

**Data sources for outcome indicators
on Article 5:**

Right to equality and non-discrimination



**UNITED NATIONS
HUMAN RIGHTS**
OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER

ADVANCE VERSION

© 2020 United Nations

The *Data Sources Guidance* is a component of the [SDG-CRPD Resource Package](#) developed by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). This is an advance version of the SDG-CRPD Resource Package. A final version will be issued upon completion of OHCHR review processes.

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this guidance do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a figure indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

The *Data Sources Guidance* was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of OHCHR and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.



5.16 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 (SDG indicators 10.3.1/16.b.1), disaggregated by sex, age and disability.

Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries.

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

The source for this indicator is household surveys, such as Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), victimization surveys and other social surveys. The metadata for 16.b.1 recommends that the interviewer provides a brief definition of discrimination or harassment followed by two questions to be included on surveys:

- Question 1: In [COUNTRY], do you feel that you personally experienced any form of discrimination or harassment during the last 5 years, namely since [YEAR OF INTERVIEW MINUS 5] (or since you have been in the country), on the following grounds?
- Question 2: In [COUNTRY], do you feel that you personally experienced any form of discrimination or harassment during the past 12 months, namely since [MONTH OF INTERVIEW] [YEAR OF INTERVIEW MINUS 1], on any of these grounds?

Australia

In the [2015 Survey of Disability, Ageing and Carers](#), conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, respondents were asked the following:

- “In the last 12 months do you feel that you have experienced discrimination or have been treated unfairly by others because of your condition/s?” For those who responded ‘yes’, a follow up question was asked: “Who treated you unfairly or discriminated against you because of your condition/s?” A list of possible options was provided.
- In the last 12 months have you avoided situations because of your condition(s)?” Again, those who responded ‘yes’ were asked the following question: “What situation(s) did you avoid because of your condition(s)?” A list of multiple responses was provided.”

The report found that, in 2015, approximately 8.6 per cent of persons with disabilities reported experiencing discrimination in the previous year. A considerably higher proportion, 31 per cent, reported an instance of avoidance due to an underlying disability. Viewing these prevalence rates across the life course, there was a clear age pattern in both perceived discrimination and avoidance. Prevalence rates were high between ages 15 to 44 years, declining from 45 to 65 years, and low and stable from 65 years onwards.

5.17 Number and proportion of reasonable accommodation requests granted in the public sector, disaggregated by sex, age and disability.

Level 3: Indicator for which acquiring data is more complex or requires the development of data collection mechanisms which are currently not in place.

If a country has a centralized accommodation fund, or if there is an accommodation fund at a subnational level, then it would be theoretically possible to use administrative data to report on who received accommodations. However, a report could not be found covering all accommodation made throughout the public sector. One option would be to survey public sector employees.

Additionally, in some countries, certain sectors do keep track of such accommodations. In the United States of America, for example, private employers must retain records of accommodations for one year and educational institutions and local and state governments must retain them for two years. Theoretically, these records can be [reported to the U. S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission](#) to be aggregated and tracked.

5.18 Proportion of population below the international poverty line, by sex, age, employment status, geographical location (urban/rural), (SDG indicator 1.1.1) and disability.

Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries.

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

The World Bank obtains poverty data through country specific programs, including technical assistance programs and joint analytical and capacity building activities. The World Bank has relationships with NSOs on work programs involving statistical systems and data analysis. Poverty economists from the World Bank typically engage with NSOs broadly on poverty measurement and analysis as part of technical assistance activities. Within the World Bank, the Global Poverty Working Group (GPWG) is in charge of the collection, validation and estimation of poverty estimates. GPWG archives the datasets obtained from NSOs and then harmonizes them, applying common methodologies.

A variety of Household Income and Expenditure Surveys (HIES) and Living Standard Measurement Studies have data on disability. Currently, the World Bank is compiling how disability is dealt within all of the data instruments that they support. This list will be available before the end of 2020.

As an example, using data from the Malawi Integrated Household Survey 2010/11, the United Republic of Tanzania National Panel survey 2010/11, and the Uganda National Panel survey 2009/10, it is possible to calculate the proportion of households below \$1.90 per day, presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Share of households below \$1.90 per day by Disability Status (%)

	Malawi	United Republic of Tanzania	Uganda
Severe Disability	64%	20%	57%
Moderate Disability	52%	12%	46%
No Disability	53%	12%	45%

Source: Sophie Mitra “Prevalence of functional difficulties” in *Disability, Health and Human Development* (New York, Palgrave MacMillan, 2018), Table 4.6; see <https://www.palgrave.com/gp/book/9781137536372>

Note: “severe” and “moderate” correspond to the author’s definition related to the degree of difficulty doing basic activities

5.19 Proportion of population below the national poverty line, by sex, age (SDG indicator 1.2.1) and disability

Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries.

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

National poverty estimates are typically produced and owned by country governments, sometimes with technical assistance from the World Bank and UNDP. Upon release of the national poverty estimates by the government, the Global Poverty Working Group of the World Bank assesses the methodology used by the government, validates the estimates with raw data whenever possible, and consults the country economists for publishing. Accepted estimates, along with metadata, are published in the WDI database as well as the Poverty and Equity Database of the World Bank.

Another source is World Bank’s Poverty Assessments. The World Bank periodically prepares poverty assessments of countries in which it has an active program, in close collaboration with national institutions, other development agencies, and civil society groups, including poor people’s organizations. Poverty assessments report the extent and causes of poverty and propose strategies to reduce it. The poverty assessments are the best available source of information on poverty estimates using national poverty lines. They often include separate assessments of urban and rural poverty.

A variety of HIES and Living Standard Measurement Studies have data on disability. Currently, the World Bank is compiling how disability is dealt within all of the data instruments that they support. This list will be available before the end of 2020.

Some examples of countries that have reported on this indicator, taken from the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (2018) report “Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific”, follow in Table 2. The data sources are from Georgia (Integrated Households Survey, 2015); Indonesia (Susenas, 2012); Macao, China (administrative data from the Social Welfare Bureau, 2016); Mongolia (Socioeconomic Household Survey, 2014); and Republic of Korea (Survey of Household Finances and Living Conditions, 2015).

Table 2: Percentage of persons living under the national poverty line, by disability status and sex

	Persons with Disabilities			Persons without Disabilities		
	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes
Georgia	25.2%	22.6%	24.0%	20.3%	19.6%	19.9%
Indonesia	18.4%	19.4%	18.9%	14.3%	14.6%	14.5%
Macao, China	11.5%	10.9%	11.2%	0.9%	1.1%	1.0%
Mongolia	26.8%	27.0%	26.9%	21.3%	21.4%	21.4%
Republic of Korea	33.2%	36.2%	34.5%	11.0%	14.8%	12.9%

Source: United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, *Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific* (2018)

5.20 Proportion of population living in households with access to basic services (SDG indicator 1.4.1) disaggregated by sex, age and disability

Level 2: Indicator that could be produced with straightforward additions or modifications to existing data collection efforts.

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

The SDG metadata defines this as having access to the following services: “drinking water, sanitation, hygiene facilities, electricity, clean fuels, mobility, waste collection, health care, education, and broadband internet”

The main sources of data for this indicator are censuses, administrative data, and household surveys including Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), HIES, MICS and others by the

World Bank, UNICEF and UNDP. These data sources are also described in the various meta-data for the constituent SDG indicators.

The latest round of the MICS includes questions on disability. The DHS has an optional module with disability questions. Currently, the World Bank is compiling how disability is dealt within all of the data instruments that they support. This list will be available before the end of 2020.

While no examples of countries reporting on this indicator could be found, it would be straightforward to do so for countries using the DHS optional module or other surveys that collect information on disability, as well as on basic services. For example, the Uganda DHS 2016 includes the measures of drinking water, sanitation, wealth, hand washing, household population and composition, educational attainment and school attendance. The survey also includes the Washington Group Short Set on Disability and can be found at <https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-FR333-DHS-Final-Reports.cfm>. An analyst would need to recode the variables and create a cross-tabulation by age, sex and disability.

5.21 Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure (SDG indicator 1.4.2) and disability

Level 2: Indicator could be produced with straightforward additions or modifications to existing data collection efforts.

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

Indicator 1.4.2 is composed of two parts: (A) measures the incidence of adults with legally recognized documentation over land among the total adult population; while (B) focuses on the incidence of adults who report having perceived secure rights to land among the adult population. Part (A) and part (B) provide two complementary data sets on security of tenure rights, needed for measuring the indicator.

Part A is computed using national census data or household survey data generated by the national statistical system and/or administrative data generated by land agency (depending on data availability).

Part B is computed using national census data or household survey data that feature the perception questions globally agreed through the EGMs and standardized in a module with essential questions discussed in section 5.1.1).

Administrative data are routinely produced by land administration institutions. The 116 countries reporting having electronic land information systems, can generate the required

data at a low cost on a routine basis, and at high levels of disaggregation, once the queries for the SDG dashboard are put in place.

Nationally representative multi-topic household surveys have collected land related data in many countries. These provide information, separately for residential and non-residential land, on (i) the share of individuals with legally documented rights; and (ii) the share of individuals who perceive their rights to be secure. Nationally representative household surveys will also provide data on two other key elements, namely (i) reported type of documentation and (ii) perception of tenure security by tenure type and other disaggregation discussed above.

For example, DHS asks if the respondent owns a house or land. If yes, the respondent is asked if there is a title or deed and if their name is on the title/deed, as can be seen in the example for women aged 15/49 in Table 3. The DHS reports the data by gender, age, urban/rural, region, wealth quintile and disability, but not by disability status. Questions on disability are included in the Malawi DHS, at http://www.nsomalawi.mw/images/stories/data_on_line/demography/mdhs2015_16/MDHS%202015-16%20Final%20Report.pdf, so the relevant data disaggregated by disability could be computed.

Table 3: Among women age 15-49 who own a house, per cent distribution by whether the house owned has a title or deed and whether or not the woman’s name appears on the title or deed

	House	Land
Number of women who own a house/land	14,509	14,163
Women’s name is on the deed	3%	2%
Women’s name is not on the deed	3%	2%
House/land does not have a title or deed	93%	96%

Source: Malawi DHS (2015-16), Tables 16.5.1 and 16.6.1; See http://www.nsomalawi.mw/images/stories/data_on_line/demography/mdhs2015_16/MDHS%202015-16%20Final%20Report.pdf

5.22 Average hourly earnings of female and male employees, by occupation, age and persons with disabilities (SDG indicator 8.5.1)

Level 2: Indicator could be produced with straightforward additions or modifications to existing data collection efforts.

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

There are a variety of possible sources of data on employees’ earnings. Establishment surveys are usually the most reliable source, given the high accuracy of earnings figures

derived from them (the information typically comes from the payroll, so is precise). However, the scope of these statistics is limited to the coverage of the establishment survey in question (usually excluding small establishments, agricultural establishments and/or informal sector establishments).

Household surveys (and especially labour force surveys) can provide earnings statistics covering all economic activities, and all establishment types and sizes, but the quality of the data is highly dependent on the accuracy of respondents' answers.

Data on earnings could also be derived from a variety of administrative records.

ILO hosts data from force surveys and provides relatively easy access to pre-tabulated data on “Mean nominal monthly earnings of employees by sex and occupation (local currency).”

Some of the surveys include disability questions, but ILO does not have a pre-tabulated table for this information. A table from for Spain (ESP - ES - Encuesta Anual de Estructura Salarial in 2015), is reformatted below, in table 4. ILO could report this table by disability status for countries which include disability within their labour force survey.

Table 4: Mean nominal monthly earnings of employees by sex and occupation (local currency), Spain, 2015

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
Total	€ 1,894	€ 2,122	€ 1,644
1. Managers	€ 4,134	€ 4,399	€ 3,604
2. Professionals	€ 2,889	€ 3,213	€ 2,656
3. Technicians and associate professionals	€ 2,298	€ 2,485	€ 1,997
4. Clerical support workers	€ 1,787	€ 2,053	€ 1,651
5. Service and sales workers	€ 1,330	€ 1,608	€ 1,144
6. Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers	€ 1,329	€ 1,330	€ 1,326
7. Craft and related trades workers	€ 1,724	€ 1,764	€ 1,302
8. Plant and machine operators, and assemblers	€ 1,802	€ 1,845	€ 1,518
9. Elementary occupations	€ 1,038	€ 1,301	€ 881
10. Armed forces occupations	€ 2,107	€ 2,196	€ 1,579

Source: ILO, ESP-ES – Encuesta Anual de Estructura Salarial (2015)

5.23 Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities (SDG 8.5.2)

Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries.

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

The preferred official national data source for this indicator is a household-based labour force survey. In the absence of a labour force survey, a population census and/or other type of household surveys with an appropriate employment module may also be used to obtain the required data. It is important to note that unemployment data derived from employment office records or unemployment registers would not refer to unemployment (as defined for the purposes of this indicator, using the three-criteria of being without a job, seeking employment and available for employment) but to registered unemployment, and thus, it would not be comparable with indicator 8.5.2.

Collection process:

The ILO Department of Statistics sends out its annual questionnaire on labour statistics to all relevant agencies within each country (national statistical office, labour ministry, etc.) requesting for the latest annual data available and any revisions on numerous labour market topics and indicators, including many SDG indicators. Indicator 8.5.2 is calculated from statistics submitted to the ILO via this questionnaire as well as through special agreements with regional and national statistical offices or through the processing of microdata sets of national labour force surveys.

The following table presents data from Armenia's Labour Force Survey which fulfils this indicator.

Table 5: Armenia SDG indicator 8.5.2 - Unemployment rate by disability status (%)

	<i>All</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
Total	19.0%	17.8%	20.4%
With disability	19.0%	17.7%	20.7%
Without Disability	17.8%	20.7%	13.3%

Source: ILO, ARM – LFS – Household Labour Force Survey (2018)

5.24 Proportion of people living below 50 per cent of median income, by age, sex and persons with disabilities (SDG indicator 10.2.1)

Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries.

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

Data of income or consumption comes from nationally representative household surveys or assessments of income or consumption distributions, typically carried out and overseen by National Statistical Offices (NSOs). After some quality control and harmonization the data is available through PovcalNet, the World Bank online tool for global poverty and inequality measurement. However, this source does not provide disaggregation by disability.

The Chad Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys – MICs Enquête Démographique et de Santé et à Indicateurs Multiples au Tchad – includes questions on income and disability. The report based on the survey, available at <https://www.dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR317/FR317.pdf>, presents disability prevalence by income quintile, as can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6: Proportion of the population of households with a person with disability, by certain sociodemographic characteristics. Chad, 2015

Disability prevalence by income quintile	
Lowest quintile	31%
Second quintile	20%
Third quintile	17%
Fourth quintile	16%
Highest quintile	15%

Source: Institut National de la Statistique, des Études Économiques et Démographiques (INSEED), Ministère de la Santé Publique (MSP) et ICF International, *Enquête Démographique et de Santé et à Indicateurs Multiples (EDS-MICS 2014-2015)* (Rockville, Maryland, USA : INSEED, MSP et ICF International, 2014-2015), table 16.3

5.25 Coverage by essential health services (defined as the average coverage of essential services based on tracer interventions that include reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health, infectious diseases, non-communicable diseases and service capacity and access, among the general and the most disadvantaged population) (SDG indicator 3.8.1), disaggregated by sex, age and disability.

Level 2: Indicator could be produced with straightforward additions or modifications to existing data collection efforts.

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

Many of the tracer indicators of health service coverage are measured by household surveys. However, administrative data, facility data, facility surveys, and sentinel surveillance systems are utilized for certain indicators. Underlying data sources for each of the 14 tracer indicators are explained in more detail in Annex 1 of the metadata.

In terms of values used to compute the index, values are taken from existing published sources. This includes assembled data sets and estimates from various UN agencies, as explained in more detail in the metadata.

The mechanisms for collecting data from countries vary across the 14 tracer indicators, however in many cases a UN agency or interagency group has assembled and analyzed relevant national data sources and then conducted a formal country consultation with country governments to review or produce comparable country estimates. For the UHC service coverage index, once this existing information on the 14 tracer indicators is collated, WHO [World Health Organization] conducts a country consultation with nominated focal points from national governments to review inputs and the calculation of the index. WHO does not undertake new estimation activities to produce tracer indicator values for the service coverage index; rather, the index is designed to make use of existing and well-established indicator data series to reduce reporting burden.

Summarizing data availability for the UHC service coverage index is not straightforward, as different data sources are used across the 14 tracer indicators. Additionally, for many indicators comparable estimates have been produced, in many cases drawing on different types of underlying data sources to inform the estimates while also using projections to impute missing values. Based on the underlying data sources for each of the tracer indicators (i.e., ignoring estimates and projections), the average proportion of indicators used to compute the index with underlying data available since 2010 is around 70% across countries globally.

For countries that already have disability information in their source data, it is a simple matter of disaggregating the indicator. However, no countries were found to have done it.

Note that this indicator does not cover support services, which are covered by other indicators.

5.26 Proportions of positions (by sex, age, disability and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions (SDG 16.7.1)

Level 3: Indicator for which acquiring data is more complex or requires the development of data collection mechanisms which are currently not in place.

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

The multiple data points pertaining to the parliamentary sub-component of indicator 16.7.1 will be compiled by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) based on information gathered in its New PARLINE database on national parliaments:

The IPU already collects data from secretariats of national parliaments on an ongoing basis for New PARLINE, which can provide data on members and speakers. The Platform already provides up-to-date and disaggregated data on the following positions:

- Members: data disaggregated by sex and age.
- Speakers: data disaggregated by sex and age.
- Chairs of permanent committees on Human Rights and Gender Equality: data disaggregated by sex and age.

Data on age and sex of Chairs of permanent committee on Foreign Affairs, Defense and Finance: Data on the sex and age of Chairs of permanent committees on Foreign Affairs, Defense and Finance New Parline, will be added to Parline in 2020. This is building on the successful attempt made by the IPU in 2011 to collect sex-disaggregated data on committee Chairs, broken down by area of competence (see IPU, Gender-sensitive parliaments, 2011).

In the immediate future, data on the disability and population group status of individual members will not be collected: (1) such characteristics are very rarely tracked by parliaments in a systematic way; (2) confidentiality and data protection concerns are likely to make such data collection challenging, if not legally impossible; (3) data on the representation of persons with disabilities or various population groups will likely be of limited potential use aside from reporting on this indicator.

Instead, lists of electoral or constitutional provisions guaranteeing representation of persons with disabilities and various population groups in parliament are already compiled in the New PARLINE database (see ‘Reserved seats and quotas’ section) and will be used to report on this indicator.

In the future, it is recommended that the ‘Inclusion Survey’ (see Annex in metadata) be considered by the IPU’s network of national parliaments. In this survey, each member is asked to self-report on (1) levels of difficulty in performing activities in five core functional domains – namely seeing, hearing, walking, cognition and communication (the ‘Inclusion Survey’ is an adapted version of the standardized Short Set of Questions on Disability elaborated by the Washington Group), and (2) his/her affiliation to a national, ethnic, religious or linguistic minority group, or to an indigenous or occupational group, in keeping with the UN principle of self-identification with regards to indigenous peoples and minorities.

Given the potential sensitivity of disclosing information on population groups and disability, declaring and being transparent as to which body is the sponsor of the Inclusion Survey can make respondents more comfortable. It is important for the sponsor to be a neutral entity, independent from the employer institution, with the capacity to protect the confidentiality of survey respondents. In this regard, organisations such as the Inter-Parliamentary Union or National Statistical Offices are particularly well-positioned to administer the Inclusion Survey in national parliaments, and to perform subsequent data analysis.

According to [Parline](#), 41 countries have reserved seats and quotas for at least one of these groups: women, indigenous peoples, minorities, youth, persons with disabilities or others. A review of this data yielded the following countries had seats reserved for persons with disabilities, available in table 7.

Table 7: Number of seats reserved for persons with disabilities, by legislative bodies and country

Country	Legislative body	Number of seats reserved for persons with disabilities
Afghanistan	House of Elders	2
Kenya	Senate	2
Rwanda	Chamber of Deputies	1
Uganda	Parliament	5
Zimbabwe	Senate	2

Source: Inter-Parliamentary Union, “Parline – global data on national parliaments”, 2020