



UNODC

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Report of the First Global Meeting of Focal Points of the United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of the Criminal Justice System (UN-CTS) held in Vienna from 9-11 May 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

The First Global Meeting of national experts on crime statistics takes place to advise and assist UNODC in the activities to implement the ‘Roadmap to improve the quality and availability of crime statistics at the national and international level’ (E/CN.3/2013/11 and E/CN.3/2015/8) and it is supported by the INEGI-UNODC Centre of Excellence for Statistical Information on Government, Victimization of Crime, Public Security and Justice.

The objectives of the meeting are:

- i. To discuss options to review the UN-CTS data collection to make it fully compliant with the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS) and to respond to data needs connected to international monitoring of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in the areas of public security and safety, access to justice and the rule of law
- ii. To review and discuss ways to improve quality and standardization of victimization surveys to produce high quality data for indicators included in the new SDG framework;
- iii. To discuss challenges and present good practices on role and activities of UN-CTS national Focal Points
- iv. To present the workplan of activities to support countries in the implementation of the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS).

II. ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING

- A. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, China, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, India, Indonesia Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United States of America. and by representatives of the following organisations: European Commission, European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights,

Eurostat, Organization of American States, UN Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights, UNDP Regional Office Central America, UN Women, Korean Institute of Criminology, Thailand Institute of Justice, Cisalva Institute, Small Arms Survey, Transparency International.

B. The agenda of the meeting is provided as annex to the Report.

III. OUTCOME OF THE MEETING

A. New information needs on crime and criminal justice: SDG, ICCS and others

New information needs on crime and criminal justice were discussed at this session, with a specific focus on those deriving from SDG monitoring framework. SDG targets and indicators can be grouped under three main headings: violence (including violence against women and violence against children), illicit trafficking and organized crime, and lastly access to justice, rule of law and corruption. Moreover, the cross-cutting principle of 'leave no one behind' requires that data are disaggregated by variables, as for example by sex and age, that can portrait the situation of various population groups. It was highlighted that new demands on crime and criminal justice data will require renewed efforts at national level, which need to be supported at international level through methodological guidance and coordination of capacity building initiatives. The role of the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS) was underlined as it is an instrument providing a common vocabulary of crime, besides being a powerful analytical and statistical framework, and it will support the production of standardized data for SDG indicators. As a consequence of new information needs, the UN Crime Trends Survey (UN-CTS), the annual data collection on crime and criminal justice statistics, needs revision of its contents. This meeting of the national UN-CTS Focal Points is the first step of an open and participatory process aiming to review its contents in line with SDG statistical framework, as well as to maximize the coverage and quality of collected data. The role of Victimization Surveys in producing SDG indicators was also stressed and the need to produce technical guidance to produce standardised indicators was voiced.

B. Data collection on crime and criminal justice: achievements and challenges

This session highlighted the role of UNODC regarding the collection, analysis, improvement and dissemination of crime statistics at the international level and the central place of the United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (UN-CTS) within this framework. It outlined the role of UN-CTS Focal Points and their important function as a technical point of contact regarding the compilation of the UN-CTS questionnaire at the national level. It

showcased the gradual improvement in the quality and country coverage of the UN-CTS, due in large part to the increasing number of active Focal Points, and improvements of data dissemination owing to improved functionalities of the UNODC data portal (<https://data.unodc.org/>). An analysis of UN-CTS response rates by section and by selected indicators was presented. According to this analysis, the coverage of several sections needs further improvement, particularly the section on crime victimization surveys, which are not regularly conducted in all countries. In addition, issues of data consistency, and data quality should be addressed. The important role of Focal points in data validation, provision of accurate and complete metadata and coordination between data providers was stressed.

C. Proposals for UN-CTS review

The discussion for reviewing UN-CTS contents was organised in working groups which dealt separately with the following topics: “Intentional Homicide”, “Violent Crime”, “Other crime”, “Administration of Justice (efficiency and effectiveness)”, “Administration of Justice (access to justice and fairness)” and “Prisons”. Outcomes of discussions were presented by respective facilitators, who emphasized the efforts to balance the desirability of data against the feasibility of collecting them.

The rich discussion on UN-CTS review produced a comprehensive list of data on crime and criminal justice. Participants acknowledged that the list of proposed topics is too long and it will require further work before a first draft is produced. The UN-CTS needs to remain a manageable tool and its revision will need to respond to main information needs at international level. In particular, data needs deriving from SDG indicator framework will be carefully considered.

1. Intentional homicide: the following core and non-core variables were identified:

TABLE 1. PROPOSAL FOR INTENTIONAL HOMICIDE
<i>Proposed core variables</i>
<i>Victims</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Total, sex and age (SDG indicator 16.1.1)</i> • <i>Relationship victim-perpetrator (according to ICCS)</i> • <i>Situational context (from police, prosecutor or courts) (according to ICCS)</i> • <i>Mechanism (type of weapon)</i>
<i>Offences</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Total</i> • <i>Capital city</i> • <i>Total homicide offences with firearms</i>
<i>Attempted homicide</i>
<i>Perpetrators</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Total, sex and age group</i>
<i>Proposed Non- core variables</i>
<i>Offences</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Location disaggregation as in the ICCS</i> • <i>Additional cities by size (categories for population size to be set up)</i>
<i>Perpetrators</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Intoxication status</i> • <i>Citizenship</i> • <i>Legal status (private person or public official)</i> • <i>Recidivism</i>

The discussion also dwelt extensively on the topic of femicide (gender-based killings) and it was indicated that data on homicide victims by relationship with perpetrators represent a solid starting point to provide a minimal and common count of femicides, while recognizing that it cannot capture all forms of gender-based killings. The feasibility of complementary approaches to identify and count other homicides targeting women should be tested, including for example counting cases of femicides (in countries where such offence exist) or counting relevant cases of ‘hate crime’ (where possible). An increasing number of countries particularly in LAC defines femicide as specific criminal offences, but the count of these offences would provide an undercount of total femicides because of different prosecution practices. Advances on the counting of femicide will result from the methodological work being conducted by the ICCS Technical Advisory Group and other initiatives.

2. Violent crime: the following core and non-core variables were identified:

TABLE 2. PROPOSAL FOR VIOLENT CRIMES
<i>Proposed core variables</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months (SDG indicator 16.1.3)</i> • <i>Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live. (SDG indicator 16.1.4)</i> • <i>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)</i> • <i>Proportion of young women and men aged 18-29 years</i>

<p><i>who experienced sexual violence by age 18 (SDG indicator 16.2.3)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by form of violence and by age (SDG indicator 5.2.1)</i> • <i>Proportion of women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by age and place of occurrence (SDG indicator 5.2.2)</i>
<p><i>Serious assault (reported)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Age, sex, victim-perpetrator relationship</i> •
<p><i>Sexual violence (reported)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Total, Rape and other</i> • <i>Age, sex, relationship victim-perpetrator</i> •
<p><i>Child pornography</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Attribute on cyber modality</i>
<p><i>Robbery</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Administrative and Victimization survey data</i>
<i>Proposed Non- core variables</i>
<p><i>Sexual exploitation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Age, sex</i> •
<p><i>Trafficking in Persons (SDG indicator 16.2.2)</i></p> <p><i>Age, sex</i></p>
<p><i>Kidnapping</i></p> <p><i>Abduction</i></p>
<p><i>Recidivism of perpetrators (Sexual Assault, Sexual Violence, Sexual exploitation)</i></p>

Participants highlighted that standard guidelines need to be developed for the production of prevalence indicators of physical and sexual violence, while available experiences on measuring psychological violence in Victimization Surveys need to be used to operationalise its measurement in more precise terms, also on the basis of experiences conducted in surveys on VAW. Participants highlighted that measuring VAW in specialised surveys is resource intensive, despite its advantages.

Similarly, the indicator on harassment needs to be operationalised on the basis of available experiences in victimisation surveys and VAW surveys; issues on

production data by location and disability status may exist as large samples are needed to produce estimates.

The possibility of including relevant question for indicator 16.1.4, among other indicators, in household surveys other than victimisation surveys should be considered.

It was acknowledged that it can be challenging to measure child pornography but as an emerging and serious form of cybercrime countries are encouraged to attempt to measure and provide appropriate metadata-context to understand the figures.

3. Other crime: the following core and non-core variables were identified:

TABLE 3. PROPOSAL FOR OTHER CRIMES
<i>Proposed core variables</i>
<p><i>Corruption</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Bribery prevalence among population (SDG indicator 16.5.1)</i> • <i>Bribery prevalence among business (SDG indicator 16.5.2)</i> • <i>Administrative data on Bribery, embezzlement (possibly active/passive bribery)</i>
<p><i>Theft</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>both administrative and survey data on prevalence</i>
<p><i>Motor Vehicle Theft</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>both administrative and survey data on prevalence</i>
<p><i>Burglary</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>both administrative and survey data on prevalence</i>
<i>Proposed Non- core variables</i>
<p><i>Extortion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>both administrative and survey data on prevalence</i>
<i>Domestic Burglary</i>
<i>Migrant smuggling offences</i>
<p><i>Environmental crime</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>trafficking of waste and trafficking of wildlife</i>
<i>Firearms trafficking (SDG indicator 16.4.2)</i>
<p><i>Cybercrime (cross-cutting)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>both administrative and survey data</i>
<p><i>Drug law offences</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Trafficking/possession</i> • <i>Age, sex</i> <p><i>(taking into account the need to avoid duplication of data with ARQ as well as the objective of improving the quality and coverage of responses)</i></p>

In particular, the discussion examined the possibility of including drug law offences, as the data currently collected via the Annual Report Questionnaire (ARQ) present issues of data quality and coverage, while taking into account the need to avoid duplication of data collections. It was suggested that future collection of data on drug-related crime (data on drug-related offences and persons arrested for drug-related offences) could be done in the UN-CTS rather than in the ARQ. One participant suggested that in this case the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) be informed about any decision to collect data on drug-related offences through the CTS instead of the ARQ.

Participants also invited to study the feasibility to collect data on crime 'perpetrated through/facilitated by' the Internet, as this is a modus operandi increasingly used for the commission of a number of crimes. Data should be disaggregated by type of offences and whether perpetrated through the Internet.

In this case, the focus should be on offences where the victim is an individual, as opposed to institutions or businesses.

4. Efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal justice system, the following core and non-core variables were identified:

TABLE 4. PROPOSAL ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE
<i>Proposed core variables</i>
<i>Police personnel</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sex and age group</i> • <i>By function (prevention, detection, investigation, administrative)</i>
<i>Prosecution personnel, total</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sex and age group</i>
<i>Professional judges or magistrates</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Judges</i> • <i>Magistrates</i> • <i>Sex and age group</i> • <i>By function (criminal, civil and other)</i>
<i>Persons brought into formal contact</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>violent crimes or for crimes classified by Level 1 of ICCS</i>
<i>Persons prosecuted</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>violent crimes or for crimes classified by level 1 of ICCS</i>
<i>Persons convicted</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>violent crimes or for crimes classified by level 1 of ICCS</i>
<i>Crimes cleared by police</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>violent crimes</i>
<i>Proposed Non- core variables</i>

<p><i>Private security personnel</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>total, sex</i>
<p><i>Financial resources</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>By stage/institution of the Crime Justice System</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Police,</i> ➤ <i>Prosecutor,</i> ➤ <i>Courts,</i> ➤ <i>Prison</i> • <i>Annual public budget allocated to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Salaries</i> ➤ <i>Computerization (equipment, investments, maintenance)</i> ➤ <i>Buildings (maintenance, operating costs, new buildings)</i> ➤ <i>Training</i> ➤ <i>Other</i>

The discussion also dwelt on the possible approaches to measuring the duration of the criminal justice process and stages thereof, including pre-trial detention and court proceedings.

5. Administration of justice (access to justice and fairness): while recalling that access to justice implies the ability to seek *and* obtain justice, the following core and non-core variables were identified:

TABLE 5. PROPOSAL FOR ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE
<i>Proposed core variables</i>
<i>Physical Assault reporting rate (SDG indicator 16.3.1)</i>
<i>Sexual Assault reporting rate (SDG indicator 16.3.1)</i>
<i>Proposed core exploratory variables:</i>
<i>Total police reporting rate(VS)</i>
<i>Legal representation (victims and offenders)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Total</i> • <i>Free, subsidized, public/private</i> • <i>No legal representation</i>
<i>Access to interpretation</i>
<i>Legal representation by sex, age, and citizenship</i>
<i>Access to ADR</i>
<i>Proposed Non- core variables</i>
<i>Experience/satisfaction (perception survey)</i>
<i>Proximity to courts and police</i>
<i>Legal representation (disability status)</i>

6. Prisons: the following core and non-core variables were identified:

TABLE 6. PROPOSAL FOR PRISONS
<i>Proposed core variables</i>
<i>Official capacity</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>By sex of persons housed</i> • <i>Adult prisons and juvenile prisons</i>
<i>Total number of persons held in prisons</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adult prisons and juvenile prisons</i> • <i>By sentencing status (SDG indicator 16.3.2)</i> • <i>By sex</i>
<i>Persons under other types of supervision (community measures)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>By sex</i>
<i>Deaths of persons in prison</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Total</i> • <i>Deaths due to external causes</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Intentional homicide</i> ○ <i>Non-intentional homicide</i> ○ <i>Suicide</i> • <i>Deaths due to other causes</i>
<i>Proposed Non- core variables</i>
<i>Number of facilities available</i>
<i>Prison staff</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adult prisons and juvenile prisons</i> • <i>By sex</i> • <i>By type of responsibility</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Staff (supervision, correctional officers, guards)</i> ➤ <i>Other staff (education, treatment, medical, admin, etc.)</i>
<i>Recidivism on prison inmates and entries to prison (to explore also recidivism at other stages of CJ process)</i>
<i>Persons entering in prisons by sex and by sentencing status (sentenced/unsentenced)</i>
<i>Vulnerable groups incarcerated</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sexual orientation/gender identity</i> • <i>Medical condition</i> • <i>Mental health</i>
<i>Children of incarcerated parents</i>
<i>Past alcohol, drug and other controlled substance abuse and dependence</i>
<i>Persons held by type of offence (consistent with ICCS)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>by sex</i>

Perception of conditions of confinement

The discussion on prisons also described the issues involved in measuring the official capacity of prisons - whether it should refer to originally determined capacity, as determined by prison administration or by the actual operational capacity.

Next steps on UN-CTS review

The list of core and non-core variables, with the relevant remarks, will be used as a basis to build the reviewed UN-CTS, to be shared with UN-CTS focal points as per the work-plan below.

Participants also underlined the need to review the current set of metadata to make it clearer to understand, easier to compile and more informative to understand data generation process and data accuracy. The process of collecting UN-CTS metadata will also be assessed in view of making it less burdensome for countries.

The discussion also stressed the need to further strengthen the dissemination of UN-CTS data in order to bring them as close as possible to users: this topic will deserve a specific discussion at the next meeting of UN-CTS Focal Points. Moreover, ways to strengthen and facilitate the mode of UN-CTS data transmission between UNODC and member states should be explored.

Workplan of UN-CTS Revision

The process of CTS revision:	Action by	Timeline
1st Global Meeting of Focal Points – options and preferences developed	Focal Points, UNODC	9-11 May 2016
First draft of revised UN-CTS 2017	UNODC	29 July
Comments on first draft	Focal Points	15 September
Second draft of revised UN-CTS 2017	UNODC	15 October
Comments on second draft	Focal Points	31 October
Testing of UN-CTS 2017 by volunteer countries	UNODC	30 Nov. 15-Jan
Final CTS based on testing	UNODC	28 February
Production/translation of UN-CTS 2017	UNODC	30 June
Sending of UN-CTS 2017	UNODC	1-14 July 2017
Deadline for responses to CTS 2017	Focal Points	15 September 2017

D. Performing the role of UN-CTS Focal Points

Argentina, Germany and Uganda presented their individual experiences as UN-CTS Focal Points; this highlighted the different circumstances, advantages and challenges that countries face when collecting data for the UN-CTS. Countries are characterised by very diverse institutional, regulatory and organisational settings and this has a direct impact on processes for data collection on crime and criminal justice. Argentina emphasized the structural changes on the collection and validation of data, and the design of indicators that have been taking place in their system to improve data quality. Germany presented the system in place for data collection from the statistical offices to international organizations and how it combines data requests and data availability. Uganda presented the different institutions that play a role in providing UN-CTS data and the important link that exists through communication, coordination and collaboration between the entities in the Criminal Justice system. Presentations by member states highlighted that the role of UN-CTS focal points is key in collecting and ensuring consistency of data from the entire criminal justice system. This coordination role applies not only to collecting data for UN-CTS but, more broadly, to improve coordination of statistical production on the justice system, which is extremely complex and articulated by nature.

Eurostat presented from a regional perspective its experience collecting and processing the UN-CTS - especially the data validation procedures and the data coverage and accuracy - and its initiatives for improvement including methodological guides, training courses and guidance to data providers.

It was concluded that efforts should be made to strengthen the role and skills of UN-CTS focal points, including through training, development of good practices, provision of detailed instructions for UN-CTS compiling.

E. Victimization surveys: increasing quality and comparability of data on SDG indicators (part I: violence indicators)

The discussion focused on how victimization surveys can be used and adapted to measure the SDG indicators, particularly those related to violence, with presentations by France, Netherlands, and the United States. The discussion highlighted that countries with a victimisation survey programme are able to produce data for a number of SDG indicators, including the indicators on violence prevalence, safety perception, violent crime reporting rate. The possibility to include additional questions to better capture violent experiences should be considered.

The need for clear definitions on concepts like harassment and psychological violence and on the need for a harmonised methodology to produce comparable SDG indicators based on victimisation surveys was stressed.

Finally countries discussed the possibility of developing a standardised victimization survey tool, which would be available and useful for all countries.

Participants also discussed about the difference between criminal victimization surveys and VAW/public health surveys for the production of accurate and comparable data on violence and on how a choice can be made between them.

The user should be guided by the use of data from different sources. It was also underlined that global standards to measuring VAW exist and when possible they should be taken into account.

F. Victimization surveys, increasing quality and availability of data on SDG indicators (part II: corruption, discrimination)

Focusing on the SDG indicator 16.5.1, Italy presented their survey from 2015-16 measuring corruption and bribery in the public sector to measure the economic value of monetary exchange and corruption dynamics. Mexico presented its experience in measuring corruption both in the population and among business sector, namely ENCIG (Encuesta Nacional de Calidad e Impacto Gubernamental) and ENVE (Encuesta Nacional de Victimización de Empresas). Transparency International underlined the methodological challenges of measuring corruption and provided several lessons learned as well as methodological recommendations for measuring corruption. The EU Fundamental Rights Agency explained their surveys on discrimination and provided a preview of future surveys, discussing the diversity of situations that research on discrimination and harassment has to cover. These initiatives are very relevant in view of producing SDG indicators in the areas of corruption and discrimination.

G. Recent developments on victimisation surveys

Introducing one specific approach on measuring access to justice UNODC gave a first overview about the access to justice module implemented in a survey on corruption in Nigeria. One key lesson from the first analysis of a partial data set is that adequate sample size is necessary for the measurement of access to justice. As an example of international cooperation on victimization surveys, the Latin America and Caribbean Crime Victimization Survey Initiative (LACSI) was presented, showing the process to develop the survey instrument and the progress to date to enlarge the number of countries using the survey instrument. Referring to this topic the discussion focused on steps to be done to enable new countries to join this survey project, the chances and risks of adapting new methods to increase efficiency and promote sustainability of data collection as well as the problem of adapting to break in series through changes in survey methodology on the national level while recognizing the importance of harmonizing crime victimisation surveys at the international standard. The idea to establish an informal group of experts on victimisation surveys (possibly a Victimization Lab hosted at the UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence) was discussed. This Lab should look at specific and technical solutions to support the implementation of victimization surveys; participants expressed interest and appreciation for this idea.

It was highlighted that in several countries there is not yet a programme of victimization surveys and there is a need for assisting in the development of this tool.

H. Review of activities on the International Classification of Crime for Statistical

Purposes (ICCS)

This session provided a short overview of recent activities of UNODC to support countries in the implementation of the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS). After a brief introduction of the ICCS and its importance for the future UN-CTS, the progress of UNODC activities was presented in four main areas: Information/Dissemination activities (translation, printing, website, briefs), methodological support (draft Manual Vol.1, CTS review process), Technical assistance (e-learning and training materials, Training and regional workshops), and organizational framework (Technical Advisory Group, Partnerships, Resources).

Several participants highlighted the need for presenting, monitoring and advocating for the use of the ICCS. A number of challenges on the implementation of the ICCS were raised by the participants, which will be addressed in the forthcoming meeting of ICCS Technical Advisory Group.

I. Adoption of the report

The report of the meeting was adopted at its last session.

It was decided that the report of the meeting would be shared with other UN-CTS Focal Points (those not present at the meeting), request their comments, and their comments will be a matter of record.

J. Comments received after the adoption of the report

The meeting report was shared with all participants and with all Focal Points not present at the meeting. Comments were received from Australia, Cyprus and Pakistan.

Australia expressed concerns that if all proposed topics listed in the meeting report were to be included in a future UN-CTS, the questionnaire would become too long. In addition, some concepts need further elaboration (e.g. recidivism, cybercrime). For homicide, sex, age and victim-offender relationship should be core while some difficult disaggregations could be dropped instead (e.g. intoxication and legal status). For data on physical and sexual assault, disability might be considered as an additional variable, while psychological violence is seen as a complicated concept that is not easily measured.

Cyprus also expressed concerns about the feasibility of collecting many of the new variables proposed for a future UN-CTS, which may not be available at the source level. This is especially the case for data derived from victimization surveys, as CYPSTAT currently lacks the resources to carry out such as survey.

Pakistan further specified the proposal that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) be informed should data on drug-related offences in future be collected from Member States through the CTS instead of the ARQ: This could be done through a room paper to be included in the documentation of the next session of the CND or through a brief presentation to the CND Bureau.

First Global Meeting of Focal Points of the United Nations Survey on Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (UN-CTS)

Vienna, 9-11 May 2016
Vienna International Centre, Room C1 (2nd floor)

Organized by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) with the support of the INEGI-UNODC Centre of Excellence for Statistical Information on Government, Victimization of Crime, Public Security and Justice

Agenda

Monday 9 May 2016	
	<i>Morning</i>
1 0 h 0 0 - 1 1 h 1 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and goals of the meeting • New information needs on crime and criminal justice: SDG, ICCS and others (UNODC) • Discussion
1 1 h 1 0 - 1 1 h 3 0	<i>Coffee / Tea break</i>
1 1 h 3 0 - 1 2 h 3 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection on crime and criminal justice: achievements and challenges (UNODC) • Discussion
1 2 h 3 0 - 1 4 h 0 0	Lunch Break
	<i>Afternoon</i>
1 4 h 0 0 - 1 5 h 4 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to review the UN-CTS: discussion in working groups (first part)
1 5 h 4 0 - 1 6 h 0 0	<i>Coffee / Tea break</i>
1 6 h 0 0 - 1 7 h 3 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to review the UN-CTS: discussion in working groups (second part)

Tuesday 10 May 2016	
	<i>Morning</i>
9 h 3 0 - 1 1 h 0 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of proposals for UN-CTS review from working groups (first part)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion
11 h 00 – 11 h 20	<i>Coffee / Tea break</i>
11 h 20 - 13 h 00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of proposals for UN-CTS review from working groups (second part) • Discussion
13 h 00 – 14 h 30	Lunch Break
	<i>Afternoon</i>
14 h 30 – 15 h 40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performing the role of UN-CTS Focal Point, experiences from countries <i>Perspectives from selected countries (Argentina, Germany, Thailand, Uganda)</i> • A regional perspective on UN-CTS process and data quality (Eurostat) • Discussion
15 h 40 – 16 h 00	<i>Coffee / Tea break</i>
16 h 00 - 17 h 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victimization surveys: increasing quality and comparability of data on SDG indicators (part I: violence indicators) <i>Perspectives from selected countries (France, Netherlands, USA)</i> • Discussion

Wednesday 11 May 2016	
	<i>Morning</i>
9 h 30 – 11 h 00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victimization surveys, increasing quality and availability of data on SDG indicators (part II: corruption, discrimination) <i>Experience-based surveys on corruption (Italy, Mexico, Transparency Int.l)</i> <i>Surveys on discrimination (EU Fundamental Rights Agency)</i> • Discussion
11 h 00 – 11 h 20	<i>Coffee / Tea break</i>
11 h 20 - 13 h 00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent developments on victimisation surveys <i>Testing a module on access to justice (UNODC)</i> <i>The LACSI experience, a model to export? (UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence)</i> • Discussion
13 h 00 – 14 h 30	Lunch Break
	<i>Afternoon</i>
14 h 30 – 17 h 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of activities on the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS) • Meeting report: review and adoption • Conclusions and next steps

**First Global Meeting of Focal Points of the United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of the Criminal
Justice System (UN-CTS), May 9 – 11 2016**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Title	Country	Institution	Email
Djamel Feloussi	Director of the enforcement of sentences and pardons	Algeria	Ministry of Justice	feloussi@mjustice.dz
Diego Fleitas	Director of Research and Development of Security Policies	Argentina	Ministerio de Seguridad	diego.fleitas@minseg.gob.ar
Juan Jose Benitez	Jefe de Gabinete	Argentina	Subsecretaria de política criminal	ijbenitez813@gmail.com
Barbara Bauer	Social Statistics	Austria	Statistics Austria	barbara.bauer@statistik.gv.at
Samir Shirinov	Head of department	Azerbaijan	Ministry of Internal Affairs	international@mia.gov.az
Rovshan Safarov	Third Secretary	Azerbaijan	Embassy of the Republic of Azerbaijan	r_safarov@azembassy.at
Amra Ibrahimagic	Senior Advisor	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina	amra.ibrahimagic@bhas.ba
Adriana Tetevenska	Chief Expert	Bulgaria	National Statistical Institute	atetevenska@nsi.bg
Biennvenu Claude Valéry Bado	Magistrat	Burkina Faso	Chef de service affaires pénales	
Djeukwi Vicky Laure Epse Nana	Ingenieur Statisticien Economiste	Cameroon	Statistics Cameroon	vldjeukwi@yahoo.fr
Rebecca Kong	Chief, Policing services program	Canada	Canadian centre for justice statistics	rebecca.kong@canada.ca
Ge Xiangwei	Associate Researcher	China	Ministry of Justice/Institute for crime prevention	xiangweipku@126.com
Andri Ahven	Adviser	Estonia	Ministry of Justice	Andri.Ahven@just.ee
Kimmo Haapakangas	Senior statistician	Finland	Statistics Finland	Kimmo.haapakangas@stat.fi
Cyril Rizk	Expert	France	Observatoire National de la Délinquance (ONDRP)	Cyril.rizk@inhesi.fr
Thomas Baumann	Head of the Justice Statistics Unit	Germany	Federal Statistical Office	thomas.baumann@destatis.de

Surendra Panwar	Joint Director	India	NCRB	spanwar@ncsb.nic.in
Hendry Syaputra	Statistician	Indonesia	Statistics Indonesia -BPS	hesy@bps.go.id
Maria Giuseppina Muratore	Senior Researcher, Chief of the Unit	Italy	National Institute for Statistics	muratore@istat.it
Rochelle Clarke Grey	Programme and Policy evaluation manager	Jamaica	Ministry of national security	rochelle.grey@mns.gov.jm
Robert Buluma	Manager in charge of Governance, Peace and Security Statistics	Kenya	Kenya National Bureau of Statistics	rbuluma@knbs.or.ke
Rakhmanova Zhyldyz	Head of department	Kyrgyzstan Republic	Department of social statistics	rakhmanovazz@mail.ru
Kalvis Okmanis	Senior Officer of Living Standards Statistics Section	Latvia	Central Statistics Bureau of Latvia	kalvis.okmanis@csb.gov.lv
Lieutenant Colonel Eduard Ayrout		Lebanon	Directorate general of the international security forces	ncbbbeirut@isf.gov.lb
Nada El Asmar	Judge	Lebanon	Lebanese Ministry of Justice	nadasmar@hotmail.com
Edgar Guerrero	Director General Adjunto de Políticas de Información Gubernamental y Censos Nacionales de Gobierno	Mexico	Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía	edgar.guerrero@inegi.org.mx
Apil Raj Bohara	Deputy Superintendent of Police	Nepal	Ministry of Home Affairs	apil@nepalpolice.gov.np
Heike Goudriaan	Researcher	Netherlands	Statistics Netherlands	h.goudriaan@cbs.nl
Jawad Ali		Pakistan	Permanent Mission	parepvienna@gmail.com
Aracelly de Casanova	Directora Nacional	Panama	Ministerio de Seguridad Pública	adecasanova@siec.gob.pa
Omar Jose Blandon	Deputy Strategic Advisor	Panama	Ministerio de Seguridad Pública	

Rodriguez				
Luis Calle Rosasco	Punto Focal de INEI ante OCDE	Peru	Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas	Luis.CalleR@inei.gob.pe
Candido J. Astrologo Jr.	Assistant National Statistician	Philippines	Philippines Statistics Authority	c.astrologo@psa.gov.ph
Captain Mohamed Abdulla M.AL-Khater	Head of studies and international affairs section	Qatar	Ministry of Interior - Drugs Enforcement Administration	malkhater@moi.gov.qa
First Lieutenant Abdulla Nasser AL-Yafei	Drug Control Officer	Qatar	Ministry of Interior - Drugs Enforcement Administration	
Ibrahim Al-Sulaiti		Qatar	Ministry of Interior - Drugs Enforcement Administration	
Fahad Al-Hajiri		Qatar	Ministry of Interior	
Sara Al-Sulaiti		Qatar	Permanent Mission	pm.vienna@mofa.gov.qa
Ali Al-Kuwari		Qatar	Permanent Mission	pm.vienna@mofa.gov.qa
Kes Kyungsoon Choi	Deputy Director	Republic of Korea	Statistics Korea	kchoi@korea.kr
Samoila Marian	Public Manager	Romania	Public Ministry	samoila_marian@mpublic.ro
Oleg A. Insarov	Deputy Head of the General Department of Organization and Analysis, Head of the Department of the Legal Statistics	Russian Federation	Prosecutor General's Office of the Russian Federation	
Olga A. Trushkina	Deputy Head of the Department of the Legal Statistics	Russian Federation	Prosecutor General's Office of the Russian Federation	

Natalia Y. Sokolova	Advisor, Department of Legal Assistance, General Department of International Legal Cooperation	Russian Federation	Prosecutor General's Office of the Russian Federation	
Dr. Thaar Almohya	General Supervisor	Saudi Arabia	Anti-Crime Research Centre	saudiembassy@saudiembassy.at
Mohammed Al-Awagi		Saudi Arabia		saudiembassy@saudiembassy.at
Mohammed Al-Rabeah		Saudi Arabia		saudiembassy@saudiembassy.at
Abdullah Alotaibe		Saudi Arabia		saudiembassy@saudiembassy.at
Jaime Cereceda Fernandez-Oruña	Jefe del área estadística	Spain	Ministerio del Interior	jcf@interior.es
Levent Kemetli	Statistician	Sweden	The Swedish National Council for Crime and Prevention	Levent.Kemetli@bra.se
Jack Moli	Statistician	Sweden	The Swedish National Council for Crime and Prevention	jack.molin@bra.se
Stephan Gysi	Scientific collaborator for the area Police & Police checks, Crime and Criminal Justice	Switzerland	Swiss Federal Statistical Office	stephan.gysi@bfs.admin.ch
Kullanan Sricharoen	Justice Officer	Thailand	Office of Justice Affairs, Ministry of Justice	s_kullanan@oja.go.th
Latoya Atkins		Trinidad and Tobago	PSODC	latoya.atkins@SSA.GOV.TT
Fethullah Bulut	TURKSTAT Expert	Turkey	TURKSTAT	fethullah.bulut@tuik.gov.tr
Lucy Ladira	Technical Advisor, criminal justice	Uganda	Ministry of justice and constitutional affairs	ladira77@googlemail.com
Saif Alkaabi		United Arab		un.vienna@mofa.gov.ae

		Emirates		
Abdulla Dhanhani		United Arab Emirates		un.vienna@mofa.gov.ae
Fahad Alhebsi	3rd Secretary	United Arab Emirates	UAE Embassy in Vienna	un.vienna@mofa.gov.ae
Jehad Saeed AlMazrouei	Internship Student	United Arab Emirates	UAE Embassy in Vienna	un.vienna@mofa.gov.ae
Allen J. Beck	Senior Statistical Advisor	United States of America	Bureau of Justice Statistics	allen.beck@usdoj.gov
Juan Pablo Gordillo	Infosegura project coordination specialist		UNDP Regional Office Central America	juan.gordillo@undp.org
Juncal Plazaola Castaño	Violence against women data specialist		UN Women	j.plazaolacastano@unwomen.org
Anna Alvazzi del Frate	Director of Programmes		Small Arms Survey	anna.alvazzi@smallarmssurvey.org
Coralie Pring	Research Coordinator		Transparency International	cpring@transparency.org
Seong-jin Yeon	Director		Korean Institute of Criminology	marathon@kic.re.kr
JeahYen Soung	Deputy Director		Korean Institute of Criminology	june3651@kic.re.kr
Steve Clarke	Team Leader		Eurostat	Steve.Clarke@ec.europa.eu
Dra. Maria Isabel Gutierrez	Directora		Universidad del Valle Cisalva Institute	maria.gutierrez@correounivalle.edu.co
Richard Caine	Policy Officer		European Commission	Richard.caine@ec.europa.eu
Grace Sanico Steffan	Human rights measurement and indicators		UN Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights	gsteffan@ohchr.org
Sudarak Suvannanonda	Programme Officer		Thailand Institute of Justice	sudarak.s@gmail.com

Yodsawadi Thipphayam ogkoludom	Programme Officer		Thailand Institute of Justice	yodsawadi.t@gmail.com
Felix Reiterer	Senior Crime Statistics Expert		GOPA	felix_far@aon.at
Karen Bozicovich	Research Officer		OAS	KBozicovich@oas.org
Sami Nevala	Head of Sector Statistics and Surveys		European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights	Sami.nevala@fra.europa.eu
Rossalina Latcheva	Senior Programme Manager - Statistics and Surveys		European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights	Rossalina.latcheva@fra.europa.eu
Michael Rand	Expert			michael.r.rand@gmail.com
Angela Me	Chief, Research and Trend Analysis Branch		UNODC	angela.me@unodc.org
Enrico Bisogno	Chief, Data Development and Dissemination Unit		UNODC	enrico.bisogno@unodc.org
Kristiina Kangaspunta	Chief, Crime Research Unit		UNODC	kristiina.kangaspunta@unodc.org
Michael Jandl	Research Officer		UNODC	michael.jandl@unodc.org
Salome Flores	Research Officer		UNODC	Salome.flores@unodc.org
Antoine Vella	Statistician		UNODC	antoine.vella@unodc.org
Lucia Carballo	Consultant		UNODC	lucia.carballo@unodc.org
Macarena Torres	Consultant		UNODC	macarena.torres.rossel@unodc.org
Gerald Kandulu	Associate Statistician		UNODC	Gerald.kandulu@unodc.org
Umid Rakhmonberdiev	Statistical Assistant		UNODC	umid.rakhmonberdiev@unodc.org