

# The indicators framework of OHCHR applied to the right to development

Nicolas Fasel\*

## I. Introduction

The human rights discourse and practice are increasingly looking at issues of implementation and accountability gaps. States and international and national human rights monitoring mechanisms are working to improve policy and monitoring frameworks to foster the implementation of universally accepted human rights standards. In this context, there has been an increasing demand for indicators, whether quantitative or qualitative, as tools for assessing progress in the implementation of human rights, formulating evidence-based human rights policies and making available relevant information to States, human rights monitoring mechanisms and civil society.

The interest in indicators is, however, not entirely new in the human rights arena. To some extent human rights actors have been using and compiling indicators for human rights, much as M. Jourdain, in Molière's *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme*, was "doing prose without knowing it". References to statistical indicators are explicitly made in international human rights treaties.<sup>1</sup> States Members of the United Nations have underlined the instrumental value of indicators to measure progress in the realization of human rights and guide the formulation of targeted policies.<sup>2</sup> The inclusion

of legal provisions exclusively dedicated to the role of statistics and data collection to enforce the implementation and monitoring of rights in the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, adopted in 2006 (art. 31), constituted a landmark from this perspective. In this context, it is not surprising that the Working Group on the Right to Development and its high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development started looking at indicators in their work on the articulation of criteria and sub-criteria for the operationalization of the right to development.

Despite the demand for indicators in human rights, their development and use have remained well below their potential. This can be explained by a combination of interrelated factors, including a lack of political will, limited resources in data collection and dissemination, denials of the right to information, knowledge gaps in human rights and statistical tools, and lack of trust in statistical information.<sup>3</sup> More importantly, insufficient conceptual and methodological considerations may have undermined

rights, additional approaches should be examined, such as a system of indicators to measure progress in the realization of the rights set forth in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights" (part II, para. 98). The outcome document of the Durban Review Conference held in 2009, available at [www.un.org/durbanreview2009/pdf/Durban\\_Review\\_outcome\\_document\\_En.pdf](http://www.un.org/durbanreview2009/pdf/Durban_Review_outcome_document_En.pdf), also recommended the development of indicators to inform policies and other measures to eliminate racial discrimination (para. 103).

<sup>3</sup> Mistrust of statistics is sometimes fuelled by an excessive trust in or reliance on statistics by certain actors or the tendency of others (or sometimes the same people) to disparage statistics that do not support their positions. In the literature, mistrust of statistics is sometimes summed up—not without a touch of humour—by the saying "There are three kinds of lies: lies, damned lies, and statistics", a phrase popularized by Mark Twain who himself attributed it to the nineteenth century British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli.

\* Human Rights Officer, Right to Development Section, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Geneva.

<sup>1</sup> For instance, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women asks States parties to take measures to ensure the reduction of female student dropout rates in relation to the right to education (see article 10 (f)).

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, stating that "[t]o strengthen the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural

progress and discussion on the development of indicators for human rights.<sup>4</sup>

Against this background, this chapter aims to inform the discussion and work on the development of indicators and other operational tools to foster the implementation of the right to development, drawing on the work on indicators for human rights undertaken by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) following requests of human rights monitoring mechanisms, in particular the treaty bodies.<sup>5</sup> More specifically, it draws on the conceptual and methodological framework on indicators for human rights that was endorsed by the international human rights treaty bodies in 2008, after two years of a validation process involving consultations and workshops with a range of national and international human rights, development and statistics actors.<sup>6</sup>

## II. The notion of indicators for human rights

There is no universally agreed definition of the term “human rights indicator”. Human rights actors, such as human rights and legal experts, policymakers, development practitioners as well as statisticians, tend to have different notions and perceptions of the term. For some, human rights indicators are seen as equivalent to questions to be considered when assessing a particular event or situation, whereas for others indicators are essentially synonymous with statistics.

In exploring the issue and surveying various initiatives dealing with indicators and human rights issues, OHCHR adopted a working definition of human rights indicators: “specific information on the state of an event, activity or an outcome that can be related to human rights norms and standards; that address and reflect the human rights concerns and principles; and that are used to assess and monitor promotion and protection of human rights” (HRI/MC/2006/7, para. 7). Indicators such as the number of victims of

arbitrary execution or forced eviction, the proportion of a population with a body mass index below a certain level and prison occupancy rates will meet the requirements of this definition. Moreover, this type of indicator has been used in different human rights assessment contexts, including by international human rights monitoring mechanisms.

In studying the notion of indicators and its articulation in the human rights, development, programming and statistical literature, we find frequent attempts to distinguish qualitative from quantitative indicators and subjective from objective indicators. It is instructive to distinguish between these different indicators as they are potentially useful in assessing the implementation of human rights.

### A. Qualitative and quantitative indicators

In undertaking a comprehensive human rights assessment, there is a need to combine indicators of both a quantitative and a qualitative nature. The distinction is, however, not necessarily obvious, especially since qualitative aspects can be quantified and quantitative information needs to be qualified. For instance, quantitative indicators such as the proportion of primary education teachers who are fully qualified and trained, the youth and adult literacy rates and the ratio of girls to boys enrolled in education will be useful in assessing the quality of national education systems. At the same time, statistics will typically need to be further qualified or accompanied by qualitative information to facilitate interpretation. Taking the previous examples, when can a teacher be considered to be “fully qualified and trained”? What definition and criteria should be used to assess literacy? Also, analysing trends in terms of the number of complaints received and processed by a monitoring mechanism will typically require further information and investigation.

As qualitative and quantitative indicators are seen as useful tool for human rights, in the work of OHCHR on human rights indicators the need to distinguish between indicators expressed in quantitative form, such as numbers, percentages or indices, from those expressed in a narrative or text form has been pointed out. The latter are sometimes part of a set of questions, checklists or thematic criteria used to complement or elaborate on information—numerical or otherwise—related to the realization of human rights. This distinction between indicators is different from that between objective and subjective indicators.

<sup>4</sup> See, for instance, the report of the Turku Expert Meeting on Human Rights Indicators (Turku/Åbo, Finland, 10-13 March 2005), available at [www.abo.fi/institut/imr/research/seminars/indicators/Report.doc](http://www.abo.fi/institut/imr/research/seminars/indicators/Report.doc).

<sup>5</sup> See OHCHR, *Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation* (HR/PUB/12/5, available at [www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx)) and also chapter 28 by Rajeev Malhotra.

<sup>6</sup> Using this framework and the identified illustrative indicators for human rights, a growing number of Governments, national and international human rights entities as well as civil society organizations initiated work on indicators in support of human rights implementation and assessments.

## B. Objective and subjective indicators

The distinction between objective and subjective indicators can be based on whether data collection methods or sources are considered reliable. It can also be seen, perhaps more usefully, in terms of the nature or content of the information collected by the indicator. Subjective indicators will therefore capture the opinions, perceptions or even judgements of individuals, such as the proportion of the population that feels “unsafe” walking alone at night, or their perception of the extent of corruption in public life. Objective indicators will relate rather to a narrative and factual description and aggregation of objects or events that can be more directly observed and verified, such as the ratification of an international human rights treaty, the number of corpses discovered in a mass grave and the literacy rates. Like qualitative and quantitative indicators, objective and subjective indicators are potentially useful in assessing the realization of human rights. It is worth noting that in the OHCHR working definition, quantitative indicators can be subjective and qualitative indicators can be objective.<sup>7</sup>

## III. Conceptual considerations on indicators for human rights, including the right to development

In identifying potentially relevant indicators, methodological and conceptual considerations are of equal importance. The need for conceptual considerations is fuelled by the complex and evolving nature of the human rights normative framework and practical concerns that require the use of a structured approach to guide the identification of indicators. The following paragraphs outline some of the main features of the conceptual framework used by OHCHR in its work on indicators for human rights, highlight commonalities with the right to development, and suggest areas where there may be a specific need to develop indicators in the light of the national and international dimensions of the right to development.

In developing its conceptual and methodological approach on indicators, OHCHR has been guided by the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity, constructive dialogue and cooperation aimed at strengthening the capacity of Member States to comply with their human rights obli-

gations for the benefit of all human beings.<sup>8</sup> The conceptual and methodological frameworks described in the following sections seek to facilitate the identification of universal as well as contextually relevant indicators anchored in international human rights instruments. The proposed frameworks neither attempt to propose a common list of indicators to be applied across all countries irrespective of their social, political and economic development, nor to make a case for building a global measurement for cross-country comparisons of the realization of human rights. The outlined tools aim to support the development and use of indicators for human rights through participatory processes at the country level.

### A. Indivisibility of human rights

One of the main features of the OHCHR conceptual framework is the adoption of a common approach on indicators for all civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights. By doing so, the approach strengthens the indivisibility, interdependence and interrelatedness of human rights and is consistent with the right to development as defined in the Declaration: “The right to development is an inalienable human right by virtue of which every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to, and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized” (art. 1 (1)). The Declaration also proclaims that “[a]ll human rights and fundamental freedoms are indivisible and interdependent; equal attention and urgent consideration should be given to the implementation, promotion and protection of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights” (art. 6 (2)).

In practice, a common framework for human rights indicators means that there may be a need to transcend traditional human rights assessment approaches that tend to look only at the negative obligations (e.g., the obligations to respect and protect) of civil and political rights and only at the positive obligations (e.g., the obligations to fulfil, promote and provide) for economic, social and cultural rights. It also means that different data-generating mechanisms, such as events-based data and socioeconomic statistics (see section IV below), should receive equal attention when identifying indicators on these human rights. For instance, while events-based data have traditionally been used in monitoring civil and

<sup>7</sup> For further practical guidance, see *Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation*.

<sup>8</sup> See General Assembly resolution 60/251 establishing the Human Rights Council.

political rights, events-based data on the number of victims of forced labour or food contamination are equally relevant to the monitoring of rights in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in this case the right to work, the right to fair conditions of work and the right to adequate food. On the other hand, socioeconomic statistics on the conditions of detention, such as the proportion of detained or imprisoned persons in accommodation meeting legally stipulated requirements (e.g., access to drinking water, minimum floor space, availability of heating) are relevant for assessing the realization of the right not to be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Likewise, statistics on the proportion of women enrolled in university-level education or occupying elected or managerial positions in the public and private sectors are useful in assessing the realization of the right to participate in public affairs and the right to education.

## B. Anchoring indicators in the normative framework of rights

### 1. Attributes of human rights

The link between potentially relevant indicators and the human rights normative framework needs to be established. The identification of attributes of the right(s) under consideration constitutes an important starting point towards this end and should precede the selection of indicators. Attributes of a right are a translation of the normative content of that right into a limited number of characteristics that are expected to capture the essence of the right. The identification of attributes should be based on an exhaustive reading of the human rights normative framework, including the international human rights treaties and related jurisprudence of human rights mechanisms. To the extent feasible, the attributes should not overlap in their scope. To give an illustration, in the work of OHCHR on indicators the identified attributes of the right to food were nutrition, food safety and consumer protection, food availability and food accessibility. Other examples of identified attributes of the right to education and the right not to be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment are provided in tables 1 and 2 respectively in the annex.

A similar approach was used in elaborating criteria and sub-criteria for the operationalization of the right to development. Three overall attributes, namely comprehensive and human-centred develop-

ment policy, participatory human rights processes and social justice in development, were identified and seen as the possible basic expectations of the right to development (see A/HRC/15/WG.2/TF/2/Add.2).<sup>9</sup>

### 2. Commitments, efforts and results

Following the identification of attributes, the OHCHR conceptual framework recommends the use of a configuration of indicators giving, inter alia, equal attention to the process as well as the outcome dimensions of policies. This is another example of consistency with the Declaration on the Right to Development, which proclaims that “States have the right and the duty to formulate appropriate national development policies that aim at the constant improvement of the well-being of the entire population and of all individuals, on the basis of their active, free and meaningful participation in development and in the fair distribution of the benefits resulting therefrom” (art. 2 (3)). The OHCHR conceptual framework adopts a configuration of structural, process and outcome indicators to bring to the fore an assessment of steps taken by States, from their acceptance of international human rights standards (structural indicators) to the realization of those standards on the ground through the implementation of related policy measures and programmes (process indicators), and on to the resulting outcomes of those efforts from the perspective of rights holders (outcome indicators). In other words, it seeks to capture a linkage between commitments, efforts and results, as follows:

- *Structural indicators* help in capturing States’ acceptance of human rights in terms of the adopted legal, institutional and policy frameworks
- *Process indicators* help in assessing the implementation of those commitments by measuring how the policies and other measures actually work on the ground. This category of indicator may also help in assessing the extent to which populations can actively participate in related decision-making processes
- *Outcome indicators* help in assessing the results of States’ efforts in furthering the enjoyment of human rights and the actual distribution of the resulting benefits for the human person

<sup>9</sup> See also chapter 28.

If we consider, for instance, the right to education, the adoption of a plan of action to implement free and compulsory primary education will be categorized as a structural indicator; primary enrolment ratios in primary education as process indicators; and youth (15-24 years) literacy rates as outcome indicators. Using this configuration of indicators, illustrative indicators for a number of rights were identified by OHCHR in consultation with a panel of experts and subjected to validation with national and international human rights stakeholders.<sup>10</sup>

### 3. Cross-cutting human rights norms or principles

Cross-cutting human rights norms or principles, such as non-discrimination and equality, participation, access to remedy and accountability, are relevant to the process of realizing all human rights. Given the transversal nature of these norms or principles, there is no unique way or indicator that can capture all aspects of their implementation, but a configuration of structural, process and outcome indicators can help in assessing how they are being realized in the implementation of a specific right. For instance, measuring non-discrimination and equality calls for a structural indicator such as the list of legally prohibited grounds of discrimination relevant to the realization of the right to education, and for process and outcome indicators disaggregated by the same categories, such as enrolment ratios in education and literacy rates disaggregated by sex. Process and outcome indicators on social transfers and income distribution will also be relevant to the assessment of the implementation of the right to development. Additional indicators will help in assessing how the process of implementing a right can be participatory, accountable, and provide access to remedy.

In the tables of illustrative indicators developed by OHCHR, efforts have been made to identify indicators that help to capture the realization of cross-cutting norms or principles. It is worth noting that the tables of indicators on the right to participate in public affairs and the right to a fair trial are also useful in assessing the implementation of the principles of participation and access to remedy. Moreover, cross-cutting prin-

ciples, such as participation, should ideally guide the processes of identifying contextually relevant and country-owned indicators. In the work of OHCHR on indicators for human rights at country level, efforts have been made to support participatory initiatives and processes involving relevant human rights stakeholders, such as Government agencies, national human rights institutions, statistical offices and relevant civil society organizations.

## IV. Methodological considerations and main data-generating mechanisms

The articulation of a methodological framework for the use of indicators in human rights monitoring requires that the different types of methods and sources for data generation considered be assessed for their specific relevance. In the context of the OHCHR work on indicators, following an extensive survey of initiatives,<sup>11</sup> four main data-generating mechanisms were identified and assessed for their practical relevance to human rights assessment:

- Socioeconomic and administrative statistics
- Events-based data
- Perception and opinion surveys
- Expert judgements

The first category, socioeconomic statistics, refers to information commonly compiled and disseminated by Government agencies through their administrative records, statistical surveys and censuses. From the perspective of States that have adopted international human rights instruments, statistics collected by line ministries and Government agencies can be seen as their primary and own source of information when reporting and assessing their effectiveness in translating their human rights commitments into policies and programmes and the impact of those policies and programmes on the targeted populations or beneficiaries. Socioeconomic statistics can potentially cover aspects of the realization of all civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights. The Millennium Development Goal indicators typically belong to this first category of data-generating mechanism.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Lists of illustrative indicators were developed by OHCHR on the right to life; the right to liberty and security of person; the right to participate in public affairs; the right not to be subjected to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; the right to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health; the right to adequate food; the right to adequate housing; the right to education; the right to freedom of opinion and expression; the right to a fair trial; the right to social security; the right to work; the right to non-discrimination and equality; and violence against women.

<sup>11</sup> R. Malhotra and N. Fasel, "Quantitative human rights indicators: A survey of major initiatives", paper presented at the Turku Expert Meeting on Human Rights Research. Available at <http://web.abo.fi/institut/imr/research/seminars/indicators/>.

<sup>12</sup> For more detailed assessments and examples of each data-generating mechanism, see the paper mentioned in the previous footnote.

Events-based data on human rights violations refer to qualitative or quantitative data that can be linked to alleged or confirmed human rights violations. The data are usually collected and processed by national or international human rights monitoring mechanisms or non-governmental organizations and based on testimonies of victims or witnesses or on information provided by the media. Quantitative indicators derived from events-based data typically record violations in terms of the number of victims (e.g., the number of reported victims of forced labour). Events-based data and socioeconomic statistics are the two main data-generating mechanisms that are usually used by international and national human rights monitoring entities.

Perception and opinion surveys collect representative samples of the personal views of individuals. The nature of the information collected is predominantly subjective and not directly observable. Coding methods are applied to transform the information into quantitative form.<sup>13</sup> For instance, indicators are compiled on the proportion of individuals declaring that they are generally satisfied with or endorse Government actions or policies, or the proportion of targeted populations reporting satisfactory involvement in the decision-making process affecting their enjoyment of certain human rights.

Expert judgements consist of data generated through combined assessments and scoring of a human rights situation by a limited number of experts, or “key informants”. As with perception and opinion surveys, the information collected is subjective and needs also to be translated into a quantitative form using coding procedures. Unlike for surveys, respondents are not usually chosen on the basis of statistical sampling and therefore the selection of experts can sometimes be controversial. As the objective is often to summarize large amounts of information into a few indicators and indices, data based on expert judgements are frequently used for ranking across countries.

In keeping with the methods of work of international human rights monitoring mechanisms and given issues of reliability, the methodological framework for the indicators developed by OHCHR seeks first the availability of socioeconomic statistics and events-based data. Also, in identifying potentially relevant indicators, this methodological framework suggests

that the following “RIGHTS” criteria<sup>14</sup> could be considered:

**R**elevant, robust and reliable<sup>15</sup>

**I**ndependent in their data collection methods<sup>16</sup> from the “monitored” subject

**G**lobally (universally) meaningful but amenable to contextualization and disaggregation by prohibited grounds of discrimination

**H**uman rights standards-centric and anchored in the normative framework of rights

**T**ransparent in their methods, timely and time bound

**S**imple and specific

To conclude this brief outline of the OHCHR conceptual and methodological framework, the primary purpose of which is to support the development and use of indicators for implementing and measuring human rights, it is important to underline that the operationalization of the framework calls for the setting up of appropriate institutional and participatory processes at country level. In other words, there is a need for an operational framework to complement this conceptual and methodological framework to facilitate the formulation, collection and use of contextually relevant indicators and enhance their ownership by national stakeholders, including the civil society, Government agencies, statistics offices and human rights institutions. A growing number of countries and institutions in different regions of the world and with different socioeconomic and development contexts have been operationalizing the OHCHR framework on indicators for human rights. This operationalization has taken place in the context of national human rights action plans, integrating human rights into development plans or programmes for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, reporting and following up on recommendations of human rights mechanisms or, more generally, improving country-level systems for promoting and monitoring the implementation of human rights.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup> The proposal of a template of “RIGHTS” criteria is correlated to other templates commonly used in policy and programming management contexts, such as the SMART criteria (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound).

<sup>15</sup> The reliability of an indicator refers to consistency in the estimate or the value of an indicator if the data-generating mechanism employed for devising an indicator is repeated. For instance, if a question in a survey is posed to the same person a second time and the same response is received, then the indicator can be considered reliable.

<sup>16</sup> The collection, storage and dissemination of indicators should follow strict ethical and professional considerations and should conform, as applicable, to international statistical standards, including the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics adopted by the Statistical Commission of the United Nations, available at <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/dnss/gp/fundprinciples.aspx>.

<sup>17</sup> For further information on the operationalization of the OHCHR framework at country level, see *Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation*.

<sup>13</sup> Coding is a procedure for converting verbal information into numbers, using a numerical scale to measure the responses to satisfaction survey questions, for instance (1) bad; (2) average; and (3) good.

## V. Towards indicators to capture the international and national dimensions of the right to development in an integrated manner

A prominent feature of the right to development is the equal attention given to the national and international dimensions of the realization of this composite right. In the preamble to the Declaration, States recognize that the human person is the central subject of the development process and that development policy should make the human being the main participant in and beneficiary of development. It also states that the creation of conditions favourable to the development of peoples and individuals is the primary responsibility of their States and that efforts at the international level to promote and protect human rights should be accompanied by efforts to establish a new international economic order. Such considerations, in a world of interdependent economies, global crises as well as universal human rights aspirations, as revealed once again by the Arab Spring, may be one of the major values added of the Declaration in terms of the existing international human rights normative framework. In this respect, the recent financial and debt crisis has also demonstrated how national or even local decisions and behaviours, such as in the context of the sub-prime mortgage crisis, have worldwide repercussions and force us to look beyond national boundaries and to approach national and international human rights efforts in a new and integrated manner.

The conceptual and methodological framework and lists of illustrative indicators developed by OHCHR, derived from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the international human rights treaties, constitute tools consistent with and relevant for the implementation and assessment of the right to development. Article 6 (3) of the Declaration indeed proclaims that the realization of all human rights is integral to development: “States should take steps to eliminate obstacles to development resulting from failure to observe civil and political rights, as well as economic, social and cultural rights.” The proposed identification of attributes, configurations of structural, process and outcome indicators and use of multiple

sources of information in the OHCHR framework help in assessing important aspects of the right to development. Structural indicators relating to the adoption of specific national development policies and programmes, corresponding process indicators measuring their implementation on the ground from the perspective of the duty bearers, and outcome indicators measuring the distribution of the resulting benefits from a rights holder’s perspective are particularly relevant to the right to development, which pays equal attention to the outcome as well as to the process of development.

There is, however, a critical lack of indicators for assessing important aspects of the implementation of the right to development. Further indicators are needed, for instance to enhance analysis of the realization of active, free and meaningful participation by the entire population and all individuals in the development process (arts. 2-8 of the Declaration), sovereignty over natural wealth and resources (art. 1) and efforts towards disarmament (art. 7). There is also a serious need to develop indicators to better capture the obligations of States to create not only national, but also international conditions favourable to the realization of the right (arts. 3-4). Indicators on global challenges and international obstacles impacting on the realization of human rights at country level, whether in developing or developed countries, are clearly lacking. Improving the development and use of such indicators is, however, a long-term process and calls for the involvement of and dialogue between a wide range of development, human rights as well as statistics actors. The concrete tools and indicators outlined in this publication, which can be reviewed and assessed with the help of the conceptual and methodological framework on indicators for human rights presented in this chapter, constitute a significant step forward in identifying steps to enhance the implementation of the right to development. They also help in bridging analytical and normative gaps in the development and human rights discourses. Finally, indicators are and will always remain tools for assessing complex realities and cannot be used as a substitute for more qualitative and comprehensive assessments, in particular evaluations by independent judicial or quasi-judicial human rights mechanisms.

Table 1: List of illustrative indicators on the right to education<sup>o</sup> (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, art. 26)

	Universal primary education	Accessibility of secondary and higher education	Curricula and educational resources	Educational opportunity and freedom
<b>Structural</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>International human rights treaties relevant to the right to education ratified by the State</li> <li>Date of entry into force and coverage of the right to education in the constitution or other form of superior law</li> <li>Date of entry into force and coverage of domestic laws for implementing the right to education, including prohibition of corporal punishment, discrimination in access to education, making educational institutions barrier free and inclusive (e.g., to children with disabilities, children in detention, migrant children, indigenous children)</li> <li>Date of entry into force and coverage of domestic law on the freedom of individuals and groups (including minorities) to establish and direct educational institutions</li> <li>Number of registered and/or active non-governmental organizations (per 100,000 persons) involved in the promotion and protection of the right to education</li> <li>Time frame and coverage of the plan of action adopted by the State party to implement the principle of compulsory primary education free of charge for all</li> <li>Stipulated duration of compulsory education and minimum age for admission into school</li> <li>Proportion of received complaints on the right to education investigated and adjudicated by the national human rights institution, human rights ombudsperson or other mechanisms and the proportion of these responded to effectively by the Government</li> <li>Public expenditure on primary, secondary and higher education as a proportion of gross national income; net official development assistance for education received or provided as a proportion of public expenditure on education*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time frame and coverage of national policy on education for all, including provision for temporary and special measures for target groups (e.g., working and street children)</li> <li>Time frame and coverage of national policy on vocational and technical education</li> <li>Date of entry into force and coverage of regulatory framework including standardized curricula for education at all levels</li> <li>Proportion of education institutions at all levels teaching human rights/number of hours in curricula on human rights education</li> <li>Proportion of education institutions with mechanisms for students to participate in matters affecting them (student council)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of schools or institutions conforming to stipulated national requirements on academic and physical education facilities</li> <li>Periodicity of curricula revision at all levels</li> <li>Number of education institutions by level recognized or de-recognized during the reporting period by relevant regulatory body</li> <li>Average salary of schoolteachers as percentage of regulated minimum wage</li> <li>Proportion of teachers at all levels completing mandatory in-service training during reporting period</li> <li>Ratio of students to teaching staff, in primary, secondary, public and private education</li> <li>(Improvement in) density of primary, secondary and higher education facilities in the reporting period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of education institutions engaged in "active learning" activities</li> <li>Proportion of adult population covered under basic education programmes</li> <li>Proportion of students, by level, enrolled under distance and continuing education programmes</li> <li>Number of institutions of ethnic, linguistic minority and religious population groups recognized or extended public support</li> <li>Proportion of labour force using retraining or skill-enhancement programmes at public or supported institutions</li> <li>Proportion of higher learning institutions enjoying managerial and academic autonomy</li> <li>Personal computers in use per 100 population*</li> <li>Proportion of women and targeted population with professional or university qualification</li> </ul>
<b>Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net primary enrolment ratio* by target groups, including children with disabilities</li> <li>Drop-out rate for primary education by grade for target groups</li> <li>Proportion of children enrolled in public primary education institutions</li> <li>Proportion of students (by target group) covered under publicly supported additional financial programmes or incentives for primary education</li> <li>Proportion of public schools with user charges for services other than tuition fees</li> <li>Proportion of primary education teachers fully qualified and trained</li> <li>Proportion of children getting education in their mother tongue</li> <li>Proportion of students in grade 1 who attended pre-school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transition rate to secondary education by target group</li> <li>Gross enrolment ratio for secondary and higher education by target group</li> <li>Drop-out rate for secondary education by grade for target groups</li> <li>Proportion of students enrolled in public secondary and higher education institutions</li> <li>Share of annual household expenditure spent on education per child enrolled in public secondary or high school</li> <li>Proportion of students (by target group) receiving public support or grant for secondary education</li> <li>Proportion of secondary or higher education teachers fully qualified and trained</li> <li>Proportion of students enrolled in vocational education programmes at secondary and post secondary level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ratio of girls to boys in secondary or higher education* by grade</li> <li>Proportion of children completing secondary education (secondary completion rate)</li> <li>Number of graduates (first level university degree) per 1,000 population</li> </ul>	
<b>Outcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ratios of girls to boys in primary education* by grade for target groups</li> <li>Proportion of students starting grade 1 who reach grade 5 (primary completion rate)*</li> <li>Proportion of out-of-school children in primary education age group</li> <li>Youth (15-24 years)* and adult (15+) literacy rates (i.e., reading, writing, calculating, problem-solving and other life skills)</li> </ul>			

<sup>o</sup> All indicators should be disaggregated by prohibited grounds of discrimination, as applicable and reflected in metadata sheets.

\* Indicators related to the Millennium Development Goals.

Table 2: List of illustrative indicators on the right not to be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment\* (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, art. 5)

	Physical and mental integrity of detained or imprisoned persons	Conditions of detention	Use of force by law enforcement officials outside detention	Community and domestic violence
<b>Structural</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>International human rights treaties relevant to the right not to be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment ratified by the State</li> <li>Date of entry into force and coverage of the right not to be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment in the Constitution or other forms of superior law</li> <li>Date of entry into force and coverage of domestic laws for implementing the right not to be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment including code of conduct on medical trials and scientific experimentation on human beings</li> <li>Type of accreditation of national human rights institution by the rules of procedure of the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions</li> <li>Date of entry into force of code of conduct for law enforcement officials, including on rules of conduct for interrogation of arrested, detained and imprisoned persons</li> <li>Date of entry into force and coverage of formal procedure governing inspection of police cells, detention centres</li> <li>Legal maximum for incommunicado detention</li> <li>Time frame and coverage of health policy for detention centres and prisons</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of received complaints on the right not to be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment investigated and adjudicated by the national human rights institution, human rights ombudsperson or other mechanisms and the proportion of these responded to effectively by Government</li> <li>Proportion of communications sent by the Special Rapporteurs on the question of torture and on violence against women responded to effectively by Government in the reporting period</li> <li>Proportion of law enforcement officials (including police, military, specialized investigation agencies and custodial staff) trained in rules of conduct concerning proportional use of force, arrest, detention, interrogation or punishment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Date of entry into force and coverage of specific legislation on community and domestic violence</li> <li>Number of rehabilitation centres for victims of domestic violence including women, partners and children</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of public social expenditure on campaigns to sensitize people on violence against women and children (e.g., violence by intimate partners, genital mutilation, rape)</li> <li>Proportion of health care and community welfare professionals trained in handling domestic violence issues</li> <li>Proportion of teaching staff trained not to use physical violence against children</li> <li>Proportion of teaching staff subjected to disciplinary action/ prosecuted for physical and non-physical abuse of children</li> <li>Proportion of women reporting forms of violence (physical, sexual or psychological) against herself or her children initiating legal action or seeking help from police or counselling centres</li> <li>Number of persons arrested, tried, convicted or serving a sentence for violent crime (including homicide, rape, assault) per 100,000 population in the reporting period</li> </ul>
<b>Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of detained or imprisoned persons in facilities inspected by an independent body in the reporting period</li> <li>Proportion of custodial staff formally investigated for physical and non-physical abuse of or crimes against detained or imprisoned persons (including torture and disproportionate use of force) in the reporting period</li> <li>Proportion of formal investigations of custodial staff resulting in disciplinary action or prosecution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actual prison occupancy as a proportion of prison capacity in accordance with relevant United Nations conventions on prison conditions</li> <li>Proportion of detained and imprisoned persons in accommodation meeting legally stipulated requirements (e.g., drinking water, cubic content of air, minimum floor space, heating)</li> <li>Number of custodial and other relevant staff per inmate</li> <li>Proportion of detention centres and prisons with facilities to segregate persons in custody (by sex, age, accused, sentenced, criminal cases, mental health, immigration-related or other cases)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of law enforcement officials formally investigated for physical and non-physical abuse or crime (including torture and disproportionate use of force) in the reporting period</li> <li>Proportion of formal investigations of law enforcement officials resulting in disciplinary action or prosecution</li> <li>Proportion of arrests and other acts of apprehending persons where a firearm was discharged by law enforcement officials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of children or pupils per 1,000 enrolled and patients who experienced corporal punishment in teaching and medical institutions</li> <li>Incidence and prevalence of deaths and crimes related to community and domestic violence (including homicide, rape, assault) in the reporting period</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incidence and prevalence of death, physical injury and communicable and non-communicable diseases (e.g., HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis, mental impairment) in custody</li> <li>Proportion of detained or imprisoned persons held incommunicado or in prolonged solitary confinement</li> <li>Reported cases of inhuman methods of execution and treatment of persons sentenced to death/incarcerated in the reporting period</li> <li>Proportion of detained or imprisoned persons with body mass index &lt; 18.5</li> <li>Reported cases of torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment perpetrated by an agent of the State or any other person acting under Government authority or with its complicity, tolerance or acquiescence, but without any or due judicial process (e.g., as reported to the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture/violence against women) in the reporting period</li> <li>Proportion of victims of torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment who received compensation and rehabilitation in the reporting period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incidence and prevalence of death and physical injury resulting from arrests or other acts of apprehending persons by law enforcement officials in the reporting period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incidence and prevalence of deaths and crimes related to community and domestic violence (including homicide, rape, assault) in the reporting period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of children or pupils per 1,000 enrolled and patients who experienced corporal punishment in teaching and medical institutions</li> <li>Incidence and prevalence of deaths and crimes related to community and domestic violence (including homicide, rape, assault) in the reporting period</li> </ul>

\*All indicators should be disaggregated by prohibited grounds of discrimination, as applicable and reflected in meta-data sheets