

**Data sources for outcome indicators  
on Article 16:**

**Prevention of and  
protection against all  
forms of exploitation,  
violence and abuse and  
provision of redress**



**UNITED NATIONS  
HUMAN RIGHTS**  
OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER

ADVANCE VERSION

© 2020 United Nations

The *Data Sources Guidance* is a component of the [SDG-CRPD Resource Package](#) developed by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). This is an advance version of the SDG-CRPD Resource Package. A final version will be issued upon completion of OHCHR review processes.

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this guidance 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, or 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. Mention of such a figure indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

The *Data Sources Guidance* was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of OHCHR and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.



## 16.25 Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months (SDG indicator 16.1.3) by sex, age and disability.

**Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries**

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

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

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) collects data on the prevalence of physical and sexual assault through its annual data collection for the United Nations Surveys on Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (UN-CTS). The data collection through the UN-CTS is facilitated by a network of over 130 national Focal Points appointed by responsible authorities.

Survey data for the 2018 UN-CTS are currently being collected by UNODC. The UN-CTS does not ask the country focal points to report on disability, so most crime victimizations studies do not do so. However, two examples of surveys that do are the United States of America's National Crime Victimization Survey, available at <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5986>, and the Crime Survey for England and Wales, whose disability and crime dataset is available at <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/disability/datasets/disabilityandcrime>. [Table 1 provides an example taken from the above-mentioned National Crime Victimization Survey.](#)

**Table 1:** United States of America: Rate of violent victimization against persons with and without disabilities by type of crime, 2011-2015

Type of crime	Persons with disabilities (%)	Persons without disabilities (%)
Total	32.3	12.7
Serious violent crime	12.7	4.0
Rape/sexual assault	2.1	0.6
Robbery	4.7	1.3
Aggravated assault	5.9	2.1
Simple assault	19.6	8.7

Source: Erika Harrell, *Crime Against Persons With Disabilities, 2009-2015 - Statistical Tables* (2017).

## 16.26 Proportion of young women and men aged 18-29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18 (SDG indicator 16.2.3) by sex, age and disability.

*Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries*

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

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

The DHS includes a standard module that captures information on a few specific forms of sexual violence. Respondents are asked whether, at any time in their lives (as children or adults), anyone ever forced them – physically or in any other way – to have sexual intercourse or to perform any other sexual acts against their will. Those responding ‘yes’ to this question are then asked how old they were the first time this happened. It is important to flag that the DHS module was not specifically designed to capture experiences of sexual violence in childhood and while it produces data that can be used to report on 16.2.3, further methodological work is needed to develop standard questions specifically designed to measure child sexual abuse.

Several countries, including Senegal, Mali, Pakistan and Nigeria, include the disability module in their DHS (Washington Group questions). While they do not disaggregate the sexual violence data by disability status, it would be feasible with the data already collected. For an example of data that could be disaggregated see table 2, from Nigeria, or consult the report at <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR359/FR359.pdf>.

**Table 2:** Percentage of women age 15-49 who experienced sexual violence by specific exact ages, according to current age and current marital status, Nigeria DHS 2018

Background Characteristic	Percentage who first experienced sexual violence by exact age					Percentage who have not experience sexual violence	Total number of women
	10	12	15	18	22		
Age							
15-19	0.4	0.4	3.2			92.4	1,885
20-24	0.4	0.5	1.9	5.9		89.7	1,655
25-29	0.3	0.6	1.3	3.5	5.9	90.8	1,902
30-39	0.3	0.5	1.2	4.1	5.9	89.4	3,296
40-49	0.2	0.4	1.0	2.6	3.5	92.8	1,940

Source: National Population Commission (NPC) [Nigeria] and ICF, *Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2018* (Abuja, Nigeria, NPC; Rockville, Maryland, ICF, 2019)

## **16.27 Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence, abuse or exploitation by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, disaggregated by form of violence, abuse and exploitation, by age (based on SDG indicator 5.2.1.) and disability.**

*Level 2: Indicator that could be produced with straightforward additions or modifications to existing data collection efforts*

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

The SDG 5.2.1 Indicator Database comprises namely data from population-based household surveys implementing an internationally standardised methodology. A significant proportion of data are gathered through the inclusion of a Domestic Violence Module in the DHS. In addition, some data come from dedicated surveys on violence against women in countries that have implemented, for example, WHO's violence against women survey methodology. Where available, other dedicated surveys are included if the data are deemed comparable. All sources date from 2005 onwards.

Data are collated by the Inter-Agency Working Group on Violence against Women Data from data published by National Statistics Offices or other relevant national entities. For efficiency, some data are collated using existing data compiling online platforms (e.g., DHS StatCompiler). For a few countries, data are recalculated for harmonization regarding age group (15 to 49) and type of intimate partner violence (any form of physical and/or sexual partner violence).

Currently, the Inter-Agency Working Group on Violence Against Women, since renamed the Interagency Commission on Gender Equality, Violence against Women and Domestic Violence, does not collect data on disability but could add the Washington Group questions to their data instruments.

Another potential source of data is the DHS, which contains an optional disability module with the Washington Group questions. Table 3 presents an extract of the DHS in Pakistan, whose full report is available at <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR354/FR354.pdf>. While Pakistan does not report data disaggregated by disability, since the DHS includes the Washington Group questions doing so would be straightforward.

**Table 3:** Percentage of ever-married women who have experienced emotional, physical, or sexual violence by any husband in the past 12 months, according to background characteristics, Pakistan DHS 2017-18

Background characteristic	Emotional violence	Physical violence	Sexual violence	Physical and sexual	Physical and sexual and emotional	Physical or sexual	Physical or sexual or emotional	Number of ever-married women
Age								
15-19	18.4%	15.4%	6.6%	4.7%	4.7%	17.3%	22.8%	142
20-24	17.6%	10.2%	3%	1.8%	1.3%	11.4%	21.4%	563
25-29	20.4%	13.8%	3.5%	3%	3%	14.2%	24.2%	682
30-39	24%	16.7%	4.6%	3.4%	3.3%	17.8%	28.8%	1,180
40-49	18.1%	10.9%	1.8%	1.4%	1.4%	11.3%	22%	735
Total	20.6%	13.6%	3.6%	2.7%	2.5%	14.5%	24.8%	3,303

Source: National Institute of Population Studies (NIPS) [Pakistan] and ICF, *Pakistan Demographic and Health Survey 2017-18* (Islamabad, Pakistan, NIPS; Rockville, Maryland, USA, ICF, 2019)

## 16.28 Proportion of women and girls subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by age, place of occurrence (based on SDG indicator 5.2.2) and disability.

*Level 2: Indicator that could be produced with straightforward additions or modifications to existing data collection efforts*

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

The main sources of intimate partner violence prevalence data are (1) specialized national surveys dedicated to measuring violence against women and (2) international household surveys that include a module on experiences of violence by women, such as the DHS.

Although administrative data from health, police, courts, justice and social services, among other services used by survivors of violence, can provide information on violence against women and girls, these do not produce prevalence data, but rather incidence data or number of cases received in/reported to these services. We know that many abused women do not report violence and those who do, tend to be only the most serious cases. Therefore, administrative data should not be used as a data source for this indicator.

For more information on recommended practices in production of violence against women statistics see: UN Guidelines for Producing Statistics on Violence against Women- Statistical Surveys (UN, 2014).

An Inter-Agency Group on Violence against Women Data and its Technical Advisory Group is currently being established (jointly by WHO, UN Women, UNICEF, UNSD and UNFPA) to establish a mechanism for compiling harmonized country level data on this indicator.

Currently, the Inter-Agency Working Group on Violence Against Women, since renamed the Interagency Commission on Gender Equality, Violence against Women and Domestic Violence, does not collect data on disability but could add the Washington Group questions to their data instruments.

Countries using the DHS with the Washington Group questions, like Nigeria, have data that can be disaggregated by disability. The 2018 Nigerian DHS report shows that 9.1 per cent of women experienced sexual violence. The number of observations at the bottom of table 4 represents the 9.1 per cent of the women in the sample who answered the sexual violence questions.

**Table 4:** Persons committing sexual violence among women age 15-49 who have experienced sexual violence, percentage who report specific persons who committed the violence, according to respondent's current marital status, Nigeria DHS 2018

	Marital Status		Total
	Ever married	Never married	
Current husband/partner	64.8%		53.0%
Former husband/partner	18.4%		15.0%
Current/former boyfriend	6.6%	26.7%	10.3%
Father/stepfather	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%
Brother/stepbrother	0.9%	0.2%	0.8%
Other relative	2.8%	12.0%	4.2%
In-law	0.6%		0.8%
Own friend/acquaintance	4.7%	24.2%	8.2%
Family friend	0.8%	2.9%	1.1%
Teacher	0.5%	3.6%	1.2%
Employer/someone at work	0.2%	1.8%	0.5%
Police/soldier	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Priest/religious leader	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%
Stranger	6.5%	27.6%	10.3%
Other	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Number of women who have experienced sexual violence	799	177	976

Source: National Population Commission (NPC) [Nigeria] and ICF, *Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2018* (Abuja, Nigeria, NPC; Rockville, Maryland, ICF, 2019)

## **16.29 Number of reported cases of exploitation, violence, abuse and exploitation within public and private institutions, by sex, age and disability.**

*Level 3: Indicator for which acquiring data is more complex or requires the development of data collection mechanisms which are currently not in place*

Administrative records will only exist if there a reporting system within an institution and, even if that is the case, there is a risk of undercounting cases of abuse due to the conflict of interest in self-monitoring such violations.

An independent authority, such as a national human rights institution or a non-governmental human rights organization, could undertake a survey. However, the survey would have to be designed to both solicit information from individuals who may have cognitive and/or psychosocial disabilities and the ensure protection of all respondents from any repercussions from reporting abuse. Also, conceptually, the notion of abuse must be clarified.

## **16.30 Proportion of children aged 1-17 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month (SDG indicator 16.2.1) by sex and disability.**

*Level 2: Indicator that could be produced with straightforward additions or modifications to existing data collection efforts*

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

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

MICS, the source of the majority of comparable data, includes a module on disciplinary methods. The module, developed for use in MICS, is adapted from the parent-child version of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTSPC), a standardized and validated epidemiological measurement tool that is widely accepted and has been implemented in a large number of countries, including high-income countries. The MICS module includes a standard set of questions covering non-violent forms of discipline, psychological aggression and physical means of punishing children. Data are collected for children ranging from age 1 to age 14. Some DHS have included the standard, or an adapted version of, the MICS module on child discipline.

An example from the [MICS from Sierra Leone](#) is presented in table 5.

**Table 5: Percentage of Children age 1-14 years by Child Disciplining Methods Experience during the last one month, Sierra Leone, 2017**

	Only non-violent discipline	Psychological Aggression	Physical punishment		Any violent discipline method	Number of children age 1-14 years
			Any	Severe		
Total	5.0	80	73.1	25.5	86.5	30,076
Sex						
Male	4.5	80.4	74.1	26.4	87.0	15,068
Female	5.5	79.7	72.1	24.6	86.0	15,008
Age						
1-2	7.6	59.3	53	9.5	66.9	4,654
3-4	6.1	77.9	73.6	20.4	85.2	4,702
5-9	4.3	83.9	79.8	27.3	90.6	11,797
10 to 14	4.1	86.8	74.5	34	92	8,923
Child's functional difficulty (age 18-49 years)						
Has functional difficulty	2.2	86.2	81.3	30	91.8	5,471
Has no functional difficulty	5.3	81.6	74.2	26.3	88.2	22,339

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, *Sierra Leone Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2017, Survey Findings Report* (Freetown, Sierra Leone, Statistics Sierra Leone, 2018), p. 246

## **16.31 Proportion of persons victim of physical or sexual harassment by sex, age, disability status and place of occurrence, in the previous 12 months (SDG indicator 11.7.2)**

*Level 2: Indicator that could be produced with straightforward additions or modifications to existing data collection efforts*

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

The measurement of physical and sexual harassment is a relatively recent phenomenon. In a recent review of 50 victimization surveys conducted worldwide over several decades, only 6 included questions concerning either physical or sexual harassment (and only one screened for both types of behaviour); all were conducted between 2013 and 2016. The six surveys (conducted by Canada, France, Israel, Italy, Mexico and Sweden) that measured

physical and/or sexual harassment did so using different methodologies and question formulations, so the results are not directly comparable.

Another important source of data on sexual harassment is a survey on violence against women conducted by the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency in all 28 EU Member States in 2013 (sample size 42,000 interviewees). The measurement of sexual harassment was based on 11 types of behaviours (items) that have also been used to develop the survey module for SDG indicator 11.7.2.

Finally, various modules on physical and sexual harassment have been tested in a recent survey in Nigeria. Following pilot testing and revisions of the module, the proposed module has been included in a large-scale household survey in June 2019 (sample 33,000 interviews) and found to be useful and feasible (see Annex A and B of the Methodology Development Narrative).

The Indicator is based on eight questions to be included in a household survey. These questions can be part of an add-on module on physical and sexual harassment, to be incorporated into other ongoing general population surveys (such as surveys on quality of life, public attitudes or surveys on other topics) or be part of dedicated surveys on crime victimization.

Data should be collected as part of a nationally representative probability sample of the adult population residing in the country, irrespective of legal residence status. The sampling frame and sample design should ensure that results can be disaggregated at sub-national level. The sample size should be sufficiently large to capture relevant events and compute needed disaggregations.

Because the indicator attempts to measure incidents of harassment that do not necessarily rise to the level of a crime, police records cannot be used. Tables 6 and 7 present data from Canada and Sweden, respectively, two of the countries the metadata mentions. While none included disability, they could do so if they added the Washington Group questions to their instruments.

**Table 6:** Canada Survey of Safety in Public and Private Spaces asks about various forms of harassment but does not include any measure of disability

Type of behaviour	Women (%)	Men (%)
Any type	31.8	13.4
Unwanted sexual attention	24.8	5.5
Unwanted comments about sexual orientation or assumed sexual orientation	3.7	3.9
Unwanted comments about sex or gender	11.7	5.9
Indecent exposure	4.4	3.1
Unwanted physical contact	17.3	6.3

Source: Adam Cotter and Laura Savage, *Gender-based violence and unwanted sexual behaviour in Canada, 2018: Initial findings from the Survey of Safety in Public and Private Spaces* (Statistics Canada, 2019)

Table 7: Sweden: Incidence of sexual harassment by gender and age group (n = 13,825)

Answered yes to the question “Have you ever been sexually harassed?”		
Age	Women (%)	Men (%)
16-29	57	10
30-44	48	13
45-64	43	9
65-84	21	3

Source: Folkhälsomyndigheten, Sexuell och reproduktiv hälsa och rättigheter (SRHR) i Sverige 2017, Resultat från befolkningsundersökningen SRHR2017 (2019)

## 16.32 Proportion of women who were married or in a union before age 15 and 18 (based on SDG indicator 5.3.1) by disability.

*Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries*

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

Household surveys such as UNICEF-supported MICS and DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since around the late 1980s. In some countries, such data are also collected through national censuses or other national household surveys.

UNICEF undertakes a wide consultative process of compiling and assessing data from national sources for the purposes of updating its global databases on the situation of children. Up until 2017, the mechanism UNICEF used to collaborate with national authorities on ensuring data quality and international comparability on key indicators of relevance to children was known as Country Data Reporting on the Indicators for the Goals (CRING).

Table 8 presents a partial reproduction of a table in Suriname’s report on this indicator, available at [https://mics-surveys-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/MICS6/Latin%20America%20and%20Caribbean/Suriname/2018/Survey%20findings/Suriname%202018%20MICS%20Survey%20Findings%20Report\\_English.pdf](https://mics-surveys-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/MICS6/Latin%20America%20and%20Caribbean/Suriname/2018/Survey%20findings/Suriname%202018%20MICS%20Survey%20Findings%20Report_English.pdf).

**Table 8:** Percentage of women age 15-49 years who first married or entered a marital union before their 15th birthday, percentages of women age 20-49 and 20-24 years who first married or entered a marital union before their 15th and 18th birthdays, percentage of women age 15-19 years currently married or in a union, and the percentage of women who are in a polygynous marriage or union, Suriname MICS, 2018

	Women age 20-49			Women age 20-24		
	Married before age 15 (%)	Married before age 18 (%)	Number of women age 20-49	Married before age 15 (%)	Married before age 18 (%)	Number of women age 20-24
Total	6.5	28.5	5647	8.8	36	1012
Functional difficulties (age 18-49)						
With functional difficulties	4.1	27.6	289	0.4	22.1	42
No functional difficulties	6.5	28.5	5358	9.2	36.6	970

Source: Ministry of Social Affairs and Public Housing, *Suriname Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2018, Survey Findings Report* (Paramaribo, Suriname, Ministry of Social Affairs and Public Housing, 2019)

## 16.33 Proportion of girls and women who have undergone female genital mutilation/cutting, by age (based on SDG indicator 5.3.2) and disability.

**Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries**

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

Household surveys such as UNICEF-supported MICS and DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1980s. In some countries, such data are also collected through other national household surveys.

UNICEF undertakes a wide consultative process of compiling and assessing data from national sources for the purposes of updating its global databases on the situation of children. Up until 2017, the mechanism UNICEF used to collaborate with national authorities on ensuring data quality and international comparability on key indicators of relevance to children was known as Country Data Reporting on the Indicators for the Goals (CRING).

There are DHS that ask both the genital mutilation questions and the disability questions. The standard report does not disaggregate by disability, but it would be straightforward to do so. For example, [Nigeria's DHS 2018](#) has genital mutilation data (p. 473) and disability data based on the Washington Group questions (p.457), but no disaggregation.

Based on the MICS, Sierra Leone reported Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) data disaggregated by disability status. The complete report is available at [https://mics-surveys-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/MICS6/West%20and%20Central%20Africa/Sierra%20Leone/2017/Survey%20findings/Sierra%20Leone%202017%20MICS%20Survey%20Findings%20Report\\_English.pdf](https://mics-surveys-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/MICS6/West%20and%20Central%20Africa/Sierra%20Leone/2017/Survey%20findings/Sierra%20Leone%202017%20MICS%20Survey%20Findings%20Report_English.pdf) and an extract can be found in table 9.

**Table 9:** Percentage of women age 15-49 years by FGM/C status and per cent distribution of women who had FGM by type of FGM, Sierra Leone, 2017

	Per cent of women who had any form of FGM	Number of women age 15-49	Percentage distribution of women 15-49 year who had FGM			
			Had flesh removed	Were nicked	Were sew closed	Form of FGM not determined
Total	86.1	17,873	92.1	0.4	5.8	1.8
Age						
15-19	64.3	3,943	90.7	0.5	6.8	2.0
20-24	85.7	3,454	93.0	0.4	5.1	1.5
25-29	90.9	3,083	93.0	0.3	5.2	1.5
30-34	94.5	2,470	92.3	0.5	5.7	1.4
35-39	96.4	2,267	92.0	0.1	5.3	2.5
40-44	97.5	1,491	91.6	0.4	6.6	1.5
45-49	96.3	1,166	90.7	0.4	6.7	2.2
Functional difficulties (age 18-49)						
With functional difficulties	95.5	208	92.7	1.6	1.6	4.1
No functional difficulties	90.4	15,430	92.2	0.3	5.8	1.7

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, *Sierra Leone Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2017, Survey Findings Report* (Freetown, Sierra Leone, Statistics Sierra Leone, 2018).

## **16.34 Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population by sex, age, form of exploitation, (SDG indicator 16.2.2) and disability.**

*Level 3: Indicator for which acquiring data is more complex or requires the development of data collection mechanisms which are currently not in place*

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

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

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

No examples were found reporting on the disability status of trafficking victims, but countries do record other characteristics. For example, in Serbia, according to a report available at <https://www.state.gov/reports/2019-trafficking-in-persons-report/serbia/>:

[the] government identified 76 victims (40 in 2017). Of these, 34 were victims of sex trafficking, 18 of forced labor, two for forced begging, one for forced criminality, and 21 for multiple types of exploitation (21 were victims of sex trafficking, four of forced labor, four of forced begging, one of forced criminality, and 10 of multiple types of exploitation in 2017). Thirty-two victims were children (18 in 2017) and 57 were female and 19 were male (36 females and four males in 2017). First responders referred 193 potential victims (142 in 2017) to the government's Center for Protection of Trafficking Victims (CPTV); law enforcement referred 89 (44 in 2017), social welfare organizations referred 45 (57 in 2017), other government entities referred 21, and 38 were referred by civil society or other means (41 in 2017).

Future studies could inquire about the disability status of victims.