

Report of the Joint Second Meeting of UN-CTS Focal Points and ICCS Technical Advisory Group held in Lima, Peru from 07 – 08 June 2018

I. INTRODUCTION

The meeting took place in the framework of UNODC 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 reviewed the progress made in relation to the United Nations Surveys on Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (UN-CTS) Review and related challenges, existing needs and tools to monitor Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in the areas of crime, violence and access to justice and on the progress made in implementing the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS).

The objectives of the meeting were:

- I. To discuss the contents of the draft ICCS Implementation Manual, which will be disseminated to Focal Points and TAG-ICCS members in advance to the meeting, and to establish the steps required to finalize the Manual
- II. To discuss the progress of ICCS implementation in countries around the world and existing challenges
- III. To discuss the draft guidelines for the use of victimization surveys in reporting on selected SDG indicators in the area of security, violence, access to justice and fear of crime
- IV. To review methodological work on a number of SDG indicators in the area of crime, violence, trafficking and organized crime
- V. To review the experience of Focal Points and data providers with the first round of data collection through the newly revised UN-CTS and to discuss ways to improve the data collection process

II. ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING

A. Opening of the meeting

The joint meeting of UN-CTS Focal Points and ICCS-TAG Members was held in Lima, Peru from 7 – 8 June, 2018. The meeting was opened by Ms. Angela Me, Chief of the Research and Trend Analysis Branch, UNODC, together with Salome Flores, UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence, Didier Dupre, Eurostat and Karen Bozicovich, Organization of American States. Mr. Allen Beck, Senior Statistical Advisor of the United States Bureau of Justice Statistics, was elected by participants as Chairman of the meeting.

B. Attendance

The meeting was attended by over 70 participants from 32 countries and seven International Organizations, including: Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Cabo Verde, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, as well as the UNODC-INEGI Center of Excellence, EUROSTAT, OAS, OHCHR, UNODC, UNDP and WHO (Annex I).

C. Adoption of the agenda

The participants of the Joint Second Meeting adopted the agenda provided in Annex II.

III. OUTCOME OF THE MEETING

A. New methodologies in measuring SDGs in the area of violence, trafficking, corruption, human rights and access to justice

In this session, participants were introduced to new approaches and potential methodologies for measuring indicators for the SDGs, for which established methodologies do not yet exist (so-called Tier III indicators). Ms. Angela Me focused her presentation on a novel approach to estimate the number of victims of trafficking in persons: the multiple systems estimation method (MSE) is based on the capture-recapture method originally developed to estimate the size of animal populations in biology. If two or more independent lists of (at least 75) trafficking victims can be compared to determine the overlap between the lists (those victims who appear in more than one list), the size of the total population can be estimated. The approach has been piloted with data from the Netherlands by the Dutch National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Persons and found feasible. Besides total group size, the estimation produced a number of interesting findings, particularly on the probability of certain sub-groups of victims to be detected and led to a refocusing of Dutch anti-trafficking policy (as it was found that Dutch nationals who are victims of sex trafficking have a lower probability of detection than foreign sex trafficking victims).

The second presentation by Mr. Nicolas Fasel from the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) focused on the efforts of the OHCHR to develop a survey-based measure of discrimination and harassment to produce data for the relevant SDG indicators. Based on a review of existing surveys on discrimination, as well as the 20 grounds of discrimination listed in the Agenda 2030 on SDG indicators, a module for household surveys was developed that includes 2 questions, one on discrimination and one on harassment, each with an introductory lead text. Each module asks whether the respondent had, in the 12 months prior to the survey, experienced discrimination on one of six grounds (sex, age, skin colour/ethnicity/migrant background, disability, religion/belief, socio-economic status) or any other grounds.

Another presentation by Mr. Enrico Bisogno focused on methodological work led by UNODC to develop suitable methodologies to measure indicators on illicit financial flows (IFF), trafficking of firearms and wildlife crime.

The presentations were followed by a brief question and answer session that were able to clarify some issues and provided important feedback to further develop the new methodologies. It was pointed out that

the MSE approach faces the issue of data confidentiality and it requires the regulatory framework and institutional agreement to allow the sharing of data between different agencies and actors in the criminal justice process (e.g. police and NGOs). In this framework, the role of National Statistical Offices was highlighted.

B. The ICCS Implementation Manual: review process

Group 1: Building correspondence tables

This working group discussed national experiences and specific challenges in building correspondence tables and mapping into the ICCS. There was agreement among participants that mapping is an exercise that takes considerable time and effort, as it is not only a matter of comparing the ICCS with the Criminal Code, but also with special laws and administrative regulations, which first need to be identified. The following useful lessons emerged:

- Involve experts with a background in criminal law and have all legal documents ready when starting the mapping process;
- The correspondence exercise can be conducted by a group of people from different agencies and backgrounds;
- Some countries hired a consultant with a criminal justice background who conducted the process. For example, Panama prepared a Correspondence Manual (which could be shared).

As to specific problems in classifying crimes according to the ICCS, particularly with the disaggregation of those crimes, participants mentioned several instances of national criminal codes encompassing various crimes in the ICCS. In this regard, Peru mentioned the case of drug trafficking and South Korea mentioned fraud. To handle such cases, participants emphasized the need to classify the crime at the aggregated level and explore the possibilities of changing the corresponding forms or reports to start capturing the information that would eventually allow for the disaggregation of those crimes. Mapping so-called “borderline cases”, e.g. how to differentiate between intentional homicide, attempted intentional homicide and serious assault, were also discussed. It was mentioned that one of the key words to differentiate serious assault is the concept of recklessness, that is, acting without thinking or caring about the consequences of an action, which should be considered. The group also discussed crimes that can be classified in different ways depending on the characteristics of the crime. An example of this situation was presented regarding abortion: if the abortion is illegal, it is classified as Illegal feticide (0106), but if the abortion was conducted by someone lacking medical skills, it is classified in a different section all together; Acts that endanger health (02071).

This case raises at least 3 issues:

- the importance of understanding the differences and nuances between situations/behaviours that might appear to be similar;
- the importance of really understanding and becoming familiar with the ICCS;
- the key role of the person who classifies the crime.

Group 2: Operationalization of specific disaggregating variables

This working group discussed specific issues related to the determination of situational context and motive of crimes, with a focus on how to disaggregate homicides related to organized crime and gender-based homicides. An important clarification was made on the meaning of disaggregating variables: they are always

meant for statistical purposes and the final outcome of the criminal justice process should not be the main source of information to determine them. At each stage of the CJS process, disaggregating variables should be identified on the basis of available information at that very moment (e.g. for police data, disaggregations are made on the basis of information available at the police level).

In relation to organized crime, it was suggested that a homicide should be considered as OC-related by considering:

1. Characteristics of the Victim (e.g. known by the police as affiliated to OC, also based on previous criminal records, if existing) and/or
2. Characteristics of the perpetrator (e.g. known by the police as affiliated to OC, also based on previous criminal records, if existing) and/or
3. Modus operandi (the way the killing was perpetrated. For example, in case of killing committed by paid perpetrators (called sicariato in America Latina)

More broadly, the general context of the killing should be taken into account, considering also its geographic location and timing.

In terms of the organized crime concept, reference should ideally be made to the definition of organized criminal groups provided by the UN Convention on Transnational Organized Crime or to the concept of organized crime prevalent in the country.

In relation to gender-based homicide, the following elements should be considered to determine the entire range of gender-based killings of women:

1. Victim-perpetrator relationship
 - a. Current or former intimate partner
2. Characteristics of the perpetrator (criminal record)
 - a. Previous record of physical/sexual violence or harassment towards the victim
 - b. Subject to restraining orders for the same reasons
3. Characteristics of the victim
 - a. Women subject to measures of protection by the state (whether there has been a previous analysis of justification by the state)
 - b. Female prostitutes, women accused of witchcraft, etc.
4. Characteristics of the event
 - a. Mutilations of the body
 - b. Killings following sexual violence
 - c. Killings in relation to dowry
 - d. Killing by other family members (not IP) to be included when killing is a form of punishment or reaction to victims' behaviors or choices related to personal, sentimental or sexual life

It was recommended to include a common template to standardize information that should be included on crime reports, starting from information to be collected in relation to intentional homicide. This would facilitate the work of national authorities. In addition, it was recommended to conduct a pilot study on different data sources of the CJS existing at national level. This study should examine the quality and quantity of information produced at the various stages (police, prosecution, judiciary, etc.) in relation to selected crimes and disaggregating variables. Finally, in relation to hate crime, it was recommended that more guidance is provided to collect information on it.

Group 3: Establishing boundaries of the ICCS/Application of counting units and rules

This working group discussed the boundaries of different legal systems and the inclusion of administrative offences in ICCS mapping and gathered information on experiences with counting units and rules in relation to ICCS implementation. It was agreed that more guidance is needed on whether administrative violations should be included in the ICCS implementation mapping process or not, while recognizing that criminal law varies from country to country. It was highlighted that the issue of establishing the boundary between criminal and administrative data pertains mostly to ICCS categories 07 – 11 in offences against the state, regulatory and procedure, where regulatory systems handle sensitive information which could turn cases into criminal offences. In relation to this, the group discussed at length the issue of how administrative infractions also become criminal offences later on in the criminal justice system process, with examples from USA, Costa Rica and Bolivia.

Regarding counting units and rules, more examples on the various counting units and rules at each stage of the criminal justice system need to be provided in the manual and how counting units and rules change at each step. There was agreement amongst participants on counting multiple, serial offences as the actual number of criminal acts or events, rather than aggregating them into a single offence (corresponding to the CTS). In general, the rule is applicable but with exceptions, specifically when the crime is too difficult to count, such as acts that are repeated and have the same characteristics (e.g. intimidation, stalking, or harassment). Following the newly provided recommendations on counting units and rules in the CTS, the group mentioned that more work needs to be done to abandon the principal offence rule when counting offences, while recognizing that it is difficult to change the law enforcement method of recollecting all crimes. Participants raised the issue that the total number of convicted persons should be counted in relation to each offence, and not just once, which differs from the preferred counting rule provided in the CTS.

Group 4: Practical challenges and best practices when initiating the ICCS implementation process

This working group discussed the practical challenges and best practices when initiating the ICCS implementation process. Participants emphasized that ICCS national workings groups must incorporate all key national stakeholders, including representatives from the police, prosecution, courts, prisons, statisticians and researchers. It was also indicated that having the involvement of a legal expert is key during the mapping process. Convincing key partners for the need for change and the implementation of the ICCS, as well as human resource and budget constraints, are the key challenges when starting the process. Recommendations from the session included focusing on “selling” the value of using the ICCS to all relevant stakeholders as a key starting point and further developing awareness using strategies incorporated in the manual. It was suggested that a commission to coordinate all criminal justice institutions would be most beneficial, while providing options for consultation on crime statistics according to the ICCS - nationally and internationally, would raise awareness. Appointing an official expert to map the statistics from each authority into the ICCS could minimize time, while creating specific TORs of each meeting of the national working group would help clarifying the tasks of each actor. Finally, the option of progressive implementation by mapping only certain categories at a time was explored to facilitate the implementation process.

C. The revised UN-CTS: introduction and selected results of first data collection

Group 1: Revised CTS – collecting data on crime

This working group discussed issues related to CTS sections requesting data on crime. With regard to collecting intentional homicide data by ViP, the group discussed that data included in crime records is very useful. In these cases, machine reading systems can be used to extract specific information that can be useful to disaggregate crimes by variables of interest. In other cases, the information can be extracted manually. Alternatively, information can be extracted on a significant sample of cases. Participants highlighted that in some cases, specialised agencies, like the ones on child protection, tax authorities, or environmental agencies, need to be contacted to retrieve relevant information and data on criminal offences and following activities.

It was discussed that administrative records usually collect information on a crime, however, this information is usually recorded manually and hand-written and not systematized. Moreover, in many cases, it is not digitalized. Efforts and investment should be made to overcome this obstacle and be able to extract data from all reports. However, as an intermediate solution, it was encouraged that countries look for alternative methods to extract the information, such as strengthening institutional collaboration between NSOs and specialized investigation units (such as financial, environmental or children attention ones), developing machine learning software, etc. The engagement model should address the specific institutional context of the country.

Regarding the new crimes incorporated in the revised CTS questionnaire, no major concerns were expressed, and many countries shared their progress to report on these variables. However, it was noted that not every country is able to report on all of them. Finally, the working group also addressed the metadata file separately, and concluded that the new format and questions of the metadata are a positive improvement, giving countries the possibility to be more precise.

Group 2: Revised CTS – collecting data on criminal justice systems

This working group discussed issues related to CTS sections requesting data on criminal justice systems. Participants acknowledged that completing the ICCS matrix is not an issue, but that data collection to form attrition rates are confounded by plea-bargaining and other issues inherent to criminal justice system processes. Inconsistencies can also result from the lack of complete data in a given year (e.g. if data are from a different reference years) and from decentralized data collection systems, which needs to be addressed by modernizing criminal justice information systems. Recommendations for this data section included offering a place to provide data retrospectively, and a place to flag inconsistencies. In addition, it was mentioned that adding another variable on persons admitted to prison by offence type would facilitate comparison to those convicted.

The working group also indicated that providing data by the courts on legal representation is challenging, as courts typically do not record such information. In general, it was discussed that in terms of administrative data, information on access to legal representation is rare, while the United States mentioned that such data is collected via prison surveys on persons awaiting trial and entering prison.

The CTS request on the number of unsentenced prisoners held was discussed at length. Participants discussed issues related to double-counting (e.g. if a person leaves prison to go to court and is counted

twice when entering again) and to the dual-status of prisoners (e.g. a person is awaiting trial but is also sentenced for a prior offence). Further guidance is needed on how such cases should be treated.

It was indicated that a cross-section to measure the length of time spent in detention among unsentenced prisoners might not be the best method. Different measures included: a) length of time unsentenced prisoners had served among those who are still in prison (a stock-based calculation), b) length of time expected to be served by prisoners entering prison while unsentenced (a flow-based calculation), and c) a count of unsentenced prison inmates who had served a long time (e.g. 12 months or more; 6 months or more). Other issues with data collection in prisons addressed the differences in adults vs. juvenile status and citizenship status, as many countries expressed that such information is not usually part of admission processes. It was also indicated that it is challenging to collect administrative data on the number of sentenced inmates appealing their sentences. It was recommended to include data on staff capacity and data on prisoners held for sexual violence.

Group 3: Revised CTS Metadata/Preferred counting units and rules

This working group discussed the metadata section of the UN-CTS, how well national data fit into the ICCS categories and whether the metadata section allows countries to reflect discrepancies. The group agreed that the wording of the first question on the homicide inclusions/exclusions in the metadata section needs to be reviewed and clarified. The group drafted two initial proposals: “Are the following offenses covered by separate legislation in your country?”, or, “Are the following separately specified as illegal acts in your country?”. It was also recommended for the sections of inclusions and exclusion options, to add the option “does not apply” and “does not know”. Additionally, in order to clarify the metadata on counting rules for Principle Offence Rules, the group suggested to add a question to the metadata referring to when the data was collected (time). The group indicated that as a focal point, it is difficult to make a judgement on the quality of the data; this should be the responsibility of the provider, while the focal point should assure that the importance of providing the metadata is also understood. The group discussed that ICCS definitions and categories are useful when completing the Data file, and that they are clear, nevertheless some countries had problems while filling them out due to differences in legal definitions, and the fact that the police do not use the ICCS. Regarding the publication of metadata, participants suggested that the metadata should be published on the UNODC webpage and that the CTS 2017 metadata file should be revised again by the countries to make amendments accordingly (due to legislation changes, corrections, etc.). One option raised was to send the metadata file separately from the DATA file.

Furthermore, the role of focal points in the CTS data collection was reiterated in this working group. Latin American countries in particular, raised the issue that the CTS is often sent to institutions other than the CTS focal point, which results in multiple CTS files sent to UNODC without the supervision of the focal point. This is due to the fact that UNODC works with OAS in the region and with the Permanent Mission (who is in touch with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) in the country, who insist that the CTS files are also sent to them, in addition to the focal point. Participants of the group recommended that UNODC send a notice email to the focal point prior to sending the questionnaire, so that the focal point can inform the OAS and MFA that they will be organizing and supervising the data collection ahead of time.

Group 4: How to improve the data collection process and the role of CTS Focal Points

This working group discussed ways to improve the CTS data collection process and communication with national CTS focal points, nationally and internationally. The group highlighted problems when collecting

crime statistics, such as coordination, the lack of formal or informal agreements to share information and the difficulty of establishing and keeping focal points in each institution. Good practices to share are having focal points in each criminal justice institution appointed considering positions and not persons. Also, more UNODC support is needed for raising awareness and helping focal points fully understand why reporting is important and how the data will be used. Stronger communication (starting with a formal letter) should be kept by closely following up with focal points in all countries. Other recommendations were to inform other UN agencies about UNODC activities in each country in order to make easier resource mobilization and provide better support; to establish MoUs amongst institutions to facilitate data sharing; to hold virtual meetings with national and criminal justice focal points; to have higher and technical levels participating in meetings such as this one; and to produce materials to support ICCS/CTS dissemination. OAS and Eurostat were acknowledged as good practices to assist and follow up with countries on the CTS, a similar effort is needed in Africa and Asia. The participation of UN Economic Commissions was discussed; however, the conclusion was that it was good to invite them to UNODC activities, regardless of their possible contributions. About the format, the group expressed that the previous format was easier to fill out because it was divided by institution, they recommended to keep it separate as it was before, and lock cells. A final recommendation of the working group to improve the data collection system and the role of CTS was to develop a CTS and ICCS information package with standard operating procedures at national level (as a practical tutorial about how to complete the CTS) and an induction session for every new appointed focal point.

D. Victimization Surveys and Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicators

During the first presentation, participants were introduced to indicator 16.4.1+, measuring the forms of IFF and organized crime. The framework of building estimates on illegal activities and markets, which was developed at the first IFF expert group meeting, was presented and an example of estimating the extent of drug trafficking was given. Furthermore, methodology developed by UNODC to measure the illicit origin of firearms and the proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or trafficked illicitly was also presented.

During the second presentation, participants were introduced to the SDG indicators sourced from crime victimization surveys, namely SDG 16.1, 16.3, 11.7.

Group 1: Producing SDG indicator 16.1.3 on physical and sexual violence

This working group discussed how to produce data on the proportion of population subjected to physical or sexual violence in the previous 12 months. Participants suggested that threats and attempts should be considered for inclusion in measuring physical assault, since it is important information for decision makers. On robbery, it is also important to measure attempts. On the computation of the SDG indicators, it was suggested that further review work is needed.

Regarding the combining of indicators, it was indicated that these two types of violence are very different and combining them in a single indicator can be misleading, as it would be difficult to interpret. The group shared an example from Mexico, where INEGI combined data on victims of physical assault and victims of sexual crimes. However, the prevalence rate of sexual crimes is very small, between 0.1 percent and 2 percent, which means that the prevalence rate is not representative. It was thus decided that combining physical and sexual violence prevalence rates is difficult (please note the data collection on violence against women has a different approach).

The group recognized the existence of the methodology established by UNODC through the Manual on victimization surveys, which should be used. While in some countries the survey is applied by an electronic way, in Mexico and Argentina, for example, the data collection is face to face. The group discussed what indicator should be reported by the victimization survey and considered it necessary to base this on a statistical point of view. For example, when someone is a victim of three crimes, and it is possible to count crimes and victims, the better choice is to report victims.

Group 2: Producing SDG indicator 16.3.1 on crime reporting rate

This working group discussed how to produce data on the proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms. It was suggested that the reporting mechanisms need to be discussed and not violence itself. Forms of violence include physical assault, victims of robbery, victims of rape and victims of sexual assault.

The group discussed that if the indicator is not produced correctly, it is impossible to know whether the victim had access to justice or not, even though the SDG indicator intends to measure the relation between the experience and reporting of crimes. Participants acknowledged that in some cases, victims report crimes to other institutions, such as in South Africa, where NGOs help victims of sexual violence report to the police. The group discussed the possibility of including other competent institutions linked to the State for crime reporting, e.g. victim support organizations in cases of sexual violence, but even for other crimes. The Social Welfare Office should, for example, be considered to measure reporting of domestic violence. It was thus agreed to include all agencies from the State that have a function to receive reports of crime; NGOs receiving complaints should also be included if they are linked to the State in an official function; Metadata could clarify which authorities are included for the reporting of crime.

The group discussed ways to compute the indicator and suggested that the computation procedure should be included in the metadata to facilitate comparisons. For example, for the reporting rate on violence, how should physical assault, robbery, rape and sexual assault victimization be combined? It was found that the low prevalence and even lower reporting rate of sexual crimes would make this part of the reporting rate almost insignificant in the total. Moreover, the low number of cases picked up in the survey mean that the reporting rates will not be statistically significant. Finally, it was considered necessary to review whether attempted and threatened physical and sexual assault, rape and robbery should be included in the reporting rate for the SDG indicator.

Group 3: Producing SDG indicator 11.7.2 on physical or sexual harassment and psychological violence

This working group discussed how to produce data on the proportion of individuals who were either physically or sexually harassed by someone in the previous 12 months and how to produce data on the proportion of individuals who experienced fear or emotional distress as a result of a person's behaviour in the last 12 months. For sexual harassment, starting from the definition included in the ICCS, it is possible to identify a number of behaviours (e.g. unwanted/inappropriate touching, indecent exposure, inappropriate use of pornographic material, etc.) that can be measured through specific questions. Forms of harassment through social media networks should also be included. Participants had less experience in the measurement of physical harassment, for which specific behaviours need to be identified.

For psychological violence, significant literature and experience exist in the area of measurement Violence against Women. It was proposed to start from those practices and identify specific behaviours/acts that can

be used to identify episodes of psychological violence that can be experienced by persons of both sexes. Specific reference was made to guidelines of UN Statistical Division on measurement of violence against women.

It was recalled that the guidelines should also include recommendations on disaggregations. Besides disaggregation by sex, age, disability status and place of occurrence, another important element is the specification of the victim-offender relationship.

Group 4: Producing SDG indicator 16.1.4 on feeling of safety

This working group discussed how to produce data on the proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area that they live in. The working group recommended not to use the option “I never walk alone at night in my area” in the Likert scale options of response because it could be misinterpreted; it was also recommended to update the option response to “non applicable”. The group discussed about what a neutral option of response means for the general results of a survey and considered that it is not useful. The group recommended to omit this option, subject to further review and discussion. In order to have a more comprehensive understanding of the perception of security, the group recommended to complement the indicator with a question differentiating between the day and night. The group also agreed on the importance of putting the question taken into consideration at the beginning of the perception section of the questionnaire.

The working group also discussed the definition of “the area they live in” and agreed that it could lead to misinterpretation. For this reason, it was recommended to directly refer to “10 minutes walk from where they live”. The working group also suggested including a question of perception of safety around the area you work in. The working group agreed that the question should address the feeling of safety at night, even though this would depend on the presence of light (Northern countries might consider making a note of when the questionnaire was applied). Finally, it was agreed to keep the denominator as the total population.

E. How to assess and improve the quality of crime and criminal justice statistics

In this session, Lucy Ladira, Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, Uganda, and Salome Flores, Director of the UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence, presented two different approaches on how to assess and promote the quality of crime and criminal justice statistics. The first presentation by Lucy Ladira, discussed a national experience of assessing criminal justice systems. Recommendations of the assessment included improving coordination, integrating users in the data production process, determining a minimum required disaggregation, promoting peer-learning experiences, mobilizing funds, establishing a dissemination guidelines, creating a dissemination calendar and updating websites, among others, and national strategies were discussed on how to implement these.

The second presentation by Salome Flores, discussed a regional experience to assess the quality of crime statistics, specifically administrative records. These assessments are conducted based on the fundamental principles of official statistics applied to all stages of the statistical processes in the area of crime and criminal justice.

During the third presentation, participants were introduced to the UNODC homicide data quality assessment framework. This framework will be used to assess three dimensions of data quality: validity, completeness and consistency. It will provide guidance to national authorities for the improvement of homicide data and to communicate it to all data users.

Discussion focussed on various approaches to assessing the quality of data on crime and criminal justice. It was underlined that quality can be improved both by analysing the data production processes of all relevant stakeholders, as well as by considering the quality of data published and assessing their quality on the basis of a number of transparent criteria. It was underlined that these two approaches are complementary and they should both be pursued to enhance data quality and communicate it to users.

Particular attention was devoted to the proposed framework to assess and communicate quality of data on intentional homicide developed by UNODC. Participants discussed its methodology and the sources of information used to produce scores on the various quality dimensions. It was clarified that the dimensions comprised in the framework were selected on the basis of their relevance and feasibility to use transparent, simple and objective methods to compute the related scores.

Participants agreed that the proposed quality assessment framework is a useful and pertinent tool to provide guidance to countries to improve quality of their homicide data and to communicate quality of published data to all data users. It was also suggested to ensure coordination among relevant international and regional agencies to develop a consistent approach to assess quality of homicide data.

F. Next steps and way ahead

a. UN-CTS Focal Points

As next steps, UNODC will work on the comments and recommendations made on the UN-CTS instrument and refine the UN-CTS instrument for 2018. Additional comments from Focal Points will be considered until 15 June. Following this, the revised questionnaire will be sent to translation and the historical time series will be pre-filled, before the new CTS data collection starts.

b. ICCS-TAG Members

UNODC will work on the comments and recommendations made during the working groups on the various parts of the ICCS implementation manual. Additional written comments will be considered until 30 June. A final version will be shared with members of the TAG-ICCS and CTS Focal Points in September 2018, the Manual will be published towards the end of the year 2018. Guidelines for the use of victimization surveys for SDG indicators will be further elaborated and shared with ICCS-TAG members in the second half of 2018 with a request to provide comments and inputs.

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Country	Functional title	Institution	Email
Mariela Budino	Argentina	Undersecretary of Criminal Statistics	Ministry of Security	mariela.budino@minseg.gob.ar
Nicolas Garcette	Argentina	Director of the National Criminal Information System	Ministry of Security	nicolas.garcette@minseg.gob.ar
Tanisha Chavarria	Belize	Statistician	Statistical Institute of Belize (SIB)	tchavarria@mail.sib.org.bz
Edwin Juarez Donaire	Bolivia	Espacialista en Investigacion Economica y Social	Instituto Nacional de Estadistica	ejuarez@ine.gob.bo
Malene Alais Barbosa Almeida	Cabo Verde	Consultant	Instituto Nacional de Estatística de Cabo Verde / Praia City Group Secretariat	malene.almeida@ine.gov.cv
Ge Xiangwei	China	Associate Research Professor	Ministry of Justice of China	xiangweipku@126.com
Wangxin	China	Director of Exchange Division	Ministry of Justice of China	rickking74@163.com
Luisa Fernanda Suarez Leon	Colombia	Coordinador de Regulacion Estadistica	Dep. Administrativo Nacional de Estadistica	lfsuarezl@dane.gov.co
Diego Rodriguez Zumbado	Costa Rica	Estadistico	Organismo de Investigación Judicial	droduguez@poder-judicial.go.cr
Jessica Cárdenas Bohorquez	Costa Rica		National Institute for Statistics and Census	jessica.cardenas@inec.go.cr
Oscar Delgado Cascante	Costa Rica	Coordinador	National Institute for Statistics and Census	odelgado@mj.go.cr
Henrik Bech	Denmark	Head of Division	Danish National Police	hob003@politi.dk
Lorena Moreno	Ecuador	Director of Innovation in Metrics and Methodologies	National Institute for Statistics and Census (INEC)	lorena_moreno@inec.gob.ec

Evaristo Hernandez	El Salvador	Director General	Dirección General de Estadística y Censos (DIGESTYC)	evaristo.hernandez@digestyc.gob.sv
Kimmo Haapakangas	Finland	Senior statistician	Statistics Finland	kimmo.haapakangas@stat.fi
Axel Romero	Guatemala		Ministerio de Gobernación	axelromg@gmail.com
Bessy Aracely Mendoza Coello	Honduras		Statistics	asis.diradjunto@dnii.gob.hn
Miguel Colindres	Honduras	Head of Telematics Statistics Department	Secretaria de Seguridad-Policía Nacional	miguel.colindres@sepol.hn
Maria Giuseppina Muratore	Italy	Senior Researcher, Chief of the Unit	National Institute for Statistics	muratore@istat.it
Leesha Delatie-Budair	Jamaica	Deputy Director General	Statistical Institute of Jamaica	ldelatie-budair@statinja.gov.jm
Renice Bunde	Kenya	Senior officer, Governance, Peace and Security Statistics	Kenya National Bureau of Statistics	rbunde@knbs.or.ke
Robert Buluma	Kenya	Manager in charge of Governance, Peace and Security Statistics	Kenya National Bureau of Statistics	rbuluma@knbs.or.ke
Oscar Jaimes Bello	Mexico	Deputy Director-General of Government Information Policies and National Government Census	National Institute for Statistics and Geography	oscar.jaimes@inegi.org.mx
Junaid Soleman	Pakistan	Assistant Director (UN-II)	Ministry of Foreign affairs	junaidsul181@gmail.com
Aracelis Ivette Camacho de Casanova	Panama	National Director	Directorate of Integrated Crime Statistics (SIEC)	adecasanova@siec.gob.pa ; solyluz7@hotmail.com
Juan Trejo Bedon	Peru	Statistician	National Institute of Statistics and Informatics	Juan.trejo@inei.gob.pe
Luis Calle	Peru	Specialist on data analysis	National Institute of Statistics and Informatics	Luis.caller@inei.gob.pe

Candido Astrologo	Philippines	Assistant National Statistician	Philippine Statistics Authority	c.astrologo@psa.gov.ph
Rosalinda Garcia	Philippines	Supervising Statistical Specialist	Philippine Statistics Authority	r.garcia@psa.gov.ph; rbmagarcia2014@gmail.com
Kes KyungsoonChoi	Republic of Korea	Deputy Director	Statistics Korea	kchoi@korea.kr
Sinho Kim	Republic of Korea	Director	Statistics Korea	ksh7788@korea.kr
Cătălin-Andrei Popescu	Romania	Chief Prosecutor	Prosecutors Office attached to High Court of Cassation and Justice	popescu_catalin_andrei@mpublic.ro
Natalia Y.Sokolova	Russian Federation	Deputy Head, Translation Division	Prosecutor General's Office of the Russian Federation	info@rusmission.org
Oleg A.Insarov	Russian Federation	Deputy Head of the General Department of Organization and Analysis, Head of the Department of the Legal Statistics	Prosecutors General's Office of the Russian Federation	trushkina.o@genproc.gov.ru
Olga A.Trushkina	Russian Federation	Deputy Head of the Department of the Legal Statistics	Prosecutors General's Office of the Russian Federation	info@rusmission.org
Delvin Mathurin	Saint Lucia	Acting Corporal 181	Royal Saint Lucia Police Force	del_181@hotmail.com
Gwen Lehloenya	South Africa	Deputy Director General	Statistics South Africa	isabelsc@statssa.gov.za
Nkoshilo Hosiah Seimela	South Africa	Brigadier	South African Police Service	seimelan@saps.gov.za
Solly Molayi	South Africa	Director of Transport Statistics	Social Statistics Chief Directorate	sollymol@statssa.gov.za
Thulare Norman Sekhukhune	South Africa	Major General	South African Police Service	thulare.sekhukhune@gmail.com
Frank Weideskog	Sweden	Methodologist	The Swedish National Council For Crime Prevention	frank.weideskog@bra.se

Mink Sawasdeepon	Thailand	Project Coordinator for Statistics Programme	Thailand Institute of Justice	mink.s@tijthailand.org
Sudarak Suvannanonda	Thailand	Chief, Statistics Programme	Thailand Institute of Justice	sudarak.s@tijthailand.org
Yodsawadi Thipphayamongkoludom	Thailand	Project Coordinator	Thailand Institute of Justice	yodsawadi.t@tijthailand.org
Hurbert La Rode	Trinidad and Tobago	Sergeant of Police/Crime Records and Information Section	Trinidad and Tobago Police Service	hurbert.larode@ttps.gov.tt
Lucy Ladira	Uganda	Technical Advisor, Criminal Justice	Ministry of justice and constitutional affairs	ladira77@googlemail.com
Mark Bangs	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Deputy Head of Crime Statistics and Analysis Team	Office for National Statistics	mark.bangs@ons.gov.uk
Allen Beck	United States of America	Director	United States Department of Justice / Office of Justice Programs / Bureau of Justice Statistics	allen.beck@usdoj.gov
Ana Karen Padilla Sáenz		Project auxiliary	UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence	karen.padilla@un.org
Angela Me		Director	UNODC	angela.me@un.org
Didier Dupre		Head of Unit Income and Living Conditions, Quality of Life	European Commission, Eurostat	didier.dupre@ec.europa.eu
Enrico Bisogno		Chief	UNODC	enrico.bisogno@un.org
Giada Greco		Victimization surveys technical assistant	UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence	giada.greco@un.org
Karen Bozicovich		Research Officer	OAS	kbozicovich@oas.org
Leonel Perez Lainez		Human development specialist	UNDP/Infosegura	leonel.perez@undp.org
Luis Raúl Delgado Antonio		Project Assistant	UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence	raul.delgado@un.org
Luisa Sanchez-Iriarte Mendoza		Researcher on crime and justice	UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence	luisa.sanchez@un.org

Michael Jandl		Research Officer	UNODC	michael.jandl@un.org
Naty Mireya Huerta Ferrari		Project auxiliary	UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence	naty.huerta@un.org
Nicolas Fasel		Adviser on Human Rights Measurement	OHCHR	nfasel@ohchr.org
Roberto Murguía Huerta		Project Assistant	UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence	roberto.murguia-huerta@un.org
Sadio Harris		Data management, analysis and reporting specialist	UNDP Barbados	sadio.harris@undp.org
Salome Flores Sierra		Research Officer	UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence	salome.flores@un.org
Sarika Dewan		Consultant	UNODC	sarika.dewan@un.org
Stephanie Burrows		Technical Officer	WHO	burrowss@who.int
Teresa Navarrete Reyes		Technical assistant	UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence	teresa.navarete@un.org
Victor A. Tablas		Analyst	UNDP	victor.tablas@undp.org

Joint Second Meeting of UN-CTS Focal Points and ICCS Technical Advisory Group

Lima, 7-8 June 2018

Room: El Paraiso

Centro de Convenciones de Lima

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

AGENDA

Thursday, 7 June 2018

Time	Activity	
BLOCK 1	8:30 – 9:00	Registration
	9:00 – 9:30	Opening Session Welcome and introductory remarks from UNODC, UNODC-INEGI CoE, OAS and Eurostat Objectives of the meeting
	9:30 – 11:00	Session 1– New methodologies in measuring SDGs in the area of violence, trafficking, corruption and access to justice Presentation, Angela Me, UNODC Presentation, Nicolas Fasel, OHCHR Discussion
	11:00 – 11:20	Break
	11:20 – 13:00	Session 2 – The ICCS Implementation Manual: introduction and review Presentation, Sarika Dewan, UNODC <i>Parallel working groups: Review of the draft ICCS Implementation Manual</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Group 1: Building correspondence tables - Group 2: Operationalization of specific disaggregating variables - Group 3: Establishing boundaries of the ICCS/Application of counting units and rules

		- Group 4: Practical challenges and best practices when initiating the ICCS implementation process
	13:00 – 14:00	Lunch
BLOCK 2	14:00 – 16:00	Session 3 - Parallel working groups continued Reports of the ICCS working groups to plenary
	16:00 – 16:20	Break
	16:20 – 18:00	Session 4 – The revised UN-CTS: introduction and outcomes of first data collection Presentation, Michael Jandl, UNODC Presentation, Didier Dupre, Eurostat <i>Parallel working groups: Feedback and Discussion on the Revised CTS</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Group 1: Revised CTS – collecting data on crime - Group 2: Revised CTS – collecting data on criminal justice systems - Group 3: Revised CTS Metadata/Preferred counting units and rules - Group 4: How to improve the data collection process and the role of CTS Focal Points

Friday, 8 June 2018

	Time	Activity
BLOCK 3	9:00 – 10:30	Session 5 – Parallel working groups continued (CTS) Reports of the CTS working groups to plenary
	10:30 – 10:50	Break
	10:50 – 13:00	Session 6 – Victimization Surveys and Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicators Presentation, Enrico Bisogno, UNODC <i>Parallel working groups: Production of specific survey-related SDG indicators (Goals 16 and 11)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Group 1: Producing SDG indicator 16.1.3 on physical and sexual violence - Group 2: Producing SDG indicator 16.3.1 on crime reporting rate - Group 3: Producing SDG indicator 11.7.2 on physical or sexual harassment and psychological violence - Group 4: Producing SDG indicator 16.1.4 on feeling of safety Reports of the SDG indicator working groups to plenary
	13:00 – 14:00	Lunch
BLOC	14:00 – 15:30	Session 7 – How to assess and improve the quality of crime and criminal justice statistics

	<p>Presentation, Lucy Ladir, Uganda Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs</p> <p>Presentation, Salome Sierra, UNODC-INEGI CoE</p> <p>Presentation, Enrico Bisogno, UNODC</p> <p>Discussion on national and international experiences</p>
15:30 – 15:50	Break
15:50 – 17:30	<p>Session 8 – Final discussion and way ahead</p> <p>Discussion on any other issues and the way ahead</p> <p>Finalization of meeting report</p>