



# **Manual to Support National Data Collection on SDG Indicator 16.7.1(c):**

*Proportions of positions in national and local institutions, including (c) **the judiciary**, compared to national distributions, by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups*

UNDP Oslo Governance Centre

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1. Who is this Manual for? .....	4
2. What is this Manual? .....	4
<b>Scope of SDG 16.7.1(c) and main concepts .....</b>	<b>4</b>
3. What does SDG 16.7.1(c) measure?.....	4
4. How does it measure it? .....	5
5. Why is it important to measure representation in the judiciary? .....	6
6. How is the ‘judiciary’ defined for the purpose of reporting on SDG 16.7.1(c)? .....	6
7. What specific courts have to be included in the reporting on SDG 16.7.1(c)?.....	6
8. How are specialized courts or tribunals categorized in the reporting on SDG 16.7.1(c)? .....	7
9. Which specific positions in the judiciary need to be counted when reporting on SDG 16.7.1(c)? .....	8
<b>Disaggregation .....</b>	<b>9</b>
10. What are the disaggregation requirements of SDG 16.7.1(c)? .....	9
11. How can data on judges and registrars be disaggregated by ‘nationally relevant population groups’?.....	10
12. How can data on judges and registrars be disaggregated by disability status? .....	10
<b>Data sources.....</b>	<b>11</b>
13. What sources of data can I consider for reporting on SDG 16.7.1(c)? .....	11
14. What can NSOs do to enhance the harmonization of administrative data collection across different levels of court, and its alignment with SDG 16.7.1(c)?.....	12
15. What data protection considerations need to be applied when sharing judiciary personnel data with an institution maintaining a centralized database or with the NSO? .....	12
<b>Data processing.....</b>	<b>13</b>
16. How do I fill out the first page of the online SDG 16 Data Reporting Platform? .....	13
17. How do I fill out the first table on page two of the online SDG 16 Data Reporting Platform? .....	16
18. How do I fill out the second table on page two of the online SDG 16 Data Reporting Platform? .....	18
19. How do I fill out the third table on page two of the online SDG 16 Data Reporting Platform?.....	18
20. What if the format of the tables on the reporting platform is not appropriate for any given category in my country? .....	20
21. What if disaggregated data is not yet fully available for certain dimensions, or if your country collects more disaggregated data than required by SDG 16.7.1(c)?.....	20
22. What if I need to update previously submitted data? .....	20

This Manual will be periodically reviewed as the indicator is further refined, building from methodological discussions, possible new recommended standards and national experiences in measuring SDG 16.7.1(c).

For assistance in data collecting, processing and computing data for this indicator, or if you have questions around the inputting of SDG 16.7.1(c) data through the [UNDP SDG 16 Reporting Platform](#), please contact [SDG16indicators@undp.org](mailto:SDG16indicators@undp.org) at the [UNDP Oslo Governance Centre](#).

## Introduction

### 1. Who is this Manual for?

This Manual is for national entities involved in the production and compilation of the data needed to report on SDG 16.7.1(c), namely National Statistical Offices (NSOs) and relevant national institutions collecting data on judiciary personnel, such as a Judicial Services Commission or a Ministry of Justice, or other competent bodies maintaining information on the appointments of judges and other positions in the judiciary (often as part of a broader mandate to exert oversight over the judiciary).

While it is expected that NSOs will work closely with the above mentioned data-producing institutions to locate and compile the necessary data for global reporting, it is important to underline that NSOs, as coordinator of SDG statistical reporting in their country, have final responsibility for the validation and accuracy of the data submitted.

### 2. What is this Manual?

This Manual aims to help NSOs and relevant data-producing institutions prepare for the national submission of data on SDG 16.7.1(c). Building on the [metadata](#) for this indicator, this Manual outlines key considerations to keep in mind for global reporting on this indicator throughout the data collection, processing and reporting phases. It is meant as a companion guide to the [UNDP online SDG 16 Data Reporting Platform](#), which NSOs are invited to use to report on SDG 16.7.1(c) (and other SDG 16 indicators).

## Scope of SDG 16.7.1(c) and main concepts

### 3. What does SDG 16.7.1(c) measure?

**Goal 16:** Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

**Target 16.7:** Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels

**Indicator 16.7.1:** Proportions of positions in national and local institutions, including (a) the legislatures; (b) the public service; and **(c) the judiciary**, compared to national distributions, by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups





SDG indicator 16.7.1(c) measures the ‘proportional representation’ (also known as ‘descriptive representation’) of various groups across two key decision-making positions in the judiciary (namely judges and registrars) as well as across three levels of courts, namely supreme/constitutional courts, ‘higher-level courts’ and ‘lower-level courts’.

More specifically, this indicator compares the proportion of women, youth, persons with disabilities and other nationally relevant population groups among judges and registrars to the proportion of these groups in the national population to measure the extent to which the composition of the judiciary mirrors the composition of the national population (insofar as these two positions are concerned).

#### 4. How does it measure it?

SDG 16.7.1(c) compares the representation of a specific group (i.e. women, youth, persons with disabilities and a nationally relevant population group) in the judiciary to the representation of this same group in the national population by calculating a **ratio** whose value can start with 0 meaning no representation, where less than 1 means under-representation, 1 means equal representation, and greater than 1 means over-representation.

The rationale for calculating such normalized ratios, rather than simply reporting the proportion of any given group in the judiciary, can be illustrated with an example. Let's assume that two countries report a proportion of 32% of 'young' judges (aged 44 or younger). This proportion may be an over-representation of youth in country A where only 20% of the national working-age population is aged 44 or younger (Ratio =  $32/20 = 1.6 > 1$ ), but in country B where as much as 40% of the working-age population is 44 or younger, the same 32% would be interpreted as under-representation (Ratio =  $32/40 = 0.8 < 1$ ). In this example, the figure of 32% is not internationally comparable (it means over-representation in one country and under-representation in another), but the ratios 1.6 and 0.8 *are* internationally comparable. They help us understand whether 32% of judges aged 44 or younger is close to, or far from, the share of this age group in the national population.

	<b>Country A:</b> <i>Ageing population</i>	<b>Country B:</b> <i>Youthful population</i>
% of 'young' judge aged 44 years or younger	32% 	32% 
% of working-age population aged 44 years or younger	20% 	40% 
<b>Ratio</b>	$32/20 = 1.6$	$32/40 = 0.8$
<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Ratio &gt; 1: Over-representation</b> of youth among judges	<b>Ratio &lt; 1: Under-representation</b> of youth among judges

Global reporting on SDG 16.7.1(c) requires the calculation of 8 'priority ratios', namely:

- Ratio 1a: Representation of women among judges
- Ratio 1b: Representation of women among registrars
- Ratio 2a: Representation of youth (aged 44 and below) among judges
- Ratio 2b: Representation of youth (aged 44 and below) among registrars
- Ratio 3a: Representation of people with a disability among judges
- Ratio 3b: Representation of people with a disability among registrars
- Ratio 4a: Representation of people belonging to nationally relevant population groups among judges

- Ratio 4b: Representation of people belonging to nationally relevant population groups among registrars

The resulting ratios can be interpreted as follows:

Greater than 1	The representation of [women/youth/disabled people/population group A] is <b>higher</b> in the judiciary than in the working-age population.
1	The representation of [women/youth/disabled people/population group A] is <b>equal</b> in the judiciary and in the working-age population. Parity is also between <b>0.97</b> and <b>1.03</b> .
Between 0 and 1	The representation of [women/youth/disabled people/population group A] is <b>lower</b> in the judiciary than in the working-age population.
0	There is <b>no</b> representation of [women/youth/disabled people/population group A] in the judiciary.

## 5. Why is it important to measure representation in the judiciary?

Understanding the extent to which various population groups are represented in the judiciary (and the extent to which some may be excluded) is important to understand who is influencing judicial decision-making, and to identify what human resources policies and recruitment strategies are needed to make the judiciary more representative. Evidence shows that a more representative judiciary can be an important first step in the judicial reform processes to ensure more equitable judicial outcomes. More inclusive representation can:

- Improve access to justice, by signaling that justice is not the prerogative of any particular group;
- Improve the quality of judicial decision-making by building on the diverse knowledge, experiences and worldviews of judicial personnel;
- Make the judiciary more sensitive to the experiences and concerns of particular groups in cases related to discrimination, sexual harassment or affirmative action, and more responsive to their demands;
- Have a powerful symbolic value and increase the level of public confidence in the impartiality and fairness of the judiciary.

## 6. How is the ‘judiciary’ defined for the purpose of reporting on SDG 16.7.1(c)?

The judiciary can be defined as the system of courts that constitutes the branch of central authority in a country concerned with the administration of justice. It is important to specify that SDG 16.7.1(c) focuses on the *formal* court system and does not include within its scope informal justice mechanisms, such as religious, tribal, indigenous or other traditional dispute resolution mechanisms.

## 7. What specific courts have to be included in the reporting on SDG 16.7.1(c)?

SDG 16.7.1(c) requires reporting on judges and registrars at three ‘levels’ of courts, namely supreme/constitutional courts, ‘higher-level courts’ (courts that handle national issues or appeals), and ‘lower-level courts’ (courts – typically of first instance – that commonly handle local issues, such as disputes

involving family, land, and government benefits and services). This broad categorization is elaborated to reflect the way in which courts are used, and it was developed to encompass the diversity of judicial systems across the world, including across different types of legal systems (common law, civil law, etc.) and across different types of government (unitary, federal, etc.).

- **Supreme/constitutional courts:** Supreme/constitutional courts are the courts within a country with the highest authority to interpret the law. This category includes both supreme courts (i.e. the highest judicial bodies in the domain of civil and criminal jurisdiction) and constitutional courts (i.e. the legal bodies responsible for ensuring the compatibility of legislation with the provisions and principles of the constitution in each country, in particular to protect constitutionally-established rights and freedoms). Constitutional courts include those courts that sit only on constitutional issues, as well as courts that sit as constitutional courts only on occasion when constitutional issues arise.

→ In *federal* court systems, highest courts include supreme courts and constitutional courts at the national level but excludes any supreme courts that may exist at sub-national levels, as these should be included within the category of higher-level courts. In certain jurisdictions, the supreme court and constitutional court might be one and the same and therefore data would be reported on just one court for the category of supreme/constitutional courts.

- **Higher-level courts:** Higher-level courts include other high courts, high-level courts, and courts of appeal.

→ In *federal* court systems, higher-level courts include higher-level courts at both the national and sub-national levels, and also include supreme courts at sub-national levels.

- **Lower-level courts:** Lower-level courts encompass first-instance or frontline courts of local jurisdiction. This category includes local courts, district courts, magisterial courts, and magistrate courts.

→ In *federal* court systems, lower-level courts include lower-level courts of both national and sub-national court systems.

## 8. How are specialized courts or tribunals categorized in the reporting on SDG 16.7.1(c)?

The determination of whether specialized courts or tribunals, or a subset thereof, fall within supreme/constitutional, higher-level, or lower-level courts is left to the discretion of countries.

Specialized courts are courts that have limited jurisdiction over a specialized subject matter, and may include, but are not limited to, war crimes courts, gender-based violence courts, commercial courts, finance courts, labour courts, family courts, property courts, military courts, administrative courts, social welfare courts, juvenile courts, courts for organized crime, narcotics, and corruption, etc.

In many jurisdictions, specialized courts are considered higher-level courts. In such jurisdictions, these specialized courts might have exclusive or original jurisdiction over certain claims, and therefore act in the first instance for those claims but are nevertheless considered higher-level courts. In other jurisdictions, specialized courts might be considered lower-level courts or supreme courts. Some jurisdictions might categorize a subset of specialized courts as higher-level courts and another subset as lower-level courts.

## 9. Which specific positions in the judiciary need to be counted when reporting on SDG 16.7.1(c)?

SDG target 16.7 focuses on ‘decision-making’ and the extent to which it is responsive, inclusive, and representative. In the judiciary, decision-making power and leadership roles are essentially held by individuals in two types of positions, namely judges and registrars:

- **Judges** (alternatively called ‘justice’, ‘magistrate’, or ‘jurist’): A judge can be defined as a person authorized to decide cases in a court of law. [UN DESA’s Manual for the Development of a System of Criminal Justice Statistics](#) defines ‘professional judges or magistrates’ as both full-time and part-time officials authorized to hear civil, criminal, and other cases, including in appeal courts, and to make dispositions in a court of law. This category includes associate judges and magistrates who may be so authorized.
- **Registrars** A registrar is a judicial officer of the court entrusted with judicial or quasi-judicial functions and who has autonomous competence. A registrar’s decisions may be subject to appeal in certain circumstances. Registrars assist judges in performing their functions and play an important role in case management, including by scheduling hearing dates, registering court documents, receiving fees emanating from court matters, preparing case files, drafting decisions, and executing court decisions. Some of the judicial or quasi-judicial functions performed by registrars include making decisions on interlocutory applications, assessing damages, and applying for the entry of default judgments. For illustrative purposes, please find some translations below:

Language	Translation
Arabic	المسجلون
Danish	Domstolssekretær
English	Clerk
Estonian	Riigikohtu nõunikud / I ja II astme kohtutes töötavad kohtujuristid / kohtunikuabid
French	greffiers
German	Rechtspfleger / Gerichtsvollzieher
Hebrew	רשם / רשם בכיר
Japanese	書記官
Kazakh	Бас маман
Latvian	Tiesneša palīgs
Lithuanian	Teismo kancleris
Norwegian	Rettssekretærer
Spanish	Secretario de estudio y cuenta / Secretario general / Secretario de acuerdos / Secretario de Juzgado / Amanuense
Swedish	Domstolssekretær



SDG 16.7.1(c) **does not cover** other positions such as:

- court-annexed alternative dispute resolution professionals (individuals appointed by the state to decide upon an adjudicatory dispute resolution process, such as arbitrators and mediators);
- non-legal court personnel (part-time or full-time individuals paid by the state to support the administration of the judicial system, such as bailiffs, tipstaff, secretaries, notaries, paralegals, and administrators);
- or state-funded legal professionals within the justice sector (individuals paid by the state to carry out the representation or prosecution of an individual in a legal proceeding, including prosecutors, public defenders, and legal aid service providers).

While these individuals play some role in the functioning of the justice system as a whole and are supported by state funds, they do not constitute the judiciary as it is understood by most countries.

## Disaggregation

### 10. What are the disaggregation requirements of SDG 16.7.1(c)?

SDG 16.7.1(c) requires three levels of disaggregation, as outlined in the below box. For socio-demographic characteristics, most disaggregation categories are required for the computation of the priority ratios listed in [Q.4](#) – the only exception is for age groups, where only the youngest age group (“aged 44 and below”) is required for the computation of the two age-related priority ratios (i.e. Ratios 2a and 2b on the representation of youth (aged 44 and below) among judges and registrars).

#### **Disaggregation dimensions & disaggregation categories for SDG 16.7.1(c)**

- 1. By type of position (as defined in [Q.7](#)):**
  - Judges
  - Registrars
- 2. By level of court (as defined below):**
  - Supreme/constitutional courts
  - Higher-level courts
  - Lower-level courts
- 3. By socio-demographic characteristics:**
  - Sex (male; female)
  - Age group (44 and below; 45-54; 55-64; 65 and above)
  - Disability status (disability; no disability)
  - Nationally relevant population groups (country-specific and labeled Group A, B or C)

*\*N.B. Disaggregation categories underlined are required for the computation of the*

## 11. How can data on judges and registrars be disaggregated by ‘nationally relevant population groups’?

Recognizing the role of discrimination and inequality in generating uneven development outcomes for different segments of society, the 2030 Agenda specifies that its follow-up and review will be informed by “data disaggregated by sex, age, *race*, *ethnicity*, *migration status*, disability, geographic location, and other characteristics relevant in national contexts”.<sup>1</sup> Some of these disaggregation categories especially, ‘race’, ‘ethnicity’, and ‘migration status’ can be considered by countries when defining ‘nationally relevant population groups’ for SDG 16.7.1(c). These nationally relevant groups are reported as Group A, B, or C and reflect some of the prohibited grounds of discrimination under international law. According to guidance of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), full consistency with international law would also include a focus on displacement status, religion, civil status, income, sexual orientation, and gender identity.<sup>2</sup>

A good starting point to identify relevant population groups in your national context is to refer to the National Development Plan, the National Human Rights Strategy or other relevant Strategies that identify vulnerable groups. Such national frameworks typically have a focus on specific marginalized and vulnerable groups, and often call for disaggregated data to monitor their situation. Valuable guidance can also be obtained from national human rights institutions, which play a key role in monitoring the situation of vulnerable and marginalised groups, and as such are well placed to help identify relevant groups for targeted monitoring.

In certain contexts, population group status may prove to be a sensitive variable for data collection. For example, several countries actively restrict or ban identification of ethnic or religious status in national statistics, in order to protect vulnerable populations or discourage inter-ethnic conflict. According to the [Human Rights Based Approach to Data](#), individuals should be able to choose to identify themselves as members of a minority, or not. It would not be appropriate for Judicial Services Commissions or Ministries of Justice (or any other institution collecting data on judiciary personnel) to assign judges and registrars a certain membership of a particular population group. Rather, administrative data collection systems in the judiciary should allow judiciary personnel to self-report on membership of nationally relevant population groups, possibly through surveys providing necessary assurances of confidentiality.

## 12. How can data on judges and registrars be disaggregated by disability status?

Article 31 of the [United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities](#) relates specifically to statistics and data collection. It requires States Parties to collect appropriate information, including statistics, to enable them to formulate and implement policies to give effect to the Convention, taking into account the need to comply with legally established safeguards, including legislation on data protection, to ensure confidentiality and respect for the privacy of persons with disabilities.

Countries can define or measure ‘disability status’ in two different ways. Typically, public institutions – including those in the judiciary – rely on employees’ self-reports of a disability, validated by medical certifications. A common problem with this approach however is that discriminatory practices and implicit bias against persons with a disability can make employees reluctant to voluntarily disclose their disability status to their employer. As a result, the ‘disability’ field in many human resource information systems is rarely updated if someone’s disability status changes after his/her recruitment (when this information is

<sup>1</sup> UN General Assembly, 20<sup>th</sup> Session, 21 October 2015, Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, UN Doc., A/RES/70/1, para. 74(g).

<sup>2</sup> OHCHR, 2016, [A Human Rights-based Approach to Data: leaving no one behind in the 2030 Agenda](#), p. 6.

first sought from employees), which makes it difficult to monitor the representation of persons with disabilities in the judiciary with accuracy.

A second, more novel approach consists in proactively reaching out to judicial personnel on a periodically to invite them to fill out a short survey, namely the [Short Set of Questions on Disability elaborated by the Washington Group on Disability Statistics](#).<sup>3</sup> Rather than collecting data about physical impediments, this short questionnaire (six questions) aims to measure *functional limitations* that individuals experience in basic activities, such as difficulties in seeing, in remembering or in communicating. The main advantages of this approach are that it allows for the regular tracking of disability status among employees, at minimal cost, and based on self-assessments rather than on medical certifications, which may be more difficult for employees to obtain. The data collected also gives employer institutions a clear picture of the most commonly occurring limitations in basic activity functioning among their staff, which can in turn be used to devise appropriate coping measures (without which the performance of institutions can suffer). This second approach was successfully tested in South Africa for public service statistics (see box below) and it can be replicated in other sectors including the judiciary.

## Data sources

### 13. What sources of data can I consider for reporting on SDG 16.7.1(c)?

Administrative records of employment in the judiciary are the main source of data to be used to report on SDG 16.7.1(c). A human resource management information system (HRMIS)<sup>4</sup> is the most common and most comprehensive method for collecting data on judiciary personnel. It is typically maintained by a Judicial Services Commission, a Ministry of Justice, or other competent bodies maintaining information on the appointments of judges and other positions in the judiciary (often as part of a broader mandate to exert oversight over the judiciary).

- *Strengths:* Data contained in administrative records tends to be fairly robust, precise and up-to-date. This data also has the greatest potential for expansion on various dimensions of disaggregation.
- *Limitations:* Data contained in administrative records may be incomplete: some categories of workers – e.g. those working part-time – may be missing, or data on some socio-demographic characteristics of judiciary personnel – e.g. disability status or population groups – may not be collected. It may also be the case that data contained in administrative record is not harmonized across various levels of courts, or even across courts at the same level.

Since administrative data produced by an HRMIS might not be considered ‘official’ data in its raw form, it is recommended that the national institution maintaining an HRMIS collaborate with the NSO for the latter to provide the necessary quality assurance over the statistics produced by the HRMIS. Some countries might not have human resource management information system, but rather a simplified employee record system (for instance in excel files) that allows data processing of the information contained.

---

<sup>3</sup> Washington Group questions are designed to provide comparable data cross-nationally for populations living in a variety of cultures with varying economic resources. The WG Short Set of questions was developed primarily for use in national censuses or surveys where the focus is on topics other than disability, such as labour force or living standards surveys, and where space for questions is limited. The questions cover six domains of functioning: seeing, hearing, walking, cognition (remembering and concentrating), self-care (washing oneself or dressing), and communication (understanding and being understood).

<sup>4</sup> A Human Resource Management Information System (HRMIS) is a software used to facilitate the management of human resources (HR). It combines a number of necessary HR functions, such as storing employee data, managing payroll, recruitment, benefits administration, time and attendance, employee performance management, and tracking competency and training records.

14. What can NSOs do to enhance the harmonization of administrative data collection across different levels of court, and its alignment with SDG 16.7.1(c)?

One of the following three scenarios may apply in your country with regards to the collection of administrative data on judges and registrars. In the below table, some suggestions are offered to NSOs wishing to enhance the harmonization of administrative data collection practices across the three levels of courts considered by SDG 16.7.1(c), and their alignment with the indicator's reporting requirements.

<p>1. <b>Centralized &amp; harmonized data collection:</b> Standardized administrative data records are available and are centralized for the entire judiciary, across different levels of courts.</p>	<p>Such a centralized registry on judiciary personnel is typically held by a <b>Judicial Services Commission or a Ministry of Justice</b> (or other competent bodies maintaining information on the appointments of judges and other positions in the judiciary).</p> <p>To enhance alignment of data with SDG 16.7.1(c) reporting requirements, NSOs would need to establish contact with this entity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Share global reporting requirements for SDG 16.7.1(c)</li> <li>⇒ Jointly assess current availability of data &amp; compatibility with SDG 16.7.1(c) metadata</li> <li>⇒ Jointly identify necessary adjustments to data collection practices</li> </ul>
<p>2. <b>Harmonized data collection, but not centralized:</b> Standardized administrative data records exist at different levels of courts, but they are not aggregated centrally.</p>	<p>Some NSOs may already be collecting, quality assuring and aggregating data on judiciary personnel from different levels of courts for official statistical publications (e.g. a Statistical Yearbook, a Men and Women report, etc.) If that's not the case yet, NSOs may wish to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Establish contact with each level of court, and share global reporting requirements for SDG 16.7.1(c)</li> <li>⇒ Jointly assess current availability of data &amp; compatibility with SDG 16.7.1(c) metadata</li> <li>⇒ Jointly identify necessary adjustments to data collection practices</li> <li>⇒ Help establish a centralized data collection system between each level of courts and the NSO</li> </ul>
<p>3. <b>Data collection is not harmonized, nor centralized:</b> No standardized administrative data record currently exists. Each level of courts compiles its own statistics.</p>	<p>In countries where <b>each level of courts</b> compiles its own statistics on judiciary personnel, statistics produced by lower-level courts may not be fully comparable with that produced by higher-level courts, or by constitutional/supreme courts. In such a context, NSOs may wish to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Define a national data collection mechanism that includes roles, responsibilities and a data transmission protocol between the institutions involved</li> <li>⇒ Establish contact with each level of courts and share global reporting requirements for SDG 16.7.1(c)</li> <li>⇒ With each level of courts, jointly assess current availability of data &amp; compatibility with SDG 16.7.1(c) metadata</li> <li>⇒ With each level of courts, jointly identify necessary adjustments to data collection practices</li> <li>⇒ Develop a national metadata that nationalizes SDG 16.7.1(c) in terms of sources, disaggregation, data processing and data transmission.</li> </ul>

15. What data protection considerations need to be applied when sharing judiciary personnel data with an institution maintaining a centralized database or with the NSO?

Data disclosed from a Judicial Services Commission (or from different levels of courts) to the NSO for SDG 16.7.1(c) reporting should be protected and kept private, and confidentiality of individuals' personal information must be preserved at any point in the process. In line with Principle 6 (on Confidentiality) of the [Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics](#), it is important for courts collecting data on judges and registrars to have data collection and data management systems that are equipped to protect the privacy of individuals at every stage in the statistical process. Furthermore, data on judiciary personnel should not be published or publicly accessible in a manner that permits identification of individual data subjects, either directly or indirectly. When data available allows the identification of respondents it is recommended to aggregate the information to a level that allows confidentiality of information.

## Data processing

### 16. How do I fill out the first page of the online SDG 16 Data Reporting Platform?

Global metadata reporting, which defines and describes indicator 16.7.1(c) data is done in four steps.

- **Step 1 – Source:** The first step requires users to input the **reference period** and **data sources** in three questions. Here, we breakdown these questions and describe the required information.
  1. The *reference period* is the calendar year for which the data are collected for reporting. In many cases, the reference period and time period will be identical, but there are also cases where they are different. This can happen if data are not available for the target reference period, but are available for a time period which is judged to be sufficiently close.<sup>5</sup>
  2. The *data source* is the specific data set, metadata set, database or metadata repository from where the data or metadata are available. The source of the data is often used as a synonym for the term “data provider”; however, in this context, **data provider refers to the organization or individual from where statistics are obtained**. Data source can also refer to the characteristics and components of the raw statistical data used for compiling statistical aggregates and can be categorized as administrative (data coming from administrative records e.g. court administration databases) or survey (data coming from surveys for a specific sector or institutional unit e.g. labour force survey)<sup>6</sup>.
  3. Select **Yes** or **No** indicating if the reported data on judiciary personnel was collected by an entity other than the NSO, such as (an)other agency(ies)/ministry(ies) in the National Statistical System.

---

<sup>5</sup> undata glossary: <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/dnss/docs-nqaf/NQAF%20GLOSSARY.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> undata glossary: <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/dnss/docs-nqaf/NQAF%20GLOSSARY.pdf>

## Metadata fields

### Source

1. Reference period (YYYY):

2. Data source(s) used for judiciary personnel:

3. Was this data on judiciary personnel collected by an entity other than the NSO, such as (an)other agency(ies)/ministry(ies) in the National Statistical System?

☐ Yes ☒ No

- **Step 2 – Courts/Positions:** This indicator requires reporting judiciary personnel at the supreme/constitutional, higher-level, and lower-level courts; therefore, select **Yes** or **No** indicating what levels of courts are included in the data collection. Furthermore, please specify the names both English and the main national language of the national occupational categories included under the ‘*judges*’ and ‘*registrars*’ categories.

## Courts/Positions

1) What levels of courts were included in this data collection? (NB: focus should be on the formal court system only)

1.1. Supreme/constitutional courts

☐ Yes ☐ No

1.2. Higher-level courts (courts that handle national issues or appeals)

☐ Yes ☐ No

1.3. Lower-level courts (courts – typically of first instance – that commonly handle local issues, such as disputes involving family, land, and government benefits and services)

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Please specify the names – both in English and in the main national language - of the national occupational categories included under the "judges" category reported below:

2.1. In the main national language:

2.2. In English:

3. Please specify the names – both in English and in the main national language - of the national occupational categories included under the "registrar" category:

3.1. In the main national language:

3.2. In English:

- **Step 3 – Disaggregation:** Public servant data should be disaggregated by socioeconomic dimensions such as sex, age, disability status, and nationally relevant populations (as described in [Q. 10](#)). This step requires countries to select either **Yes** or **No** indicating if their judiciary data are available across these dimensions.

## Disaggregation

1. Is public servant data available for the two youth age groups set by this indicator, or which other youth age groups do you use?

	Data available for the youth age group "below 45 years"?	Other youth age group(s) used by your country:
Judges	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<div></div>
Registrars	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<div></div>

2. Is data on judges disaggregated by disability status available?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Is data on registrars disaggregated by disability status available?

☐ Yes ☐ No

- **Step 4 – Other Methodological Notes:** The fourth and final step on this page requires user to describe any deviations from the global metadata. For example, some countries may collect different age categories than those outlined in [Q. 10](#).

## Other

Other methodological notes / deviations from global metadata

### 17. How do I fill out the first table on page two of the online SDG 16 Data Reporting Platform?

Global data reporting on indicator 16.7.1(c) is done in three steps.

The first step requires you to input **headcount data in Table 1**.

*Note: Information for part-time positions should be given in full-time equivalents (FTE)<sup>7</sup> and should be counted only for permanent posts actually filled. It is important to consider the part-time or full-time status of posts to address the risk that some population groups may be underemployed and over-reported (e.g. If women are more likely to receive part-time posts than full-time posts, there might be a false impression that women are equally represented in these posts, when in reality they work less than their male counterparts due to their part time status).*

---

<sup>7</sup> A full-time equivalent (FTE) is a unit to measure employed persons in a way that makes them comparable although they may work a different number of hours per week. The unit is obtained by comparing an employee's average number of hours worked to the average number of hours of a full-time worker. A full-time worker is therefore counted as one FTE, while a part-time worker gets a score in proportion to the hours he or she works.



Step 1: Number of judges and registrars from various demographic groups

		Sex (number)		Age group (number)					Disability (number)		Population Groups (number)		
		Male	Female	<35	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Disabled	Not disabled	Group A	Group B	Group C
Constitutional/ Supreme courts	Judges												
	Registrars												
Higher-level courts	Judges												
	Registrars												
Lower-level courts	Judges												
	Registrars												
TOTAL (across all levels of courts)	Judges												
	Registrars												

***Note:** Countries are expected to fill out the above table to the best of their ability, and to report as many disaggregated headcounts of judges and registrars as possible, across the three levels of courts identified by this indicator. If, for any given dimension, disaggregated data on judges and registrars is not available for each level of court, countries can report total headcounts (i.e. across all levels of courts). **At a minimum, countries must fill out cells highlighted in orange** to enable the calculation of the ‘priority ratios’ defined by this indicator (see [Q.4](#))*

## 18. How do I fill out the second table on page two of the online SDG 16 Data Reporting Platform?

The second step consists in calculating **simple proportions** of women, ‘youth’, persons with a disability, and specific population groups among judges and registrars, across the three levels of court considered by SDG 16.7.1(c).

Using the headcount figures provided in the first table, the second table automatically computes these simple proportions, including the proportions required for the measurement of the ‘priority ratios’ (highlighted in yellow in the table below), namely:

- The proportion of female judges overall (across all levels of courts)
- The proportion of female registrars overall (across all levels of courts)
- The proportion of ‘young’ judges aged 44 and below overall (across all levels of courts)
- The proportion of ‘young’ registrars aged 44 and below overall (across all levels of courts)
- The proportion of judges with a disability overall (across all levels of courts)
- The proportion of registrars with a disability overall (across all levels of courts)
- The proportion of judges in various population groups overall (across all levels of courts)
- The proportion of registrars in various population groups overall (across all levels of courts)

Step 2: Proportional representation of various demographic groups among judges and registrars

	Proportion of female judges and registrars		Proportion of ‘young’ judges and registrars aged 44 and below		Proportion of judges and registrars with a disability		Proportion of judges and registrars in population group(s) A		Proportion of judges and registrars in population group(s) B		Proportion of judges and registrars in population group(s) C	
	Judges	Registrars	Judges	Registrars	Judges	Registrars	Judges	Registrars	Judges	Registrars	Judges	Registrars
Constitutional / supreme courts												
Higher-level courts												
Lower-level courts												
Total (across all levels of courts)												

*Note: Countries are expected to fill out the above table to the best of their ability, and to report as many proportions as possible, across the three levels of courts. **At a minimum, cells highlighted in orange must be filled** (they are automatically filled based on headcount data entered in Table 1).*

## 19. How do I fill out the third table on page two of the online SDG 16 Data Reporting Platform?

Using the proportions calculated in the second table, the third table computes **representation ratios** comparing the proportion of women, ‘youth’, persons with a disability, and specific population groups among judges and registrars relative to the proportion of the same groups in the national population, across the three levels of courts considered by SDG 16.7.1(c).

To compute these ratios, we need **denominators** – i.e. statistics on the share of women, young people, people with a disability and specific population groups in the national population. The below box explains how these various denominators should be calculated, using national population statistics.

Once denominator figures have been added to Table 3, representation ratios will be automatically calculated based on pre-entered formulas linking back to the proportions calculated in Table 2.

### ***How to calculate denominators for the representation ratios?***

#### **A) How to calculate denominators for female representation ratios**

When comparing the proportions of women among judges and registrars in the judiciary with the share of women in the national population, SDG 16.7.1(c) uses 50% as the default proportion of women in the national population. 50% is therefore pre-entered in Table 3 as the default denominator for female representation ratios.

#### **B) How to calculate denominators for ‘youth’ representation ratios**

When comparing the proportions of ‘youth’ (44 and below) among judges and registrars in the judiciary with the proportion of youth in the national population, the relevant proportion of the national population to be used as a denominator is the share of the population that is:

- *Above* the age of eligibility for the position of judge or registrar, and
- *Below* the aged 44 and below

#### **C) How to calculate denominators for representation ratios for people with a disability and for nationally relevant population groups**

When comparing proportions of certain population groups and of people with a disability among judges and registrars in the judiciary with corresponding shares of the same groups in the national population, it is important to use the *working-age population* of that group in the national population as a denominator. This means calculating the proportion of individuals in that group who are:

- *Above* the age of eligibility for the position of judge or registrar, and
- *Below* the mandatory retirement age for the position of judge or registrar.<sup>8</sup>

These lower and upper age boundaries will vary depending on the country, and as such need to be defined by each country. For instance, if the minimum age to be eligible for a judge position in a given country is 45 years old, and the mandatory retirement age for judges in this country is 75 years old, then when comparing the proportion of judges belonging to a particular population group (say, a particular ethnic group) with the corresponding proportion of this ethnic group in the national population, it is important to use as the denominator only on those members of this ethnic group aged between 45 and 75.

---

<sup>8</sup> In the event that a mandatory retirement age (MRA) has not been set specifically for the positions of judges and registrars in a given country, the “default retirement age” (DRA) set by this country could be used as an alternative. The DRA applies to all employment in a given country, and “is the minimum age at which employers can (if they choose to) set a mandatory retirement age, requiring employees to retire.”

Step 3: Ratios compared to overall working-age population

	Female representation ratios: Proportion of female judges and registrars / Proportion of women in the working-age population		'Youth' representation ratios: Proportion of 'young' judges and registrars aged 44 and below / Proportion of the working-age population aged above the eligibility age and below 45		Disability representation ratios: Proportion of judges and registrars with a disability / Proportion of persons with a disability in the working-age population		Population group(s) representation ratios: Proportion of judges and registrars in population group A / Proportion of persons in given population group in the working-age population		Population group(s) representation ratios: Proportion of judges and registrars in population group B / Proportion of persons in given population group in the working-age population		Population group(s) representation ratios: Proportion of judges and registrars in population group C / Proportion of persons in given population group in the working-age population	
	Denominator	50%	Denominator	0	Denominator	0	Denominator	0	Denominator	0	Denominator	0
	Judges	Registrars	Judges	Registrars	Judges	Registrars	Judges	Registrars	Judges	Registrars	Judges	Registrars
Constitutional / supreme courts												
Higher-level courts												
Lower-level courts												
Total (across all levels of courts)												

## 20. What if the format of the tables on the reporting platform is not appropriate for any given category in my country?

If the format of the tables is not appropriate for any given category in your country, please fill in the data to the best of your abilities and explain any adjustments in the comments box, below the appropriate table:

- Example 1: The row “44 years and below” also includes people aged 45.
- Example 2: Data for “Female” also includes “other” and/or “unknown”

Please mark "NA" for any category that is not applicable to your national context, and “-” when data is not available.

## 21. What if disaggregated data is not yet fully available for certain dimensions, or if your country collects more disaggregated data than required by SDG 16.7.1(c)?

The availability of judge and registrar data disaggregated by age, disability status and nationally relevant population groups may vary across countries, and sometimes, across different levels or types of courts within a given country. Countries are encouraged to report all data that is currently available on the [SDG 16 Data Reporting Platform](#), while they build additional capacities and adjust their data collection systems to allow for the further disaggregation of judge and registrar data, as required by SDG 16.7.1(c).

Some countries may be collecting judge and registrar data disaggregated along other dimensions than the ones prioritized by SDG 16.7.1(c), or in a different format than the one used on the reporting platform. We encourage these countries to upload files with these additional datasets on the platform, as their experiences could be of interest to other countries. UNDP, as custodian agency for this indicator, will facilitate peer learning around this indicator. We will therefore greatly appreciate hearing more about the data collection practices in place in your country’s judiciary.

## 22. What if I need to update previously submitted data?

For assistance with updating/modifying previously submitted SDG 16.7.1(c) data through the [UNDP SDG 16 Reporting Platform](#), please contact [SDG16indicators@undp.org](mailto:SDG16indicators@undp.org) at the [UNDP Oslo Governance Centre](#) requesting to unlock your country data. Kindly use the following email format:

**Title:** Country Name, Indicator 16.7.1(c), Year

**Body:** Your request to unlock your country data with a brief explanation.