UN 6th Survey (1995-97): PRISONS data (Questions 13-21) – validation no.2

Introduction

1. Last July I prepared a validation of the 56 responses which had then been received to the prisons data (Part IV of the UN 6th Survey). I have since received from CICP a further nine responses, from Japan, Italy, Belize, Colombia, Kazakhstan, Mauritius, New Zealand, Peru and Canada. This is my commentary on these additional responses.

The new responses

2. JAPAN Information on Q 17 and 18 was not available.

3. ITALY The information on juveniles is given on a separate form from that for adults but the responses appear to be complete and valid.

4. BELIZE I suspect the figures in Tables 16 and 21 refer to all persons admitted during the year. They are more than twice the prison totals I have received from ILANUD which are likely to be reliable. REFER BACK pointing out that these data need to be about a specific day of the year and asking for the day to be specified. If no satisfactory response is received the these figures in Tables 16 and 21 SHOULD BE REJECTED.

5. COLOMBIA (1) No information on juveniles – Q 14 and 15.4- 15.6
   (2) No information on Q 19 and 20
   (3) The figures given in response to Q 21 refer to pre-trial and sentenced prisoners combined (as Chile, Panama, Spain – see para 10c of my earlier note validating the first 56 responses. REFER BACK for information on convicted prisoners only, as intended.

6. KAZAKHSTAN (1) The answers to Q 13.1 and 13.2 (number of adult prisons and capacity) omit pre-trial institutions. REFER BACK for total including these. [I know from a UN mission to Central Asia that in 1996 there were 19 pre-trial institutions with a capacity of about 16,000.]
   (2) The answers to Q 16.1 are impossibly low and MUST BE REJECTED. REFER BACK with careful explanation of what Q 16 requires.
   (3) For Q 18 numbers are given but the question requires averages. REFER BACK or make deductions from data given.
   (4) Q 19. I don’t think Kazakhstan has probation. Is the Russian translation of the question right? Also, the numbers fluctuate implausibly between 1995, 1997 and 1998. REJECT
   (5) No answer given to Q 20.
7. **MAURITIUS**  Q 19 gives totals, for 1995 only, of persons on probation during the year, not the number on probation on a selected day. ?REFER BACK.

8. **NEW ZEALAND**  
   (1) No information on Q 15.  
   (2) Q 14 reports 4 prisons for juveniles and 93 places but Q 21.7 – 21.9 gives no information on juvenile convicted prisoners. ? REFER BACK for explanation.

9. **PERU**  No answers given to Q 14, 15, 19 and 20.

10. **CANADA**  No answer given to Q 21.

**Referrals back – Europe**

11. I wrote to Sami last Autumn with the results of my referrals back in respect of European countries. I have further news about Estonia, Hungary and Norway.

12. **ESTONIA**  I undertook to refer back about the capacity of the prisons. The Estonian Prison Administration reports that the capacity of adult prisons (Q 13.2) was 4,164 at 31.12.95 and 4,824 at 31.12.97. The capacity of juvenile prisons was 250 both at 31.12.95 and at 31.12.97.

13. **HUNGARY**  I also undertook to contact the Hungarian Prison Administration about the missing answers to Q 13, 14, 15, 17, and 18. They have faxed me a completed form, a copy of which I will bring with me to Vianna next week.

14. **NORWAY**  The November response from Norway to HEUNI, copied to me, only improves the quality of the prisons data in respect of two details. It corrects 21.2 for 1997 from 1406 to 1409 and it corrects 21.4 for 1997 from 1404 to 1407.

**Tonga**

I have recently received a second copy of the response from Tonga on which I commented last year. This arrived from CICP. It seems to be a re-typed version on plain paper of what Tonga sent on the original form. The problems with the data, to which I referred, have not been dealt with but this re-typed version introduces two new errors which I mention lest they get onto the database. Q21.3 for 1997 should read 221, as Tonga reported, and Q 21.6 should read 220.
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