given by Mr. Steven Kapsos, economist in the Employment Trends Unit of the Economic and Labour Market Analysis Department at ILO. The session was moderated by Mr. Gianni Rosas, Coordinator of Youth Employment Programme at ILO. Mr. Kapsos noted that youth often have special vulnerabilities in the labour market due their lack of prior job experience and paucity of links to professional networks and contacts. Some youth possess skills or talents not in demand by the labour market or suffer from having received a low-quality education that did not prepare them for the world of work. Furthermore, youth today enter a job market in which many job opportunities open to them are based on short-term contracts with few benefits and little job security and youth in employment may find themselves the victims of “last-in-first-out” policies during difficult economic times which accord job security to more senior employees. Youth also face barriers to entrepreneurship such as lack of access to credit. It was noted also that youth employment is currently a high priority for policymakers around the world, given the ongoing impacts of the world financial crisis and recessions in many economies as well as recent youth-led political upheaval in the Middle East and North Africa.

21. The following indicators were proposed for discussion for the youth and employment priority area:

Core indicators

1. Youth unemployment rate
2. Ratio of youth to adult unemployment rates
3. Youth employment-to-population ratio
4. Youth labour force participation rate
5. Working poor youth

Supplementary indicators

1. Youth not in education, employment or training (NEET)
2. Youth vulnerable employment

22. Among the core indicators, the youth unemployment rate was considered an essential measure of the underutilization of the youth labour supply while the ratio of youth to adult unemployment rates was presented as an indicator of the extent to which youth are disproportionately affected by unemployment as compared to adults. The youth employment-to-population ratio, which is Millennium Development Goals (MDG) indicator 1.5, was proposed as a measure of the extent to which national economic activity creates employment for youth, although it was noted that there is no optimal level of the youth-to-employment ratio. The youth labour force participation rate was suggested as a key indicator for assessing a country’s stock of youth workers who are working or trying to find work. Finally, MDG indicator 1.6, on persons

employed with less than the World Bank's extreme poverty threshold of \$1.25 per day, could be applied to youth as the percentage of employed youth who live in households with incomes below the extreme poverty line, as a measure of the extent to which employment for youth does or does not provide a decent income.

23. Supplemental indicators suggested by the experts from ILO included the share of youth neither in education nor employment (NEET) and youth vulnerable employment. The NEET indicator captures the non-utilized working potential of the youth population. Data on the prevalence of NEET by country already exists for the European Union (EU) countries, available through Eurostat, and could be calculated by other countries using data from their household or labour force surveys. Youth vulnerable employment, defined as the share of youth workers who are own-account or contributing family workers, gives an indication of the relative size of the youth workforce that works in less-formal conditions and which has limited access to social security and formal benefits. It was noted however that age-disaggregated data for this indicator are not currently collected in many developing countries.

24. In the course of the discussion of these proposed indicators, the following questions and concerns among members of the expert group were raised:

- (a) Experts suggested the inclusion of indicators on social security provisions for youth, youth share of non-farm employment, quality of employment opportunities for youth, and youth entrepreneurship, although it was recognized that existing data are currently limited in these areas, especially in developing countries;
- (b) Experts raised the issue of the extent to which existing data on youth employment can be disaggregated to subnational levels, or by urban and rural residence. Of particular interest was production in urban and rural areas and the rate of growth in youth employment by industry in urban and rural areas. Mr. Rosas and Mr. Kapsos acknowledged the importance of the urban/rural distinction in youth employment but stated that with the exception of the indicator on the youth working poor, possibilities for disaggregating existing data to sub-national levels were limited. However, Member States should be able to disaggregate employment data for youth by urban and rural and major city on the basis of data from household and labour force surveys;
- (c) Experts also inquired about the possibility of including an indicator on the employability of youth, or the extent to which skills that youth bring to the labour market are those that are demanded by employers. Mr. Rosas and Mr. Kapsos noted that while measurement criteria for the employability of youth are difficult to determine, OECD was undertaking an assessment of youth employability in some countries;
- (d) Many experts found the indicator on youth not in education, employment or training (NEET) to be a valuable proposal although some noted the possibility that this indicator could also capture young parents who are not in education or employment in order to care for children or youth with disabilities who would like to work but who are unable to. However, it was agreed that this indicator provided a good approximation of the extent of involuntary youth

unemployment, especially when used in connection with other indicators of youth in the labour force.

25. In this field the experts reached the following conclusions:

- (a) The expert group was in favour of moving the proposed supplemental indicator on youth neither in education nor employment (NEET) into the core list of indicators for youth and employment. Furthermore, the proposed indicators on youth employment-to-population ratios could be shifted from the core to the supplementary list;
- (b) The group recognized that employment is interconnected with many other issues relevant to youth, exemplified by the fact that several other priority areas of the World Programme of Action for Youth mention youth employment;
- (c) Proposed indicators could be disaggregated by gender, urban/and rural and by age groups 15-19 and 20-24.

VI. Quantitative Indicators Linked to Youth and Poverty

26. This agenda item was considered on the basis of a presentation given by Mr. David Gordon, Professorial Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Poverty and Social Justice, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The session was moderated by Ms. Ann Biddlecom, the Chief of Fertility and Family Planning Section of the Population Division, DESA, United Nations Secretariat. Mr. Gordon recapped five indicators relevant to the World Programme of Action for Youth priority area on youth hunger and poverty, currently used in the United Nations *World Youth Reports*, which he endorsed for inclusion among the core indicators under the youth and hunger and poverty priority area of the Programme of Action. He also noted that existing MDG indicators for hunger and poverty are not available for the population age group 15-24.

27. Prof. Gordon proposed two different classification methods for measuring malnutrition based on ranges of Body Mass Index (BMI) values and shared data with the group showing how these classifications could be used to show important variations in youth malnutrition among low- and middle-income countries in sub-Saharan Africa and North Africa, and even in high-income countries, through an example drawn from data on the prevalence of underweight by gender and age group in England.

28. Prof. Gordon further proposed a multidimensional measure of deprivation of basic needs among youth based on the discussion on absolute poverty contained in the Programme of Action of the World Summit for Social Development, adopted in Copenhagen in 1995¹, and the discussion on child poverty contained in the 2006

¹ A/CONF.166/9, paragraph 19 of the Programme of Action.

General Assembly Resolution on the Rights of the Child². From these definitions, thresholds for deprivation in the areas of food, improved drinking water source, improved sanitation facilities, health, shelter, education, information, and access to services could be set, and deprivation and absolute deprivation measured as the percentage of youth falling below specified thresholds in two or more of these areas.

29. In the course of this presentation, the following initial indicators were proposed for discussion for the priority area on youth hunger and poverty:

Core indicators

1. Percentage of young people living in extreme poverty (\$1.25 per day)
2. Percentage of young people living in absolute poverty (based on threshold equal to 2 or more severe deprivations of basic human need)
3. Food deprivation: a Body Mass Index of 18.5 or below (underweight)
4. Severe food deprivation: a body mass index of 16 or below (severe underweight)
5. Shelter deprivation: living in a dwelling with three or more people per room (overcrowding), or in a house with no flooring (for example, a mud floor) or inadequate roofing (including natural roofing materials)
6. Deprivation of improved sanitation facilities: access only to unimproved sanitation facilities, including pour flush latrines, covered pit latrines, open pit latrines, buckets, or no access to toilets of any kind
7. Water deprivation: access only to unimproved sources such as open wells, open springs, surface water, untested bottled water, or having to walk for more than 15 minutes to reach a water source (30 minutes round trip)

Supplementary indicators

1. Under-five mortality rate for mothers aged 15-24
2. Education deprivation – youth who did not complete primary school or who are illiterate
3. Information deprivation – youth with no access to a radio or television (i.e. broadcast media) at home
4. Health deprivation – women who did not receive medical treatment for a recent serious illness or who did not receive the minimum standard of antenatal care from a person trained in midwifery during their last pregnancy. Men who did not receive medical treatment for a recent serious illness
5. Number of young people who are destitute and homeless
6. Youth in households with no person in employment over 18 years of age
7. Youth malnourished or obese (underweight already included in hunger indicator)
8. Youth in households with no electricity
9. Family disintegration
10. Displacement rates – between and within countries
11. Ratio of wages to cost of living
12. Access to transportation

² A/RES/61/146, para 46.

13. Access to capital

30. Mr. Gordon noted that in addition to the five indicators in the list that are already reported in the *United Nations World Youth Report*, this list includes suggestions of other deprivation measures that were part of the proposed multidimensional youth deprivation and absolute poverty measure. This measure had been used by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and could be constructed from data already available for many countries through existing Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and Multiple-Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS). The under-five mortality rate to young mothers in the age group 15-24 was proposed in light of the fact that standard under-five mortality statistics exclude deaths of children whose mothers are in this age group. It was also noted in the presentation that additional suggested indicators such as youth who are destitute or homeless, family disintegration, displacement rates, and access to capital may not be feasible due to lack of definitions or lack of data.

31. In the course of discussion of these proposed indicators, members of the expert group raised the following questions and concerns:

- (a) Several experts expressed a concern that malnutrition measures based on BMI ranges alone could be insufficient due to the fact that many of these thresholds were set in the context of developed countries yielding BMI thresholds that may not be well-suited for application in developing countries. Furthermore, it was suggested that more specific age-groups within the age group 15-24 would be more appropriate for assessing youth malnutrition based on body mass, in recognition that these years are characterized by rapid growth and physical development for most young people, especially those below the age of 18;
- (b) Experts also suggested several potential sources for data on the height and weight of youth for determining BMI for members of the 15-24 age group. These suggestions included the World Health Organization (WHO) STEPwise approach to Surveillance of non communicable diseases (STEPS), Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) and national records on applicants and members of the armed forces;
- (c) Concerns were raised over whether or not poverty thresholds based on household income and expenditure were sufficient in conveying intra-household inequalities and whether a threshold based on individual income or consumption could be considered. It was suggested that measuring consumption was currently difficult due to a lack of consensus on the definition of consumption and a lack of surveys which collect household or individual-level consumption information. Knowledge of the extent to which household expenditures are shared among household members is also limited;
- (d) Several experts questioned whether indicators could be suggested that would capture whether or not income poverty and deprivations of water, sanitation, and housing disproportionately affect youth compared to people of all ages or if indicators could be found that would shed light on what aspects of deprivation of these basic needs are specific to youth;

- (e) In relation to the proposed multidimensional measure of absolute poverty, while it was agreed that the areas of deprivation included within the multidimensional measure were important and should be included in their own right, some experts suggested that proposing a multidimensional measure of absolute poverty for the World Programme of Action for Youth could be difficult to explain to national policy makers and also technically problematic. Consultation with Member States to assess the extent to which the current extreme poverty measure or existing national poverty measures can be tailored to capture the aspects of poverty that are specific to youth was suggested as an alternative. Mr. Gordon suggested that decomposing the multidimensional measure into its constituent indicators would result in losing some of the detailed information that the multidimensional measure conveys;
 - (f) Some experts also stressed the importance of formal birth registration for access to basic goods and services such as education and housing later in the life cycle, and the fact that birth registration remained far from universal in many countries. It was suggested that formal registration might be a suitable indicator for the full and active participation of youth in the life of society and in decision-making.
32. At the end of the session, the group concluded:
- (a) While there was no consensus on the desirability of the suggested multidimensional deprivation measure as a core indicator, the constituent components of the proposed index that relate directly to youth access to the basic needs of water, sanitation, and housing could be included as separate indicators. It was agreed that other indicators proposed as constituent parts of the multidimensional index could be adequately covered by indicators that fall within the priority areas of the World Programme of Action for Youth, to which they are most closely linked;
 - (b) BMI thresholds for more specific age groups within the 15-24 range could be considered in the priority area of youth and health;
 - (c) Indicators for which definitions and data had not been tried out in countries lacking should be dropped from the list.

VII. Quantitative Indicators Linked to Youth and Health

33. This session was moderated by Mr. Paul Bloem, Technical Officer for Adolescent and Community Health at the Department of Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health of the World Health Organization. The agenda item was considered on the basis of a presentation by Mr. Bloem, who set the context for the discussion on indicators for youth and health, including youth and HIV/AIDS, by examining the leading contributors to additional disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) lost for young people by cause, of which injury, communicable diseases,

maternal conditions, neuropsychiatric disorders and other non-communicable diseases were most common.

34. For young people, the leading causes of mortality worldwide are injury, comprising road traffic accidents, self-inflicted injury, violence, drowning, and fires, communicable diseases and maternal causes of death, lower respiratory infections, HIV, tuberculosis, meningitis, and other non-communicable diseases. For youth, the biggest risk factors contributing immediately to DALYs are alcohol, unsafe sex, lack of contraception, iron deficiency, illicit drugs, and physical injuries. Risk factors such as obesity and tobacco use are also significant although their impacts on health tend to materialize later in the life cycle.

35. Mr. Bloem explained that the epidemiology of young people shows that mortality is more significant for this age group than once thought, that injury and mental health are leading causes of ill-health among young people, that alcohol and tobacco use among young people are primary health risk factors for public health more generally, and that major health issues among young people tend to be an indicator of future trends for health epidemics in the wider public.

36. Mr. Bloem then presented the following proposed indicators, based on the World Health Assembly resolution 64.28 on Youth and Health Risk, regional resolutions, and the ongoing work of WHO towards establishing an official list of indicators of health for adolescents and young people as well as the outcomes and impacts in WHO's Health Measurement Framework.

A. Youth and Health

37. Initial proposed indicators for discussion on youth and health included:

Core indicators

1. Percentage of students aged 13-15 who drank so much alcohol that they were really drunk one or more times during their life (total)
2. Percentage of students aged 13-15 who have smoked one or more cigarettes in the past 30 days
3. Percentage of students aged 13-15 considered overweight (> 1 standard deviation above mean by WHO guidelines for age/sex)
4. Mortality rate per 100,000 due to road traffic injuries, violent causes and self-inflicted injury (suicide)
5. Maternal mortality rate in among young women aged 15-19
6. Adolescent birth rate (age-specific fertility rate) for women aged 15-19
7. Modern contraceptive use among sexually active youth aged 15-24

Supplementary indicators

1. Percentage of live births to a young mother aged 15-24 years in a given time period, attended by skilled health personnel
2. Percentage of students aged 13-15 considered underweight (> 1 standard deviation below age and sex average, using WHO guidelines)

3. Percentage of students aged 13-15 who report being physically active for at least 60 minutes per day, in the last 7 days
4. Percentage of students aged 13-15 who reported cannabis use in the past 30 days
5. Percentage of students aged 13-15 who reported any serious injuries (road traffic, violence) in last twelve months.

38. Mr. Bloem mentioned that these proposed core indicators on alcohol and tobacco use and overweight youth were measures of health risk factors that are of growing concern in the field of public health. The age ranges for these suggested indicators reflect one existing primary source for data on these indicators, the Global School-based Student Health Survey (GSHS), in countries which have fielded it. Data for the alcohol and tobacco indicators could also be calculated from data obtained from the fourth round of Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS-4) for women ages 15-24.

39. The indicator on the prevalence of youth who are overweight could also be calculated from sources other than the GSHS using the new WHO guidelines on BMI thresholds for under- and overweight which are determined separately for youth ages 15-18 and 19-24.

40. The proposed mortality rate due to road traffic injuries, violent causes and self-inflicted injury covers the three leading causes of death among young people and the youth maternal mortality rate covers the leading cause of death among young women. However, it was noted that there are considerable technical difficulties in calculating the maternal mortality ratio for women ages 15-24 in most countries. The adolescent birth rate is an important measure of youth fertility and is MDG-indicator 5.4. Finally, modern contraceptive use among sexually active youth was included as a more accurate indicator of contraceptive utilization than MDG indicator 5.3 on use of any form of contraception. Contraceptive use among youth lags behind that of older age groups and the use of modern contraception is an important means for preventing maternal mortality. Data on this indicator for youth is available from MICS-4.

41. Among the proposed supplemental indicators, the percentage of live births attended by skilled health personnel (MDG indicator 5.2) is considered to be a factor that contributes to lowering rates of maternal mortality. Youth who are underweight remains an important proxy for youth under-nutrition in many countries and can be assessed using WHO BMI thresholds for the age groups 15-18 and 19-24. Youth inactivity is a major contributor to growing rates of overweight and obese youth around the world, and cannabis use, is considered a measure of youth illicit drug use and injury, a major contributor to morbidity among youth. The 13-15 age range specified for these indicators is proposed because the data are currently available from the GSHS in many countries for this age group, although they could be calculated for youth using data from other sources.

42. Members of the expert group raised a number of issues in regard to this set of indicators:

- (a) Many experts found the (13-15) year age range for many of the health risk factor indicators problematic both on the grounds that this only touches on the

lower end of the age range of the youth population, and in light of questions about the extent to which tobacco and alcohol use among young teenagers is a predictor of use and abuse of these substances later in life. Experts proposed that data for these risk factors for the youth population could also be obtained from sources other than the GSHS, with the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children Survey (HBSC), the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs (ESPAD), and the Mediterranean School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs (MedSPAD) offered as examples for countries of Europe and the Mediterranean basin;

- (b) Experts also questioned whether the other risk factors, such as youth exposed to smoke from cooking fires in the home or youth incidence of malaria, tuberculosis and pneumonia, should be included among the indicators;
 - (c) Several experts expressed an interest in including an indicator of youth mental health and well-being. They suggested that the WHO World Mental Health Survey (WMHS) would be one potential source in countries which had implemented the survey, but it was mentioned that this survey was only administered by 28 countries and that there were no plans to repeat it;
 - (d) Experts also expressed an interest in indicators that would offer more insight on youth access to health services, especially in light of the MDG target 5.B to achieve universal access to reproductive health by 2015;
 - (e) The value of including an indicator on physical activity was questioned but it was suggested that lack of physical energy expenditure, along with poor nutrition, were two important components leading to increasing incidence of overweight and obese youth. It was proposed that time use surveys could be a useful source of data on regular physical activity among youth, either through work or through structured recreational sporting activities.
43. At the end of the session, the group concluded:
- (a) There are currently significant difficulties in measuring youth mortality and especially youth maternal mortality and youth mortalities due to homicide and other forms of violence in many developing countries as civil death registration data for youth in many of these countries are unavailable or compromised in quality.. More effort should be placed on building country-level capacity to track mortality and morbidity accurately;
 - (b) The maternal mortality rate for women aged 15-24 was of great interest but it was agreed that calculating data for this indicator in most countries would be very difficult. In its place, the group considered keeping the standard maternal mortality rate for women aged 15-49;
 - (c) Acknowledged MDG indicator 5.6 on the percentage of women who are married or in union and who have unmet need for family planning had some merits. However, because few countries have data on this indicator, it should be included as a supplementary indicator while the percentage of youth using modern contraception remained a core indicator;

- (d) In response to interest among the experts in more indicators related to youth access to health services, the indicator on the percentage of live births to young mothers attended by skilled health personnel was moved from supplemental to core, and a new supplemental indicator on the percentage of youth aged 15-24 who have used health services at least once in the last 12 months was added.

B. Youth and HIV/AIDS

44. Initial proposed indicators for discussion on youth and HIV/AIDS were also presented by Mr. Bloem of the World Health Organization as follows:

Core indicators

1. HIV prevalence rate among population aged 15-24
2. Percentage of youth (15-24) with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS
3. Percentage of youth (15-24) who used a condom at last high-risk sex

Supplementary indicator

1. Percentage of sexually active young people aged 15-24 who access HIV counselling and testing (HCT) and know the result.

45. Mr. Bloem noted that the three existing proposed indicators for youth and HIV/AIDS, which are also MDG indicators 6.1-6.3, were acceptable to WHO in relation to the World Programme of Action for Youth, where they are available. In addition, the additional supplementary indicator for youth and HIV/AIDS would give an indication of the extent to which young people take advantage of HIV testing and counselling services and are aware of their HIV status. Data for this indicator is available from DHS and from MICS-4 for women aged 15-24.

46. The experts had no further comments on these proposed indicators for youth and HIV/AIDS.

VIII. Quantitative Indicators Linked to Youth and Information and Communication Technologies

47. This session was moderated by Mr. Gary Fowlie, Head of the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) Liaison Office to the United Nations. The agenda item was considered on the basis of a submission presented by Mr. Fowlie, which set out the statistics collected by countries and provided to ITU, therefore providing a basis for developing indicators appropriate to youth in the context of the World Programme of Action for Youth.

48. Suggested indicators drawn from household surveys which had already been undertaken in many countries, that would be most relevant to youth, include:

Core indicators

1. Percentage of individuals in the age group 15-24 who used a computer from any location in the last 12 months
2. Percentage of individuals in the age group 15-24 who used the Internet from any location in the last 12 months, by frequency (at least once a day, at least once a week, less than once a week)
3. Percentage of individuals in the age group 15-24 who used a mobile telephone in the last 12 months.

Supplementary indicators

1. Provisions for the protection of youth from harmful aspects of information communications technologies
2. Disaggregation of youth Internet use by location of use and by activity.

49. The experts suggested that the proposed core indicators were primarily measures of the developing/developed countries “digital divide” among youth in access to the Internet, and to computers and mobile telephones, including tablets and mobile phones capable of providing internet access. Additional perspectives were considered in the supplementary suggestions, for example, an indicator that could help measure the extent to which youth are protected from harmful aspects of information and communication technologies (ICT) use, particularly on the Internet. Although there is currently no available indicator on this aspect of prevention, there is ongoing work on how to identify suitable indicators.

50. Mr. Fowlie’s presentation also suggested that ITU data on youth Internet access could be disaggregated by location of use and by activity, as well as by frequency of use, and examples of classifications for these purposes were included in the ICT submission. These classifications draw on national experience and guidelines prepared by the United Nations Statistics Division on time-use statistics.

51. In the ensuing discussion, several other areas of inquiry and concern emerged:

- (a) The proposed indicators were considered by the experts to be indicators primarily of access to ICTs and did not address the content of digital media or what content youth are accessing and for what purposes beyond entertainment. The example of youth involvement in recent political upheavals in the Middle East and North Africa, often facilitated by ICTs, was mentioned, as were job search sites and educational applications;
- (b) Mr. Fowlie noted that recent events around the world meant that connectivity could no longer be considered separately from the content of digital media. He noted that the Broadband Commission for Digital Development was set up in 2010 by UNESCO and ITU to consider the interplay of ICTs and social engagement;
- (c) Using the past twelve months as the reference frame for measuring access to various ICTs was seen as problematic by several members of the group. Given the urgency of information in decision-making, they felt that a shorter

reference period (access per week) was needed to judge the extent to which the digital divide is really closing. Mr. Fowlie mentioned that because a significant percentage of the world population still lacks basic access to most ICTs, a basic measure of access was warranted. However, he also mentioned that ITU data does include the possibility of disaggregating Internet use by frequency of use (at least once a day, at least once a week, less than once a week).

- (d) ICT technologies are spreading and evolving very rapidly, which makes choosing indicators that will be meaningful in the future quite difficult. Among other examples of this, the global spread of mobile telephones, tablets, and other devices which enable mobile access to the Internet was noted. Recent trends also suggest that current distinctions between computers and mobile devices may be less meaningful in coming years;
- (e) Experts raised the point that while digital media and the Internet are sources that youth look to more and more for news and information about job opportunities, health care and other services, youth around the globe are not simply passive consumers of the information that they access through ICTs. Youth are also increasingly creators of digital content who are more and more often utilizing ICTs as a means to participate in the economy and in social life and to engage in political and decision-making processes. In this sense, an indicator measuring the frequency of use of ICT to participate in interactive discussions on important issues, would be useful;
- (f) Experts also discussed risks of ICT use for youth. While it was noted that there does not appear to be a documented health risk inherent in using handset technologies, ICT use among youth may in some cases inhibit the development of subject-matter concentration or of social skills, although research on these phenomena is still at an early stage;
- (g) While increased Internet use among youth may mean that youth are spending less time developing social skills through face-to-face exchanges with family and friends, ICT use among youth may also foster the development of critical thinking skills among youth in different ways as well as facilitate their participation in social and political life;
- (h) It was also noted that in developed countries there are increasingly fewer physical spaces for youth to interact, increasing the importance of the Internet as a forum for youth to interact socially. The work of the American social media researcher, Ms. Danah Boyd, was recommended as a reference point for these trends;
- (i) Experts also proposed that the expert group not neglect the continuing importance of more traditional forms of information dissemination and telecommunications, including newspapers, radio, and television for linking youth to the wider world;
- (j) Experts suggested that the proposed indicators, with the exception of use of mobile phones, are only really relevant to youth who have at least a basic

education and income. Mr. Fowlie added that the group could also consider data from ITU on mobile phone subscription rates and the ICT Price Basket (IPB), a composite indicator based on prices for fixed-telephony, mobile telephony and fixed broadband Internet services, as a percentage of average income in a country;

- (k) Mr. Fowlie further noted that broadband Internet access is the new “digital divide” and that access to high-speed broadband is critical for enabling commerce and governance to function on-line. In some developing countries, access to broadband is severely limited due to high costs of access, sometimes exacerbated by national taxation policies that tax Internet access as a luxury item.

52. At the close of the session, the experts agreed on the following conclusions:

- (a) The fast-evolving nature of ICT may require revisiting the list of potential indicators for youth and ICT in the future;
- (b) ICTs are a medium through which youth can engage in any number of activities, both positive and negative. Protection of youth from harmful aspects of ICT use is one priority of but the positive aspects of youth use of ICTs, not only as consumers but also as creators of content, would ideally be reflected in the indicators on youth and ICTs;
- (c) While it was recognized that base level indicators of access to ICTs are warranted by the still existing global digital divide, the expert group expressed a clear preference for indicators that would provide more detail on the frequency of the use of different ICTs as well as on the types of activities that youth participate in through their use of ICTs.

IX. Quantitative Indicators Linked to Juvenile Delinquency and Drug Abuse

53. This session was moderated by Ms. Francesca Grum, Chief of the Social and Housing Statistics Section at the United Nations Statistics Division. The agenda item was considered through a presentation delivered by Ms. Grum, based on input from the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) Headquarters, which included proposed core and supplementary indicators, with definitions, sources and references. Additional inputs on drug abuse and drug trafficking were provided by Ms. Florence Mabileau from the Council of Europe Pompidou Group for combating drug abuse and drug trafficking, which brought together cooperative research in this field in the European and Mediterranean regions through household surveys, among other sources.

A. Criminal Justice and Youth in Conflict with the Law

54. The suggested indicators on criminal justice and youth in conflict with the law from UNODC are shown below:

Core indicators

1. Number of children in detention per 100,000 child population
2. Number of children in pre-sentence detention per 100,000 child population
3. Percentage of children sentenced receiving a custodial sentence
4. Percentage of young people diverted or sentenced who entered a pre-sentence diversion scheme
5. Number and age-standardized prevalence rate of intentional homicide, by sex
6. Number and rate of young victims of assault

Supplementary indicators

1. Number of juveniles brought into contact with the police and/or criminal justice system during a 12 month period
 2. Number of young people arrested during a 12 month period per 100,000 youth population
 3. Youth homicide victims by mechanism (firearm, sharp object, other)
 4. Prevalence of young people who were victims of bullying in the past 12 months
 5. Number and percentage of young people having participated in a community-based crime (and/or drug) prevention scheme/programme.
55. In the ensuing discussion, a number of questions and concerns were raised:
- (a) The experts noted there would be considerable difficulty in applying a standard youth age grouping such as 15-24, even within countries, owing to the age threshold for “adults” typically falling between 15 and 19, and in some cases varying within countries according to the type of crime and other legal and cultural circumstances. Furthermore, there are quite different criminal justice processes and procedures involved for “children” and “adults”. A useful technical reference in this context would be the joint UNODC-UNICEF publication *Manual for the Measurement of Juvenile Justice Indicators*;
 - (b) Experts also agreed that it would be difficult to make specific recommendations on indicators in this field, where concepts and definitions for institutions and procedures differed so markedly from country to country;
 - (c) The experts agreed the indicator proposals could be simplified by adopting a single indicator for persons of a given age group or groups “in custody” for whatever reason. It also agreed that an indicator of access to prevention and rehabilitation services was needed. The group noted that the United Nations publication *Manual for the Development of a System of Criminal Justice Statistics* would be helpful in selecting and defining indicators and developing the underlying data systems to support them;
 - (d) From the point of view of victimization, the group agreed the homicide indicator was important but that mortality data, where available from vital statistics, would be a preferable source as public administration data were usually quite slow to be finalized and incomplete;

- (e) An indicator of assault was also of high priority, particularly in regard to domestic violence. Here again, the United Nations publication *Manual on Victimization Surveys* would be helpful to consult, as well as numerous United Nations and other publications and studies on violence against women.

B. Youth and Substance Abuse

56. The suggested list of indicators presented for discussion on drug abuse is shown below:

Core indicators

1. Life-time prevalence of drug use among people aged 15-16 years, by sex and drug type
2. Annual prevalence of drug use among people aged 15-16 years, by sex and drug type
3. Number of young people who have been brought into contact with the police and/or criminal justice system in relation to drug related crimes during a 12 month period per 100,000 young people, by sex and age group

Supplementary indicators

1. Life-time use of tranquillisers or sedatives without a doctor's prescription among people aged 15-16, by sex
2. Life-time use of stimulants without a doctor's prescription among people aged 15-16 years, by sex
3. Share of young persons among all persons who are in treatment for drug use, by sex and age group
4. Annual prevalence of drug-related mortality affecting young persons per 100,000 young people, by sex and age group.

57. In the ensuing discussion on this agenda item, the following issues were raised:

- (a) The experts agreed that drug use and dependency in early youth years were major factors in lifetime patterns of use and health later in life, particularly for tobacco and alcohol, teenage "binge" drinking for example being a very good predictor of alcohol dependency and health problems at older ages. However, patterns of drug dependence were much more varied among countries in terms of the drugs of concern, legal treatment and youth and general public perceptions and shifting patterns of use over time. These factors considerably affected treatment and rehabilitation policies;
- (b) The group felt core indicators were needed on alcohol and tobacco use, as well as abuse and addiction for a limited number of drugs, such as those "under international control," and on access to and take-up of treatment and rehabilitation services. Mortality data on drug-related deaths might also provide a good indicator;

- (c) The selection of indicators should also take into account differing perceptions of drug concerns among youth, which could best be determined through the use of household surveys. Possible indicators on alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drug use drawn from existing school-based surveys of national student populations were also discussed during the session on youth and health, considered on the basis of a submission from Mr. Bloem from WHO, and supported with input from Ms. Mabileau from the Pompidou Group.

X. Quantitative Indicators Linked to Youth and Globalization

58. This session was moderated and presented by Mr. Edliberto Loaiza, Senior Advisor on Monitoring and Evaluation at the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). Mr. Loaiza proposed several indicators on youth and globalization, but felt that the concept of globalization as it related to youth was vague, and the impact of globalization on youth should focus on its various components. Some cases related to making globalization more inclusive and in some others offsetting negative effects.

59. In presenting the following indicators on youth and globalization for discussion, Mr. Loaiza noted that some, such as the indicator on youth safety, currently lack a defining concept. The technical paper published in 2011 by the United Nations Population Division “International Migration in a Globalizing World: The Role of Youth”, would be a good reference for further refining the suggested indicators.

60. The suggested list of indicators presented on youth and globalization is shown below:

Core indicators

1. Foreign students enrolled in tertiary education by major area of destination
2. Number/percentage of international migrants by age groups and sex
3. Youth safety
4. Youth civic participation
5. Percentage of youth involved in crime
6. Percentage of youth who are trafficked or abducted

Supplementary indicators

1. Rates of bullying or coercive violence
2. Rates of youth gang activity
3. Rates of youth joining ‘terrorist’ activities
4. Youth voting patterns
5. Youth political participation

61. The group agreed international migration statistics were an important source for indicators when considered by age, sex, education and employment status of the migrants, relative to both sending and receiving populations. It was suggested that return migration, as for example of those who had migrated for tertiary educational

programmes or for short-term work, but came back to the country of origin would also be a valuable indicator. A related measure on globalization, youth and education would be cross-border outsourcing of employment and educational programmes on Internet, and a related impact measure would be implementation of international employment standards.

62. The group also agreed that an indicators of international refugee youth migrants and of international trafficking should have high priority.

XI. General Debate

63. This session was chaired by Mr. Robert Johnston, advisor and retired Chief of Section at the United Nations Statistics Division. Mr Johnston explained that this session had been added to the agenda to provide an opportunity for participants to comment on more general issues than had been covered in the subject-specific priority areas and to add some suggestions on priority areas that had not been included in the agenda.

64. Several comments and suggestions found broad support for future consideration.

65. Further development of an overall conceptual framework to support the selection of indicators is needed., For example, an indicator of “healthy development” could be based on an umbrella concept covering milestones or life stages in personal development that include maternal and child nutrition, early childhood through primary education, which strongly affected successful integration of youth in society, entry to the labour force, family and household formation, childbearing, exposure to illegal drugs and stimulants as well as alcohol and tobacco, exposure to cultural and behaviour norms of other countries.

66. Greater harmonization of age groupings used in statistics across different fields should be implemented so as to better focus on the youth population between the ages of 15 and 24 and smaller age groups within this range when appropriate.

67. High priority should be given to developing indicators on participation in civic life, the extent and impact of globalization on exposure to a wide variety of cultural experiences and the extent of disconnect with traditional cultural norms and practices “at home,” ranging from lifestyle changes and leisure activities to changing roles in families to human rights.

68. Countries should ensure clear responsibility and support for compilation and dissemination of indicators on youth within whatever monitoring programme each country sets up, bearing in mind the need for competent statistical staffing to ensure the continuity and soundness of the data and supporting documentation.

69. Indicators should be thoroughly documented as to sources and methods and accompanied by an explanation of their interpretation as well as potential uses and limitations.

70. Countries should take the lead in setting national goals and targets utilizing the suggested indicators.

71. Indicators on youth should be elaborated and presented in such a way as to emphasize means of harnessing the potential of youth to contribute to society rather than seeing youth in terms of stereotypical social “negatives” that needed corrective policies and interventions.

72. The use of the urban/rural classification should be given greater emphasis. It was noted in this context that the roles of youth in urban and rural areas were quite different.

73. The gender dimension of indicators chosen for the priority areas of the World Programme of Action for Youth should be given very high priority. In addition to gender-specific indicators of reproductive health, it is also important to consider changing patterns of drug use and abuse and treatment needs of young women and men, for example. It was suggested that gender should be considered a cross-cutting issue across the priority areas of the Programme of Action and equality of opportunity between young women and men the goal. Inequalities to the disadvantage of men, where they are found to exist, should also be addressed.

74. Attention should also be given to indicators which capture the full diversity of the youth population including indigenous youth, youth with disabilities, and other groups of youth with special needs and vulnerabilities;

75. Further work on the draft list and related materials should be an open process allowing for active youth participation and feedback.

76. A number of other comments and suggestions were made, including the following:

(a) National youth reports incorporating both statistics and analysis had been prepared in at least 15 mainly developed countries and could be considered in all countries as the principal monitoring output. The data in these could be made widely available through dedicated and interactive public web sites available on the Internet;

(b) It would be useful to draft an illustrative template for a simple, illustrative statistical “youth profile” or an “atlas of youth development” for use by countries as a model for national use with appropriate national adaptations. The United Nations *World Youth Report*, prepared by the Division for Social Policy and Development of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs was offered as one example;

(d) ILO had developed a program for data compilation that currently supports its Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM) database which it would be pleased to share with interested organizations. DevInfo, managed by UNICEF, and GenderInfo, developed by the United Nations Statistics Division in collaboration with UNICEF and UNFPA, were also offered as examples of platforms that could be useful to countries in planning dissemination and

visualization of data on indicators linked to the World Programme of Action on Youth;

- (e) Youth poverty should be directly addressed in the indicators. The “level of living” concept in statistics might be useful for this. The proposed indicator for the youth and employment priority area on working poor youth provides some important perspective on youth poverty.

XII. Recommendations and closing

A. General conclusions

77. This session was moderated by Mr. Patrick Guyer, Chief Statistician and Coordinator at the American Human Development Project. The expert group reached the following conclusions concerning general issues of indicator presentation and selection:

- (a) There should be broad participation of youth in the indicator selection process through, for example, interactive and social media;
- (b) Each indicator should be accompanied by a narrative explaining the rationale, concepts, definitions and potential data sources and their limitations in current statistical practice for that indicator;
- (c) The presentation of indicators in each priority area should include recommended disaggregations taking into account the need to strictly limit the total number of series for public advocacy and debate. In particular, indicators in each priority area should reflect gender inequalities, urban and rural differences where applicable, and in certain cases relevant age groups within the 15-24 youth age group;
- (d) Tested and agreed sources and methodology for each indicator should be available, explained and cited, with preference to sources with established time series. Established unofficial sources should not a priori be excluded where official sources are not available, but their methodology, history and population coverage should be documented (for example, public opinion surveys);
- (e) Indicator reporting should focus on trends where possible, and standard reporting years should be agreed on, including a benchmark year, such as 2000;
- (f) The proposed indicators are for interested countries to consider for monitoring implementation of the Programme of Action at the national level. Countries should adapt them to match their own needs and priorities for data compilation, considering national social and economic circumstances and data collection capacities.

78. The group also agreed on a number of topics where indicators are needed but further research and development are needed to establish workable and tested definitions, concepts and methods for them:

- (a) Multidimensional poverty;
- (b) Inter-generational transmission of income and poverty, and nutritional adequacy;
- (c) Family status and situation of youth in household composition;
- (d) Within country migration;
- (e) Youth participation in the political process and development;
- (f) Status of employment of youth (own-account worker, unpaid family worker, entrepreneur, wage earner);
- (g) Short and long-term impacts of environmental changes on youth;
- (h) Youth housing conditions;
- (i) Allocation of time, particularly as pertains to leisure time;
- (j) Uses of media and information and communication technologies.

B. Recommended indicators in each priority area

79. Following discussion in each priority area, the group recommended interim indicators for each priority area of the Programme of Action as given below. The group noted that while the number of indicators recommended was 34, well within the suggested limit of 50-60, the actual number of series, taking some minimal disaggregation into account, would be several times that. A large number would be difficult to implement in a simple indicator format for wide public use (the number of official Millennium Development Goals indicators including disaggregations is 60), so further careful consideration should be given to the total recommended series including disaggregations.

World Programme of Action for Youth Priority areas	Proposed indicators All indicators should be disaggregated by sex and urban/rural as far as possible.	
	Core	Supplementary
Education	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Youth literacy rates, each sex (MDG 2.3) 2. Transition rate from primary education to secondary education, each sex 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proficiency in reading, mathematics and in science, each sex 2. Educational attainment of the population 15-24 years

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Gross enrolment ratio in secondary education, each sex 4. Enrolment rates of youth 5. Gross graduation ratio for upper secondary education, each sex 6. Gross enrolment ratio in tertiary education, each sex 	
Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Youth unemployment rate, each sex 8. Ratio of youth to adult unemployment rates 9. Youth labour force participation rate, each sex 10. Youth neither in education nor employment (NEET), each sex, urban and rural 11. Working poor youth, each sex (MDG 1.6) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Youth employment-to-population ratio 4. Youth in vulnerable employment
Poverty and hunger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12. Percentage of young people living in extreme poverty (MDG 1.1) /below national poverty lines 13. Percentage of youth deprived of adequate shelter, each sex 14. Percentage of youth deprived of sanitation, urban and rural (MDG 7.9) 15. Percentage of youth deprived of protected water supply, urban and rural (MDG 7.8) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Access to electricity 6. Access to transportation
Health*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16. Youth mortality due to road traffic injuries, violent causes (homicide and conflict-related) and self-inflicted injury (suicide), each sex 17. Maternal mortality ratio for all women ages 15-49 (MDG 5.1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Percentage of women aged 15-24 who are married or in union and who have met their need for family planning 8. Percentage of youth considered underweight (> 1 standard deviation below age and sex average, using

	<p>18. Adolescent birth rate (women age 15-19) (MDG 5.4)</p> <p>19. Proportion of births to mothers 15-24 attended by skilled health personnel, urban and rural (MDG 5.2)</p> <p>20. Modern contraceptive use among sexually active youth 15-24 (MDG 5.3)</p> <p>21. Percentage of youth who have “binged” on alcohol one or more times during their life, each sex</p> <p>22. Percentage of young people who have smoked one or more cigarettes in the past 30 days, each sex</p> <p>23. Percentage of young people considered overweight (>1 standard deviation above mean by World Health Organization guidelines), each sex</p>	<p>World Health Organization guidelines)</p> <p>9. Percentage of youth who report being physically active for at least 60 minutes per day, in the last 7 days</p> <p>10. Percentage of youth who reported any serious injuries (road traffic, violence) in last twelve months</p> <p>11. Percentage of youth 15-24 who have used health services at least once in the last 12 months</p>
Drug abuse	<p>24. Annual prevalence of illicit drug use and drug dependence among youth by drug type, each sex</p> <p>25. Number of youth held in custody by civil authorities in connection with drug related crimes (annual), each sex</p>	<p>12. Percentage of youth who report cannabis use at least once in the past month</p>
Juvenile delinquency	<p>26. Number of population 15-24 years in criminal detention as juveniles, each sex</p>	
Globalization	<p>27. Youth migrants (number and as a percentage of total youth), each sex</p> <p>28. 28. Student outbound mobility ratio at the tertiary level, each sex</p>	
Information and communication	<p>29. Percentage of youth with daily access to a mobile</p>	<p>13. Provisions for the protection of youth from harmful</p>

technologies	<p>telephone, urban and rural</p> <p>30. Percentage of youth who used a computer at any location in the last week or month, each sex, urban and rural</p> <p>31. Percentage of youth who used the Internet from any location in the last week or month, each sex (MDG 8.16)</p>	<p>aspects of ICTs</p> <p>14. Disaggregation of youth Internet use by location of use and by activity</p>
HIV/AIDS	<p>32. HIV prevalence rate among youth, each sex (MDG 6.1)</p> <p>33. Percentage of youth with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS, each sex (MDG 6.3)</p> <p>34. Percentage of youth who used a condom at last high-risk sex (MDG 6.2)</p>	<p>15. Percentage of sexually active youth accessing HCT and knowing the result</p>

*Core indicators 21 and 22 and several of the supplementary indicators for the health priority area are specifically worded to reflect their origins in the World Health Organization's Global School-based Student Health Survey.

Annex I: Final Meeting Agenda

Monday, 12 December 2011

- 8:30 – 9:00 Registration of participants
- 9:00 – 9:30 **Welcome and introduction**
Jean-Pierre Gonnot, Chief of Social Integration Branch, Division for Social Policy and Development
Nicola Shepherd, Focal Point on Youth, Division for Social Policy and Development
- 9:30 – 11:00 **Session I: Quantitative indicators linked to youth and education**
Said OuldOuld Voffal, Education Indicators and Data Analysis, UNESCO Institute for Statistics
- 11:00 – 11:15 *Coffee break*
- 11:15 – 12:45 **Session II: Quantitative indicators linked to youth and employment**
Gianni Rosas, Coordinator of Youth Employment Programme, ILO
- 12:45 – 14:00 *Lunch break*
- 14:00 – 15:30 **Session III: Quantitative indicators linked to youth and poverty**
Ann Biddlecom, Chief of Fertility and Family Planning Section, UN Population Division
- 15:30 – 15:45 *Coffee break*
- 15:45 – 17:00 **Session IV: Quantitative indicators linked to youth and health**
Paul Bloem, Technical Officer, Adolescent and Community Health, WHO

Tuesday, 13 December 2011

- 9:00 – 10:30 **Session V: Quantitative indicators linked to youth, information and communication technology**
Gary Fowlie, Head, ITU Liaison Office to the UN
- 10:30 – 10:45 *Coffee break*
- 10:45 – 12:15 **Session VI: Quantitative indicators linked to juvenile delinquency and drug abuse**
Francesca Grum, Chief, Social and Housing Statistics, UN Statistics Division
- 12:15 – 13:30 *Lunch break*
- 13:30 – 15:00 **Session VII: Quantitative indicators linked to youth and globalization**
EdlibertoLoaiza, Senior Advisor on Monitoring and Evaluation, UNFPA
- 15:00 – 16:15 **General Debate**
Robert Johnston, Advisor, former United Nations Statistics Division staff member
- 16:15 – 16:30 *Coffee break*
- 16:30 – 17:00 **Session VII: Recommendations and closing**
Patrick Guyer, Chief Statistician and Coordinator, American Human Development Project

Annex II: List of Participants

Experts

Ms. Isabel M. Alvarez-Rodríguez
Youth Development Specialist
Inter-American Development Bank
(IDB)
1300 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.20577
Tel (202) 623-1060
Fax: (202) 623-3096
ISABELA@iadb.org

Mr. Leo Burd
Research Scientist
MITCenter for Future Civic Media
MIT Media Laboratory
Room E15-320M
20 Ames Street
Cambridge, MA02139
leob@media.mit.edu

Mr. David Gordon
Professorial Research Fellow
Centre for the Study of Poverty and
Social Justice, University of Bristol
8 Prior Road
Bristol, BS8 1TZ
United Kingdom
Tel :+44(0)117 9546761
dave.gordon@bristol.ac.uk

Mr. Robert Johnston
Advisor and Former Statistician at the
United Nations Statistics Division
60 beach street
New York
Home: (212) 431-8579
rgjohnston@alumni.princeton.edu

Mr. Paul Bloem
Technical Officer
Adolescent and Community Health
Department of Maternal, Newborn,
Child and Adolescent Health
World Health Organization (WHO)
20 Avenue Appia
1211 Geneva 27
Tel.: +41 22 791 4256
Fax: +41 22 791 4853
bloemp@who.int

Mr. Gary Fowlie
Head of the International
Telecommunications Union (ITU)
Liaison Office to the United Nations
Two United Nations Plaza
Room DC2-2524, 44th Street
New York
Tel. 917 367 2992
fowlie@un.org

Mr. Patrick Guyer
Chief Statistician and Coordinator
American Human Development
Project
368 Greene Ave. #3Brooklyn
NY 11216
Tel (347) 409-2533
patrick@measureofamerica.org

Mr. Steven Kapsos,
Economist
Employment Trends, Economic and
Labour Market Analysis Department
International Labour Organization
(ILO)
4 route des Morillons
CH-1211 Genève 22 Switzerland
Tel. +41 22 799 6111
kapsos@ilo.org

Experts ctd.

Mr. Stephen Leman

Statistician
United Kingdom Statistics Authority
Statistics House
Tredegar Park
Newport NP10 8XG, United Kingdom
Tel +44 (0)845 604 1857
Fax +44 01633-456179
stephen.leman@education.gsi.gov.uk

Ms. Florence Mabileau

Programme Manager
(Pompidou Group) Mediterranean
School Survey Project on Alcohol and
Other Drugs (MedSPAD)
F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex
France
Tel : + 33 3 88 41 31 95
Florence.mabileau@coe.int

Mr. George Patton

Professor of Adolescent Health
Research
University of Melbourne
2 Gatehouse Street
Parkville, Victoria 3052
Australia
Tel +61 3 9345 5890
Fax +61 3 9345 6343
george.patton@rch.org.au

Mr. Gianni Rosas

Programme Coordinator
Youth Employment Programme (YEP)
International Labour Organization
(ILO)
4 route des Morillons
CH-1211 Genève 22 Switzerland
Tel +41 22 799 7019
rosas@ilo.org

Mr. Edliberto Loaiza

Senior Advisor on Monitoring and
Evaluation
United Nations Population Fund
(UNFPA)
NBB Room 0455
New York
Tel (212) 297-5281
loaiza@unfpa.org

Mr. Makiwane Monde

Senior Research Specialist
Human Sciences Research Council
134 Pretorius Street
Pretoria 0002
South Africa
Tel. +27 (0)12 302 2239
Fax. + 27 (0) 12 302 2001
mmakiwane@hsrc.ac.za

Mr. Layne Robinson

Youth Affairs Division
Commonwealth Secretariat
Marlborough House,
Pall Mall,
London SW1Y 5HX
United Kingdom
Tel +44 (0)20 7747 6500
Fax: +44 (0)20 7930 0827
l.robinson@commonwealth.int

Mr. N.V. Varghese

Head of Higher Education Programmes
International Institute for Educational
Planning, UNESCO
7-9, rue Eugène-Delacroix
75116 Paris, France
Tel +33 (1) 45 03 77 49
Fax +33 (1) 40 72 83 66
nv.varghese@iiep.unesco.org

Experts ctd.

Mr. Said Ould Voffal

Education Indicators and Data Analysis
UNESCO Institute for Statistics
C.P. 6128 Succursale Centre-ville
Montreal, Quebec, H3C 3J7 Canada
Tel: (1-514) 343 7752 Fax: (1-514) 343-5740
s.voffal@unesco.org

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs

Ms. Keiko Osaki

Chief, Demographic and Social
Statistics Branch, Statistics Division
Two United Nations Plaza Rm-1554
New York, NY10017
Tel 212-963-8338
osaki@un.org

Mr. Serguey Ivanov

Population Affairs Officer
Population and Development Section
Population Division
Two United Nations Plaza Rm-1926
New York, NY10017
Tel 212-963-3814
ivanov@un.org

Ms. Ann Biddlecom

Chief of Fertility and Family Planning
Section
Population Division
Two United Nations Plaza Rm-1988
New York, NY10017
Tel. 212- 963-3921
biddlecom@un.org

Ms. Daniella Bas

Director
Division for Social Policy and
Development
Two United Nations Plaza Rm-1320
New York, NY10017
Tel. 212-963-2569
bas@un.org

Ms. Francesca Grum

Chief, Social and Housing Statistics
Section, Statistics Division
Two United Nations Plaza Rm-1552
New York, NY10017
Tel 212-963-4950
grum@un.org

Ms. Sara Hetog

Population Affairs Officer
Mortality Section
Population Division
Two United Nations Plaza Rm-1964
New York, NY10017
Tel 917-367-8238
hertog@un.org

Mr. Jean-Pierre Gonnot
Chief, Social Integration Branch
Division for Social Policy and
Development
Two United Nations Plaza Rm-1370
New York, NY10017
Tel. 212-963-3256
gonnot@un.org

Ms. Nicola Shepherd
Focal Point on Youth
Division for Social Policy and
Development
Two United Nations Plaza Rm-1386
New York, NY10017
Tel. 917-367-9282
shepherdn@un.org

Ms. Elizabeth Niland
Associate Social Affairs Officer
Social Integration Branch - Youth
Division for Social Policy and
Development
Two United Nations Plaza
New York, NY10017
Tel. 212-963-1896
nilande@un.org

Ms. Sandrine Cardon
Programme Assistant
Social Integration Branch - Youth
Division for Social Policy and
Development
Two United Nations Plaza
New York, NY10017
Tel. 917-367-9412
cardons@un.org

Mr. Junjie Jiang
Intern (IT support)
Social Integration Branch
Division for Social Policy and
Development
Two United Nations Plaza
New York, NY10017

Mr. Broddi Sigurdarson
Social Affairs Officer
Social Integration Branch - Youth
Division for Social Policy and
Development
Two United Nations Plaza
New York, NY10017
Tel. 917-367-2106
sigurdarson@un.org

Ms. Julie Pewitt
Programme Assistant
Social Integration Branch - Youth
Division for Social Policy and
Development
Two United Nations Plaza
New York, NY10017
Tel. 917-367-5169
pweitt@un.org

Ms. Sandra Lindblom
Consultant
Focal Point on Youth/Social
Integration Branch
Division for Social Policy and
Development
Two United Nations Plaza
New York, NY10017
Tel. 917-367-9412
lindblom@un.org