

Goal 16

Target number: 16.1

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

Agency: OHCHR

Has work for the development of this indicator begun? Yes

Who are the entities, including national and international experts, directly involved and consulted in developing the methodology/and or data collection tools?

OHCHR (headquarters and field presences in conflict situation contexts), WHO, UNODC, UNMAS and DESA Population Division, UN Peace Building Support Office and UN Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support. At its 47th session, the UNSC welcomed the support of the Praia Group for the development of indicators under SDG 16 (E/2016/24E/CN.3/2016/34).

Members/experts of the Praia working group on indicator 16.1.2 (information communicated by the National Statistical Office of Cabo Verde): Human Security Report - Andrew Mack; Independent Researcher (New York University/Congo Research) – Francesca Bomboko; Institut National de la Statistique du Niger - Amadou Garba Halimatou; INEGI México – Oscar Jaimes Bello, Adrián Franco Barrios, Garcia Velazquez Maria del Pilar; Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics – Khalid Abu Khalid; Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) - Håvard Mogleiv Nygård; Small Arms Survey – Irène Pavesi; Saferworld – Thomas Wheeler; UNDP – Alexandra Wilde, Sarah Lister; Casualty Recorders Network, Human Rights Data Analysis Group (HRDAG), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Uppsala Conflict Data Program and Centre for the Study of Civil War (UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset; One-sided Violence Dataset and Non-state Actor Dataset), International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), ACLED, Global Peace Index, Aid Worker Security Database. Other organization may be identified in the pilot and data collection phase.

In the development of the methodology, OHCHR has also consulted organizations and experts on a bilateral basis. To ensure consistent measurement of conflict-related deaths (16.1.2) and intentional homicides (16.1.1), OHCHR continues to work with WHO and UNODC. The initial work plan for the indicator was presented during a first meeting of the Praia Working Group (see above members list) in Paris, 4-6 July 2016.

What is the involvement of or how do you plan to involve National Statistical Systems in the development of the methodology?

Participants in National statistical systems have been involved in the development of the methodology in the context of the work of the Praia Group and in other relevant consultations that were organized (see below). Involvement of national statistical systems will continue during the pilot phase and data collection, as multiple data sources will be necessary for the compilation of the indicator. Consultations and communications involved a number of NSOs, including with:
Institut National de la Statistique du Niger
National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI), Mexico
Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics
Institut National de la Statistique Cameroun

Institut National de la Statistique Côte d'Ivoire
National Administrative Department of Statistics Colombia
National Statistics Office, CAPMAS, Egypt
Insee, France
Kenya National Bureau of Statistics
Statistiques, Institut National de la Statistique (INSTAT), Mali
Institut National de la Statistique du Niger
Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática (INEI), Peru
Philippine Statistics Authority, Philippines
Statistics South Africa (STATS SA)
Uganda Bureau of Statistics
INE, Cabo Verde
Office of National Statistics, UK

Please briefly describe the process of developing the methodology for the indicator

The first consultation for this indicator was held during the meeting of the Praia working group in Paris on 4-6 July 2016. The recommendations from the NSOs, UN agencies and experts working on conflict were the following:

- To clarify the definition of 'conflict-related deaths'
- To ensure that there is no overlap with the indicator 16.1.1 on intentional homicide
- The work should be based on international human rights and humanitarian law and should build on existing practices

OHCHR also consulted on the work plan with other NGOs, UN agencies, ICRC and academia during the Expert Meeting on Estimating Indirect Conflict Deaths organized by the Small Arms Survey last 25 January 2017. The two main recommendations from the consultations were: 1) that the definition of conflict death should include indirect deaths; and 2) explore the possibility of taking a concentric approach to methodology development and data collection.

Using recommendations from these consultations, OHCHR undertook a survey of practices, definitions, level of disaggregation, verification methods, data requirements, classifications and data produced on conflict-related deaths of UN, governments and civil society organizations. It has benefited from the work and support of the Small Arms Survey, which conducted a review of existing sources on conflict death, in particular civil society sources. OHCHR conducted its own review, expanding its assessment of UN sources and casualty recording practices, in particular by UN Assistance Missions in Afghanistan (UNAMA), Iraq (UNAMI), Mali (MINUSMA) and OHCHR presence in and/or monitoring of Burundi, Colombia, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Ukraine, Yemen and Syria. OHCHR also contacted the Statistical Offices of Palestine, Philippines and Colombia to understand better existing practices of NSOs.

The results of the survey highlighted the need for the following: 1) standardization of definitions, collection, verification, disaggregation of data; 2) data partnerships between a hybrid of sources; and 3) an independent entity to validate the reliability of sources and aggregate data for reporting.

Following these consultations, mapping of existence practices, desktop research and bilateral discussions with relevant institutions, a background note on a proposed methodology was prepared for discussion. OHCHR presented the draft methodology during a Multi-stakeholder Consultation on Human Rights Indicators for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development last 5-6 September 2017. The consultation included National Human Rights Institutions and National Statistical Offices from Colombia, Palestine, Philippines, South Africa, Kenya, Cabo Verde, Denmark,

Mexico, and the United Kingdom. The UNODC, WHO, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNFPA, UNESCO, ILO and ICRC and experts from NGOs working on conflict-related deaths, such Small Arms Survey, PRIO, and HRDAG.

OHCHR presented the proposed definitions of concepts, methodology and data collection for the indicator. NGOs, NSOs and UN agencies presented their related work, mandates and provided feedback on the proposed approach, including in terms of their possible contributions to the continuation of the development of the methodology and data collection. The following topics and issues were discussed:

Proposed definitions of concepts and methods of measurement:

- Definition of ‘**armed conflict**’ as understood in International Humanitarian Law (IHL).
- Identification of armed conflict in practice based on an exhaustive reading of publicly available reports and assessments issued by the United Nations and other relevant bodies and organizations;
- Definition of conflict-related deaths, including direct, indirect deaths, and the nexus requirement to the conflict;
- For documented direct deaths, the minimum data requirement includes the status of the victim [factual categories of civilians, members of armed forces, fighters or other protected persons, unknown]; name of the victim [legal name/s, alias or assumed identity]; sex of the victim [male, female, unknown]; age of victim [adult, children, date of birth, age range, unknown]; status of alleged perpetrator(s) [factual categories of members of armed forces, fighters, other actors, unknown]; location of death [city, province, country, unknown] and date of death [month, year]; cause of death [types of weapon(s), other means and methods, unknown];
- The indicator to be disaggregated by sex, age and cause of death as per the request made in the internationally agreed formulation of the indicator;
- Need for the compilation of the indicator and for OHCHR to assess available data sources and compile data from a range of potentially relevant sources, including government agencies, national statistical offices, national human rights institutions, non-governmental organizations, media and other civil society sources;
- Need for data source/provider to ensure that verification standards are met through documentation of a set of relevant information on a particular death, providing the reasonable grounds to believe that the death occurred and was conflict-related;
- Relevance of lawful/unlawful categorization and related coding to uphold international humanitarian and human rights law in the development of the indicator.

Proposed concentric approach to the counting of conflict-related deaths:

- First circle - counting first documented direct deaths. The deaths to be counted include deaths caused by the use of weapons and by other means and methods used by parties to the conflict; deaths of civilians [in priority]; and deaths of members of armed forces, fighters and other protected persons [depending on data availability]. The minimum data requirement will be used to harmonize data for compilation and global reporting.
- Second circle - estimating undocumented direct deaths. Statistical surveys and techniques may be used to estimate undocumented direct deaths.
- Third Circle – estimating indirect deaths. Administrative data, statistical surveys and other relevant sources and methods may be used to estimate indirect deaths.
- Related following steps for OHCHR: finalization of the proposed methodology; consolidation of the list of identified situations of ‘armed conflict’; mapping and assessment of available data

sources; piloting the methodology in selected situations of conflict; coordination with data partners; submission of results of pilot to IAEG-SDGs to request possible tier reclassification.

There was an overall agreement on the proposed approach and its main components. The participants supported the work plan outlined by OHCHR to finalize the methodology based on the inputs received as part of the consultation. There was agreement on the need to clarify the concepts of conflict related deaths versus intentional homicide and in particular on identifying the existing overlap between the two indicators. The need for continued collaboration with UNODC was also stressed. Regarding the follow-up, participants, in particular from directly concerned countries (around 30 countries) and organizations involved in related data compilation, all conveyed their willingness to continue the collaboration on the development of the indicator, including by sharing further data and resources. There was also support for a regular meeting of the various stakeholders or producers of data.

The draft methodology was also presented for consultation with NGOs working on conflict and casualty data recorders through a Webinar organized with Small Arms Survey last 29 November 2017. Within its limited resources, OHCHR continued working on the indicator, developing further the draft inclusion/exclusion criteria, the categories of weapons and means and methods to be used under cause of death and mapping and assessment of relevant data sources. A plan for the pilot is being finalized and the pilot will be conducted during the last quarter of 2018.

Using these outcomes, guidance will be developed to strengthen data collection, dissemination and exchange practices and further collaboration between national and international stakeholders. This guidance should enable UN agencies, including OHCHR, WHO and UNODC, in consultation with relevant partners, to compile and release consistent estimates of indicator 16.1.2. This guidance will also be reflected in the handbook to be developed and submitted by the Praia Group to the UN Statistical Commission.

Capacity building activities, exchanges on good practices and development of a network of data providers and related data validation processes, both at national and international levels, are also planned as part of the development of this indicator.

Please indicate new international standards that will need to be proposed and approved by an intergovernmental process (such as UNSC) for this methodology.

The methodology being developed relies and builds primarily on existing international legal, and statistical standards, including international human rights law, WHO International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10), UNDOC International Classification of Crime Statistics (ICCS), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) overview of weapons regulated by IHL, and OHCHR casualty recording practices. There are no new international standards being currently considered. If there would be any, they will be proposed through the Praia Group, and if applicable, through the mechanisms overseeing the ICCS.

When do you expect the methodological work on this indicator to be completed?

Towards the end of 2018 and possibly a request for tier reclassification will be submitted to the IAEG-SDGs during the March 2019 meeting. Regular data collection could begin the same year.

Are data and metadata already being collected from the National Statistical System for one or more components of this indicator?

Yes

If yes, please describe:

There are data (and to some extent metadata) already being compiled at national and international levels. It relates to administrative records, casualty recording and population surveys implemented through country-level processes, involving justice and health authorities, statistical offices, human rights mechanisms, civil society organizations, UN and other international organizations. Mapping available data and metadata is underway.

How do you plan to collect the data?

- Send questionnaire(s) to country
- Obtain data directly from country database/website
- Joint survey/compilation with national agency and international entity
- Other:

If the indicator involves multiple components from different data sources, please describe how each individual component of the indicator will be collected here.

As described earlier, different data sources will enter in the compilation of the indicator. Different questionnaires to collect necessary data are already sent to countries by UN agencies. These questionnaires may have to be reviewed in light of the needs identified for this indicator. With a concern not to add new burdens on countries, we will seek to obtain data directly from available database/website. In conflict-setting however, the lack of operational or accessible recording capacity commands to use other data collection mechanisms, even if only temporary or as a complement to existing recording systems. The work on casualty recording carried out in the framework of UN operations (e.g. Peacekeeping operations, Commission of Inquiry), in collaboration with governments and civil society organizations, should therefore constitute an important data source. In addition, data made available by civil society organizations carrying out media and other global monitoring (e.g. big data) will also have to be assessed for their usefulness in compiling components of the indicator.

With what frequency is data expected to be collected?

Annually

Is there a process of data validation by countries in place or planned for this indicator?

Yes

If yes, please briefly describe:

It is planned to develop data validation processes both at national and international levels. In identified conflict situations, capacity building activities and collaboration among relevant stakeholders at country level will be promoted. Data validation with international organizations and experts will be also sought for and particularly important in contexts of insufficiently solid data collection capacities at country level.

(as of July/August 2018)