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I. Summary

This document synthesizes the results of the Country Analytical Reports (CARs) prepared by eighteen National Statistical Offices (NSOs) from the Europe and Central Asia region, submitted to UNICEF, in 2018. The countries that submitted reports included Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo (UNSCR 1244), Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

The primary goal of this Summary Note is to capture the status and the progress that NSOs in these countries have made towards age- and sex-disaggregated reporting of nineteen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) indicators—selected as specifically relevant to children, adolescents and/or youth in the ECA region. The selection of the indicators was intentionally multi-sectoral, offering a broad view of whether the national statistical offices have advanced in developing data sources, collecting and disaggregating the (nineteen) SDG indicators, as well as to indicate areas of inconsistency and data gaps in this reporting.

The key results of the CAR can be summarized as follows:

- In general, countries have made some progress in identifying data sources and data gaps for reporting on the 19 selected indicators. The leadership of the SDG indicator nationalization process is usually delegated to a government ministry, while the NSOs are typically responsible to look for the availability of adequate data to report on the SDG indicators, and for providing the data on the indicators for which the NSO is responsible.

- Virtually all countries use the UN definition of ‘child’ (0-17 years) in their statistical reporting. Of the countries that have provided feedback, only four have a definition of ‘adolescent’\(^1\) in use, and the definition of ‘youth’ varies widely across countries as well as within countries, with differing definitions in use across the national statistical offices and line ministries.

- Amongst the 19 indicators studied, data on health, mortality, labor market, SDG indicators such as suicide and road traffic mortality rates, adolescent birth rate, and the share of youth not in employment, education or training, are the most promising indicators with respect to age- and sex-disaggregated reporting by most countries, with consistent definitions in available data in almost all countries.

- Poverty-related SDG indicators are reported in most countries, but the definitions of these indicators vary across countries, e.g. the share of the population with income below the subsistence minimum, the relative poverty rate and the at-risk-of-poverty rate are all in use as a poverty measure in ECA countries.

- Countries that are EU members, or aspire to be EU members, are adopting the EU SDG definitions and methodology which may differ from those used in other ECA countries.

---

\(^1\) Recognizing that the process of transitioning from childhood to adulthood is influenced by context and environment, as reflected in the wide variation in cultural expectations of adolescents in national legislations, the CRC General Comment 20 does not seek to define adolescents but focuses on the period of childhood from 10 until the 18\(^{th}\) birthday to facilitate consistency in data collection and reporting.
and/or may differ from UNICEF’s recommended practices. An example is the indicator used for multidimensional poverty (SDG 1.2.2): EU countries use the ‘at-risk-of-poverty or social exclusion rate’ whereas UNICEF recommends the use of methods such as the Multiple Overlapping Deprivations Analysis\(^2\) (MODA) or the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI).

- Disaggregation by five-year age group needs to be promoted for several of the selected SDG indicators under the current data gathering processes.
- Countries are encountering challenges in providing some of the education-related SDG indicators (4.3.1 and 4.6.1) because current data collection instruments for measuring the necessary concepts (participation rates in non-formal education training; proficiency in literacy and numeracy) are lacking.
- The largest data gaps by far are for SDG indicators related to the prevalence of violence, harassment and discrimination. Many countries have no data source for these measures or use a data source that is not entirely appropriate for measuring prevalence (such as administrative data based on reported crimes), or have conducted a one-time only survey on Violence Against Women, or household population surveys such as the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) or the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), with uncertain plans for future implementation of such surveys. It should be noted, however, that the existing methodologies for indicators under SDG Goals 10 and 16 acknowledges the limitations and challenges in collecting and reporting the data, whereas the indicator 11.7.2, selected under goal 11, is still classified as a Tier 3 indicator\(^3\).
- Resource constraints in implementing household surveys, typically a good source of age/sex disaggregated data, is a common problem reported across many CARs.
- A number of countries note that fielding of household surveys such as the SILC, MICS and DHS surveys is a complex and difficult task, and request methodological assistance and more ‘lessons learned’ from other countries that have successfully implemented these surveys.
- Several countries are using new data sources to fill in SDG data gaps, for example Bulgaria and Georgia are using PISA surveys to measure proficiency in literacy and numeracy, and Armenia has applied the MODA methodology to measure multidimensional poverty.

These results and further details are contained in this document. A final point to stress is that these results reflect only the situation in the eighteen countries that replied to the Country Analytical Report questionnaires, which look solely at a selected set of SDG indicators.

---


\(^3\) No internationally established methodology or standards are yet available.
II. Introduction

One of the foundational principles of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is to reduce inequities across countries and across groups of individuals. This core goal is articulated in the SDG phrase “No one left behind” making explicit that the benefits of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development should extend first and foremost to the most disadvantaged children and families in today’s world. The promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls is given high priority and is both a stand-alone SDG goal (5) and mainstreamed across a number of SDG targets and indicators.

Reducing equity gaps requires that policymakers are able to identify the most disadvantaged and vulnerable populations in their country. In many countries this task is difficult due to a lack of disaggregated data: country-level averages of poverty rates, educational attainment, and health outcomes mask large disparities in these indicators by age, sex, ethnicity, disability status and other groupings. Data disaggregated by sex is necessary to monitor progress toward gender equality and identify any gender-based differences in progress toward achieving the goals. Disaggregation by age is critical for tracking inequalities in the SDG process that may emerge for younger children and adolescents.

The first step in identifying those most in need towards ensuring that the benefits of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development extend to all is to improve data collection and disaggregated reporting. As stated in the UNICEF publication Is Every Child Counted?: “The SDGs can only deliver on the promise of equity if the world knows which children and families are thriving and which are being left behind, both at the launch of the Agenda and throughout its implementation.”4

The SDGs recognize the importance of disaggregated data collection and reporting by including this as an explicit target in Goal 17:

Target 17.18: By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts.5

This document combines the information provided in eighteen Country Analytical Reports, aims to identify gaps and challenges that countries face to report on the SDGs relevant to children, adolescents and youth. In particular, it looks at the capacity of the national statistical systems to generate age- and sex-disaggregated data on nineteen multi-sectoral SDG indicators relevant to children, adolescents and youth. In addition, it seeks to identify data gaps, as well as inconsistencies in definitions and/or other factors that impede reporting on the selected SDG indicators.

Methodology

UNICEF reviewed the SDG indicator list to identify those most relevant to children in the ECA region. Nineteen SDG indicators, under nine different goals, were selected to reflect a cross section of targets of fundamental importance to the well-being of children, adolescents and youth, as well as important markers of progress in fulfilling the SDG agenda.

A short questionnaire was developed comprised of two parts. The first part asked three questions regarding the plans and progress each country has made to date in collecting and processing data on the selected SDG indicators in general. The second part of the questionnaire probed more specifically on the availability of sex and age disaggregated data for the nineteen SDG indicators. National Statistical Offices were also asked to describe the official definitions of ‘child’, ‘adolescent’ and ‘youth’ in their countries and to indicate whether these definitions were consistent across ministries and institutions.

A total of eighteen countries submitted reports. Of these reports, fifteen are complete and three reported data and data availability but lacked a written narrative.6

The nineteen SDG indicators requested in the 2018 CAR are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Proportion of population living below the national poverty line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>Prevalence of malnutrition/overweight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 uninfected population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2</td>
<td>Suicide mortality rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.1</td>
<td>Death rate due to road traffic injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.2</td>
<td>Adolescent birth rate (age 15-19 years) per 1,000 women in that age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>Participation rate of youth and adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1</td>
<td>Female/male education parity indices for all education levels (primary, secondary, vocational, higher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1</td>
<td>Proportion of population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6Complete reports were submitted by Albania, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia and Uzbekistan. Incomplete reports were submitted by Azerbaijan, Moldova and Ukraine.
### Number | Indicator
--- | ---
5.2.1 | 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
5.3.1 | Proportion of women aged 20-24 years who were married or in a union before age 15 and before age 18
8.6.1 | Proportion of youth (aged 15-19, 20-24 years) not in education, employment or training
10.3.1 | Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months
11.7.2 | Proportion of persons who were victims of physical or sexual harassment in the previous 12 months
16.1.3 | Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months
16.2.1 | Proportion of children aged 1-17 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month
16.2.3 | Proportion of young women and men aged 18-29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18

### III. SDG Data Collection Overview

The narrative section of the CAR questionnaire asked the National Statistical Offices to identify the ministry or institution(s) responsible for overseeing the development of the country’s SDG indicators, whether progress has been made on defining the national SDG indicators, and the role of the National Statistical Office (NSO) in this process. The questionnaire also asked if the NSO has any role in identifying and defining SDG accelerators.

#### 1. The Role of the National Statistical Offices in SDG Monitoring and Reporting

In general, the National Statistical Offices play a supporting rather than leading role in developing the SDG indicators in the ECA countries. The leadership of the SDG indicator process is typically delegated to a Ministry, such as Foreign Affairs or Sustainable Development, while the National Statistical Office is responsible for database development, assessing the availability of data against selected indicators, and providing the data on the indicators for which it is responsible. None of the National Statistical Offices are involved in identifying SDG accelerators.

More detailed information on the NSO role and the general setup of monitoring and reporting on SDG indicators is provided in the individual country profiles for all countries that have provided this information.  

---

7 Note: Azerbaijan, Moldova and Ukraine did not answer these questions.
2. Definitions matrix

This section explored whether the definitions of ‘child’, ‘adolescent’ and ‘youth’ are consistent across countries and, within countries, whether these definitions are consistent across the national statistical office, ministries and other institutions. Fourteen countries responded to these questions.\(^8\)

**Child:** In all fourteen countries that responded to the definition’s matrix, the national statistical office and/or the relevant ministries all use the same definition of ‘child’ as articulated in CRC Article 1: every human below the age of 18.

**Adolescent:** Most NSOs do not have a standard definition of ‘adolescent’ in use. Among those that do, the definition varies across countries from age 14 to 18 to age 10 to 19. Article 20, for data purposes, suggests that adolescent be defined as 10 up to 18 years of age.

**Youth:** The definition of ‘youth’ is also inconsistent across countries and is sometimes inconsistent within countries, with the NSO using one definition and the line ministries using a different definition. The most common definitions are age 15-24 and age 15-29 although other definitions are in use as well. For statistical purposes, the UN defined youth as those persons between 15 and 24 years old, both included, in the General Assembly resolution 36/28, 1981.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Adolescence</th>
<th>Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSO Others in use</td>
<td>NSO Others in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>- 15-24</td>
<td>15-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>14-18 14-31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>10-19 15-30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- 15-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- 15-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>- 15-17</td>
<td>- 14-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>- 10-19</td>
<td>- 15-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>10-17 14-28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>15-18 (boys)</td>
<td>14-35 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-18 (girls)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>15-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>- 15-24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>15-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>- 14-30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Azerbaijan, Croatia, Slovakia and Ukraine did not provide information on these definitions.

\(^8\) Azerbaijan, Croatia, Slovakia and Ukraine did not provide information on these definitions.
Given these inconsistencies, the Regional Office for ECA might consider urging the National Statistical Offices to adopt a consistent definition of ‘adolescent’ (i.e. the UNSD definition) and ‘youth’ and to implement these definitions in their data reporting.

IV. Availability of Age- and Sex-Disaggregated SDG Indicators

1. Overview

The broad overview provided here illustrates several commonalities across ECA countries in the availability of data for some of these SDG indicators. For a few of the selected SDG indicators, some countries have made good progress in collecting new data that have rarely been reported for this region. For a few other SDG indicators, progress has been much slower and obstacles to collecting these data exist in the form of resource and capacity constraints. In addition, the nationalized versions of some of the indicators differ across countries. An example of this is indicator 1.2.1 Proportion of the population below the national poverty line. Some countries use a relative poverty rate for this indicator, others use an at-risk-of-poverty or social exclusion rate, and still other countries use the share of the population with income below the subsistence minimum. Such differences will make cross-country comparisons of SDG progress difficult unless consistent definitions can be agreed upon and implemented.

For a number of the SDG indicators included in the review, there are expectations that the NSOs will be able to report annual data disaggregated by sex and five-year age group. These promising SDG indicators comprise health- and mortality-related indicators, one of the poverty indicators, and some education- and labor-market indicators. These indicators are routinely collected and reported in many countries, have largely consistent definitions over time and across countries, and will likely pose relatively few problems for future reporting in countries that do not currently collect these data. These are listed below under the heading ‘Most commonly available SDG indicators.’

Despite the promise for these indicators, it should be noted that there are still some countries that do not report on these indicators at all and appear to have no plans to do so in the future.

Aside from these ‘Most commonly available SDG indicators,’ the current and future availability of other SDG indicators is more problematic. For the indicator referring to the share of the population covered by social protection systems, data are collected by many countries in some form, but disaggregation by five-year age group appears to be difficult due to the manner in which the data are collected (described in greater detail below).

By far the most challenging SDG indicators studied here, are those that relate to the prevalence of violence, harassment and discrimination. As described below, many countries have no current data source for these measures and have uncertain plans to mount surveys to collect the necessary data for these indicators. Some countries use administrative data reported by frontline institutions (police departments, social assistance institutions) for indicators of violence against women and/or children. These data do not reflect the prevalence of violence which is
the intended measure in the SDGs. More promisingly, there are countries that have conducted a one-time only survey of VAW or have conducted a MICS or DHS with a violence module, however most of these countries report that they lack the resources to regularly conduct these surveys. In addition, among the countries that have conducted a VAW, MICS or DHS survey, the national statistical offices do not consistently have the capacity and/or resources to disaggregate the data by five-year age groups, although they recognize that this should be possible using the individual-level survey data. It is unclear what the constraint is here, but there are countries that report the violence data for a group of surveyed women (or children) as a whole rather than by disaggregated age groups.

A common theme among the responses to the questionnaires is the difficulty and complexity of fielding household surveys such as the SILC, MICS and DHS surveys. Several NSOs, in their CARs, directly asked for methodological help in relation to the fielding of household surveys and other data collection exercises (particularly Albania, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan). Perhaps the most frequently-repeated comment is that future household surveys, especially VAW, MICS and DHS surveys, are uncertain due to resource constraints.

An additional issue that becomes clear in reviewing the available data is that countries that are EU members, or aspire to EU membership in the near future, are adopting the EU SDG definitions and methodology. These definitions and methodologies may differ from those used in other ECA countries and/or may be inconsistent with the global SDG standard definitions and methodologies. The best example of this is the use of MODA or MPI methodologies which are recommended as a measure of multidimensional poverty (SDG 1.2.2) as opposed to the ‘at risk of poverty or social exclusion rate’ used by countries using the EU SILC surveys for this indicator.

SDG Age Disaggregation: Current Practices and Guidelines

The SDG agenda has revealed the need to support NSOs in providing data disaggregation on the SDG indicators (see for example the Cape Town Action Plan for the SDG data). For SDG indicators that are relevant to the wellbeing of children, age disaggregation is especially important because physical and social development differs markedly across children’s age groups.

Current practice: The reporting of SDG indicators by age is inconsistent across ECA countries (see Appendix 2). This is also true of Eurostat, the World Bank and the OECD which rarely report age-disaggregated SDGs. Even UNICEF’s flagship State of the World’s Children disaggregates few indicators by child age group. For example, the rate of new HIV infections is reported only for children age 5 and under - and children age 15-19. Violent discipline is reported only for children age 1-14, and so on.

Proposed guidelines for age disaggregation: The UN’s Inter Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators has developed preliminary guidelines for SDG disaggregation:

- Each SDG indicator should be treated separately in terms of data disaggregation
- If an internationally established breakdown already exists for an indicator, it is not necessary to change this breakdown to harmonize across SDG indicators
- More detailed IAEG guidelines on age disaggregation are in development.
Also note that for indicators calculated from household surveys or labor force surveys, the national statistical offices correctly state that the samples sizes are often too small to reliably disaggregate the data by single year of age. As a result, this overview primarily focuses on whether the indicators can be reported by five-year age group rather than by single year of age. See Appendix 1, which categorizes the nineteen SDG indicators by the potential for each indicator to be reported in five-year age bands or by single year of age. See the side text box for further information on SDG age disaggregation.

The tables in Appendix 2 summarize the availability of all nineteen indicators for all countries responding to the CAR questionnaire. These tables condense the more detailed information provided by the ECA countries in their CAR questionnaires into a few essential characteristics with respect to the availability of each indicator. This allows some broad conclusions to be drawn regarding commonalities and data gaps, and strengths and weaknesses of existing SDG data collection. More nuanced information about the SDG indicators is provided on the questionnaires filled out by each country.

Appendix 3 provides individual Country Profiles that summarize the CAR responses and data provided for each country that submitted a CAR. The first page of each Country Profile briefly describes the NSO role in developing the SDG indicators and the progress made in providing age- and sex-disaggregated data for the selected SDG indicators. It also highlights one of the selected indicators, 5.3.1 Child Marriage, using data provided by each country. The second page of the Country Profiles is a dashboard/overview of SDG indicator availability that ranks each indicator on whether it is available, partially available or unavailable in each country both national averages and disaggregated by age and sex. In assigning a ranking for the availability of sex- and age-disaggregated data, the following criteria used was: (a) at a country-level, as an aggregate figure reported by the country in the completed CAR; (b) disaggregated by sex and age, whether the minimum set of disaggregation as outlined by the IAEG-SDG was met.\(^9\) Note that the Tier 3 indicator 11.7.2 “Proportion of persons who were victims of physical or sexual harassment in the previous 12 months” is omitted from the dashboard.

2. Most commonly available SDG indicators

The indicators that most countries already report and are either already disaggregated or most likely to be disaggregate by sex and five-year age group, are the following (note that this does not indicate complete reporting by all countries):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Proportion of population living below the national poverty line (but note the differing definitions of ‘national poverty line’ across countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 uninfected population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2 Suicide mortality rate
3.6.1 Death rate due to road traffic injuries
3.7.2 Adolescent birth rate: in most countries reported by single year of age: 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
4.3.1 Participation rate of youth and adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months – although note that one challenge with this indicator is in obtaining measures of participation in non-formal education and training, which are often not included in education surveys.
5.3.1 Proportion of women aged 20-24 years who were married or in a union before age 15 and before age 18
4.5.1 Female/male education parity indices for all education levels (primary, secondary, vocational, higher). Note that all countries that report this indicator report it by education level rather than by age group.
8.6.1 Proportion of youth (age 15-19, 20-24 years) not in education, employment or training

Surprisingly EU countries that reported (Croatia, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Romania) are not able to produce data on child marriage (indicator 5.3.1) – one of the possible explanations might be that they have not conducted surveys or census in recent years. Many of the countries who reported being able to report on child marriage, are able to do so with either MICS or DHS surveys.

3. Indicators that many or most countries are unable to report on currently

The following are the SDG indicators that most countries do not report for various reasons as summarized below.

1.2.2 Multidimensional poverty rate

Only Armenia reports this indicator as a multidimensional poverty measure using UNICEF’s MODA methodology. Other countries use the EU-SILC definition as a relative poverty rate/at-risk-of-poverty measure, which appears to be the same indicator these countries are using as equivalent of indicator 1.2.1 (the proportion of the population below the national poverty line).

1.3.1 Proportion of the population covered by social protection floors/systems

Several countries report this indicator using administrative data on the number of households receiving social welfare payments. For this indicator the current data collection system makes it difficult or impossible to report by sex or age group. Five countries report that the planned future source of this indicator is ESSPROS (Integrated Social Protection System of Eurostat).

4.6.1 Proportion of population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills, by sex
Several countries use Census data for this indicator and report the share of the population by age group and sex that is literate. This measure is not consistent with SDG 4.6.1 which calls for a direct measure of literacy and numeracy skills among youth (and adults) in the population.

Bulgaria and Georgia better approximate the spirit of this indicator using international tests of literacy and/or numeracy. Bulgaria uses PISA scores, specifically the share of 15-year-old students failing to reach level 2 ('basic skills level') on the PISA scale for reading and mathematics for this indicator. Georgia uses a combination of PISA, PIRLS and TIMSS scores for this indicator for various ages or grades (9-10 year olds, 15-year olds; 4th grade; 8th grade; 9th grade) and sex.

A number of countries do not report this indicator at all and provide no information on future plans for this indicator. The MICS, round 6, offers the possibility to measure the foundational learning skills of children 7-14 years old, hence bringing the option of partially reporting to this indicator.

5.2.1 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

Six countries have conducted Violence Against Women surveys which provide data on this indicator, and three countries report data on this indicator from other surveys. None of these data are disaggregated by 5-year age group. As noted in the general comments above, the NSOs appear to be aware that having individual-level data allows for age disaggregation, but they did not disaggregate the data for the CAR. Some countries report that they expect to conduct VAW surveys every 5-6 years, but others report that their ability to field such surveys is dependent on resources. As they are highly resource-constrained, future reporting of this indicator is uncertain. Several countries report that they are relying on planned future surveys for this indicator (and other violence indicators).

10.3.1 Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law.

Almost no countries report on this indicator, and two of those that do use administrative reporting data that are unlikely to reflect the actual prevalence of discrimination or harassment.

11.7.2 Proportion of persons victim of physical or sexual harassment in the previous 12 months

Only one country (Albania) reports this indicator, based on results of a VAW survey. However, the data is incomplete as it refers to women only, and is not disaggregated by age. Croatia reports this using Ministry of Interior data which is unlikely to reflect the actual prevalence of physical and sexual harassment.

16.1.3 Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months.
Only four countries, Albania, Belarus, Croatia and Georgia, report on this indicator. In Albania and Georgia it is reported for women only, not disaggregated by age, based on the results of VAW surveys conducted in those countries. Belarus and Croatia report this using Ministry of Interior data which is unlikely to reflect the actual prevalence of violence among children.

16.2.1 Proportion of children aged 1-17 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month.

About half of the reporting countries provide this indicator for children 2-14 using the most recent MICS or DHS survey conducted. Future reporting depends on resources to continue conducting MICS or DHS surveys. Croatia and Romania report this using administrative data.

16.2.3 Proportion of young women and men aged 18-29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18.

Four countries report this indicator (for women only) based on DHS or VAW survey results. Slovakia reports this indicator using criminal offense data from the Ministry of Interior.

V. Concluding Remarks

The 2018 CAR reports from eighteen countries synthesized in this report provide several lessons and directions for future work in the area of age- and sex-disaggregated reporting of child-related SDG indicators for the national statistical offices of the region.

The first conclusion from this exercise, which sought to look at the extent to which countries can provide disaggregated data on boys and girls of different ages, is that NSOs are simply struggling to collect data on many of the SDGs.

To fill data gaps, some countries have been pro-active in fielding household surveys that provide valuable disaggregated information on SDG indicators, especially on violence against women and children. The prevalence of violence has rarely, if ever, been reported in many countries and the collection of such data is a significant, positive step toward monitoring and ultimately fulfilling the SDGs in this area.

Some countries have been successful in identifying and utilizing new sources of data in other areas to enable SDG reporting. These data sources include household surveys designed to measure multidimensional poverty (Armenia) and the PISA surveys to measure proficiency in literacy and numeracy (Bulgaria and Georgia).

Nationalized SDG indicators can vary widely across countries in terms of their formulation and definitions, making cross-country comparisons of SDG progress difficult or impossible. Amongst the 18 indicators studied, the child, adolescent, youth SDG indicators with the most inconsistent national definitions are those related to poverty and social protection (1.2.1, 1.2.2 and 1.3.1) and
education (4.3.1 and 4.6.1). Other examples include 4.6.1 (direct measure of literacy and numeracy skills) where the nationalized version of the indicator that some countries have adopted – the share of the population who are literate – does not correspond to the recommended SDG indicator. For violence indicators, a number of countries use administrative data on reported crimes which inadequately measures the prevalence of violence.

National statistical offices face resource and/or capacity constraints that make it difficult to disaggregate micro-level survey data by age and sex. Resource constraints are also a significant impediment to regular fielding of household surveys.

These lessons can provide directions for future work and assistance for the national statistical offices in implementing their plans for SDG indicator collection and reporting. In particular, additional resources and methodological assistance for implementing household surveys, particularly those that include modules on violence, would be extremely valuable. Support by partners to NSOs in data analysis, to fully explore age and gender inequities and other dimensions of inequality would also be important.
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Appendix 1: Summary of age-disaggregation possibilities for the SDG indicators

1. SDGs that are already disaggregated by 1-year age group in some countries:

3.7.2  *Adolescent birth rate (age 15-19 years) per 1,000 women in that age group*
For ages 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. Reported by single year of age for all countries except Albania and Kosovo; Montenegro reports the number of births rather than birth rate by single year of age.

4.6.1  *Proportion of population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills*
For countries using PISA scores, reported by single year of age for a limited number of ages (9, 10, 15) or grades (4th, 8th, 9th). Reported by Bulgaria and Georgia.

2. SDGs that are already disaggregated by 5-year age group in some countries:

1.2.1  *Proportion of population living below the national poverty line*
Reported by 5-year age group by Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova, Romania and Slovakia.

1.2.2  *Proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions*
Reported by 5-year age group by Armenia, Romania and Slovakia.

2.2.2  *Prevalence of malnutrition/overweight*
Only for ages 0-59 months. Reported by Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Montenegro and Serbia. Slovakia reports for ages 7-18 in three-year age bands.

3.3.1  *Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 uninfected population*
Only for ages 10-14, 15-19, 20-24. Reported by Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Moldova, Romania and Slovakia.

3.4.2  *Suicide mortality rate*
Only for ages 10-14, 15-19, 20-24. Reported by Armenia, Azerbaijan (total deaths, not death rate), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

3.6.1  *Death rate due to road traffic injuries*
Only for ages 10-14, 15-19, 20-24. Reported by Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan (total deaths, not death rate), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Moldova, Romania and Slovakia.

4.3.1 Participation rate of youth and adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months
Only for ages 15-19, 20-24. Reported by Azerbaijan (formal education only), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia (18-19, 20-24) and Ukraine.

5.2.1 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
Only for ages 15-19, 20-24. Reported by Belarus (20-24), Croatia (administrative data) and Moldova (15-19).

8.6.1 Proportion of youth (aged 15-19, 20-24 years) not in education, employment or training

3. SDGs for which age disaggregation is not relevant or infeasible:

4.5.1 Female/male education parity indices for all education levels (primary, secondary, vocational, higher)
This indicator is disaggregated by education level rather than by age.

5.3.1 Proportion of women aged 20-24 years who were married or in a union before age 15 and before age 18
This indicator is only defined for women age 20 to 24.

4. SDGs for which data are limited; potential for age disaggregation is undetermined at this time:

1.3.1 Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems

10.3.1 Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months

11.7.2 Proportion of persons victim of physical or sexual harassment in the previous 12 months
16.1.3  *Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months*

16.2.3  *Proportion of young women and men aged 18-29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18*