



## About KidsRights

KidsRights is an international non-governmental organization that promotes the wellbeing of very vulnerable children across the world and advocates the realisation of their rights. KidsRights strives for a world where all children have access to their rights and are empowered to realise the great potential they carry within them. KidsRights sees children as ‘*changemakers*’ who have the power to move the world, and facilitates them in voicing their opinions and taking action in order to bring about change.

KidsRights supports children by commanding global attention for the realisation of children’s rights and acting as a catalyst to ignite change, together with children and youth. This advocacy is supported with research and action. The foundation also finances local projects aimed at directly improving the rights of vulnerable children and stimulating child participation and *changemaking* by youths.

[www.kidsrights.org](http://www.kidsrights.org) 

## About Erasmus School of Economics

Erasmus School of Economics (ESE) is a leading centre for scientific research and education. As an internationally acclaimed institute, Erasmus School of Economics contributes to future economic developments and to answering issues related to government and business policy.

<https://www.eur.nl/ease/english/> 

## About the International Institute of Social Studies

The International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) is an international graduate school of critical policy-oriented social science. ISS staff does research, teaching and public service in the field of development studies and international cooperation. The ISS is part of Erasmus University Rotterdam, but based in The Hague.

<https://www.iss.nl> 

## Table Of Contents

<b>1. General information on the KidsRights Index</b> .....	<b>2</b>
1.1 Sources	2
1.2 Methodology	3
1.3 165 Countries included in the KidsRights Index 2017: data gaps	4
1.4 The need for better collection of disaggregated data	4
1.5 Countries that reported to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child in 2016	4
1.6 The scope for realising the full spectrum of children’s rights is not only determined by income, or by level of economic or human development	5
<b>2. The results of the KidsRights Index 2017</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.1 Overall ranking	6
2.2 Striking differences	6
2.3 Cluster analysis	7
2.4 Overall conclusions	8
<b>3. Results CRC reporting</b> .....	<b>9</b>
3.1 CRC reporting per country	9
<b>Annex 1 - Domains and Indicators</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Annex 2 - Regions</b> .....	<b>19</b>

## 1. General information on the KidsRights Index



The KidsRights Index is the annual global index published by the KidsRights Foundation which ranks how countries adhere to and are equipped to improve children's rights. The KidsRights Index is an initiative of the KidsRights Foundation, in cooperation with Erasmus University Rotterdam: Erasmus School of Economics and the International Institute of Social Studies. The KidsRights Index comprises a ranking of all states that are parties to the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and for which sufficient data is available. This is a total number of 165 countries. At present the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) is ratified by all of the world's nations but one: the United States of America.

The first KidsRights Index was presented on 19 November 2013. In 2017, the fifth version of the KidsRights Index is published. Both the KidsRights Index itself and the underlying data are accessible on [www.kidsrightsindex.org](http://www.kidsrightsindex.org). 

There is still a considerable gap between international and national children's rights policies and the local day-to-day realities of children and youth worldwide. The KidsRights Index provides crucial insights into what is being done and where countries need to do better to fully implement the CRC.

The KidsRights Index has been developed to stimulate attention for children's rights at large, and more in particular public debate and opinion concerning the state of respect for children's rights across the world. It is a tool for governments, civil society and other stakeholders that informs (potential) action to improve children's rights.

### 1.1 Sources

The KidsRights Index pools data from two reputable sources: 1. quantitative data published and regularly updated by UNICEF at [www.data.unicef.org](http://www.data.unicef.org)<sup>1</sup>  and 2. qualitative data published by the [UN Committee on the Rights of the Child](http://www.unhcr.org/refugees)  in its detailed individual country reports (the so-called Concluding Observations) for all states that are parties to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. The KidsRights Index makes these data more accessible to a broader audience, so as to encourage dialogue about children's rights.

The Index covers five domains with a total of 23 indicators. It consolidates the most crucial general children's rights areas and implementation requirements of the CRC for which sufficient data is available. The five domains are:

1. Right to Life
2. Right to Health
3. Right to Education
4. Right to Protection
5. Enabling Environment for Child Rights

The KidsRights Index provides an overview of country performance on each of the five domains and is a basis for making concrete recommendations to countries on how to improve. The KidsRights Index includes a total of 16 quantitative and 7 qualitative indicators which, when available, are systematically rated in the same way for all countries. An overview of all indicators and their definitions can be found in Annex 1 to this Report.

Domain 5, the 'Enabling Environment for Child Rights' - or Child Rights Environment in short - is an important and unique domain within the KidsRights Index. It reveals the extent to which countries have operationalized the general principles of the CRC (*non-discrimination; best interests of the child; respect for the views of the child/participation*) and the extent to which there is a basic 'infrastructure' for making and implementing child rights policy, in the form of *enabling national legislation; mobilization of the 'best available' budget; collection and analysis of disaggregated data; and state-civil society cooperation for child rights*).

The scores on domain 5 are derived from the Concluding Observations adopted by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. These Concluding Observations finish off the state reporting procedure under the CRC and represent the Committee's views on the level of realization of children's rights in a particular country.

<sup>1</sup> The data for the KidsRights Index 2017 was downloaded from [www.data.unicef.org](http://www.data.unicef.org) in January 2017

## 1.2 Methodology

The scores for each domain are calculated as the mean of the scores on the underlying indicators. The scores are standardised between a minimum of 0.01 and a maximum of 1. If scores of indicators are missing then the domain score is calculated over the score of the remaining indicators.

The total score of the KidsRights Index is calculated as the geometric mean of the scores on the five specific domains. In general, the geometric mean is used, instead of the arithmetic mean, because it makes it more difficult to compensate for low scores on specific domains. Compensation is not desired, because all children's rights are considered important. An extremely low score in one area of children's rights, for example on providing an 'enabling environment for child rights', can therefore not be compensated with a high score on for example 'education'.

If a country has the lowest possible score on all indicators of a specific domain that would lead to a zero score on that domain. Because of the geometric mean, a zero score on one domain would also result in a zero score on the total KidsRights Index. To avoid a situation in which one domain fully determines the total score of the Index, zero scores on specific domains are not allowed. When zero scores appear, they are replaced by scores very close to zero (0.01). This is similar to the approach used, for example, in the Human Development Index.

In this way countries that score the lowest possible score on all indicators within a specific domain, will also score very low on the total KidsRights Index. In the KidsRights Index 2017 this is the case for Afghanistan (rank 164), Central African Republic (rank 165), New Zealand (rank 158), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (rank 156) and Vanuatu (rank 162). Especially for New Zealand and the United Kingdom this resulted in a significantly lower score than was the case in earlier versions of the KidsRights Index. New Zealand dropped from rank 45 to rank 158 in 2017 and the United Kingdom moved down from rank 11 to rank 156 in 2017.

As of 2016 the KidsRights Index has improved its approach to missing values. This entails that the score for a domain is not calculated if more than half of the indicators of that domain have a missing value. A country is not included in the overall Index if the score on domain 5 'Child Rights Environment' is missing. A country is also not included if more than half of all the domain scores are missing (e.g. when three or more domains are missing).

The advantage of this new approach is that the scores for the domains and the total Index are now completely based on the most recent available data (i.e. there are no more imputations of missing values based on historical data). Moreover, the restrictions on calculating the domain scores and the overall score make sure that these scores are based on a substantial number of indicators. In the previous versions of the KidsRights Index, the score of countries with many missing values could be based on just a small number of indicators, and therefore be sensitive for very high or low scoring based on a few indicators.

The information for domain 5 - 'Child Rights Environment' - derived from the qualitative Concluding Observations is scored on a scale between 1 and 3. The actual score assigned to each sub-indicator is exclusively based on the language used by the CRC Committee in the Concluding Observations. The resulting final scores have also been standardized.

### KidsRights Index Scoring System:

- Score 1 'bad' = only negative remarks
- Score 2 'average' = negative and positive remarks
- Score 3 'good' = only positive remarks
- NA = not addressed

The index is a ranked country list, with colour-coding indicating relevant clusters of rankings. There are five different clusters which display a more or less similar performance level, as each cluster concerns countries for which the scores belong to the same distribution (see figure 1). Within a cluster the scores of countries are thus more similar than across clusters. The clusters are expressed in coloured world maps on [www.kidsrightsindex.org](http://www.kidsrightsindex.org). 




Figure 1

### 1.3 165 countries are included in the KidsRights Index 2017

In addition to providing a global ranking on how countries are performing in terms of the realization of children's rights, the KidsRights Index draws attention to the fact that many data about the situation of children are still lacking. The KidsRights Index covers all states parties to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child for which sufficient data is available. A list of countries that are included and those that are not included in the Index can be found in Annex 2 to this report.

Because of the improved approach on missing values, Poland and Liechtenstein are no longer included in the overall KidsRights Index ranking 2016 and 2017 because of the large number of missing data on domain 5 'Child Rights Environment'. However, Poland and Liechtenstein are included in the ranking of domains 1 to 4 of the KidsRights Index 2016.

The United States of America have not ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child and have therefore not been included in the KidsRights Index. As they have not ratified the Convention they are not legally bound by it and do not report to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. Thus, no data is available for domain 5 'Child Rights Environment'.

### 1.4 The need for better collection of disaggregated data

In order to become more effective in developing initiatives for the improvement of children's rights, action should be based on sound and specific information about problems, gaps and achievements. Worldwide, countries should do more to collect and analyse disaggregated data, that is data collected on the situation of (particular groups of) children in a country. Disaggregated data reveals the position of vulnerable and marginalised children in society and highlights specific children's rights violations in a country. This data should be systematically collected, made publicly available and discussed, and used for the development of policies and plans on children's rights.

In September 2015 the UN General Assembly adopted the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The scale and ambition of the SDG agenda presents an unprecedented opportunity to truly improve the daily lives of children and youth. However, there is still a long way to go. Although the KidsRights Index is not a tool for monitoring the performance of countries regarding the SDGs directly, it does provide crucial insights into what is being done and where countries need to do better in terms of children's rights.

An initial review by UNICEF shows that *"the status of child-related SDG indicators has highlighted critical gaps in the availability of data for children in many parts of the world. Data availability for more than half of the 50 child-related global SDG indicators is either limited or poor. Furthermore, the quality of data varies across countries, and only a small number of child-related indicators are sufficiently disaggregated to enable analysis of the most relevant dimensions of inequality."*<sup>2</sup> KidsRights hopes that the monitoring of the SDGs will provide more and better quality data on children's issues and rights on a structural basis in the future.

### 1.5 Countries that reported to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child in 2016

In the KidsRights Index 2017, the domain 5 'Enabling Environment for Child Rights' has been updated to include all Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child about states that interacted with the Committee in 2016 in the state reporting procedure. The following 27 states, thus received a new score for domain 5 'Child Rights Environment': Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, France, Gabon, Haiti, Iran, Ireland, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, Suriname, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

For some of the countries scored in domain 5 the scoring is based on dated information. This is mostly the case for smaller island states such as Barbados (last reviewed in 1999), Micronesia (last reviewed in 1998) and Vanuatu (last reviewed in 1999), but it also the case for some other countries such as Uganda (last reviewed in 2005), Syria (last reviewed in 2003) and Estonia (last reviewed in 2003). Zimbabwe (rank 126) finally was reviewed again in 2016 by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child after their last review twenty years ago in 1996. Even though the information is dated, these countries are still included in the KidsRights Index, as the Index remains the only source of information on the CRC that allows for international comparison. It also underlines the need for countries to be reviewed by the Committee on the Rights of the Child on a regular basis (every five years).

<sup>2</sup> UNICEF: Is every child counted? Status of data for children in the SDGs. 2017, page 83, available <https://data.unicef.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/SDGs-and-Data-publication.pdf>

### 1.6 The scope for realising the full spectrum of children's rights is not only determined by income, or by level of economic or human development

In line with CRC, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child considers the implementation record of states parties to the Convention with a certain level of consideration for the development level and/or implementation capacity of those states parties. For example, according to article 4 of the CRC, states have to mobilize 'the maximum extent of their available resources'. This may have different actual implications for some states as compared to others. For example, a highly developed country can be expected to mobilize more resources than a least developed country. Accordingly, in situations in which relatively limited means are available to implement the CRC, political will to genuinely prioritize children's rights by allocating the maximum/best available budget can make a significant difference. Likewise, certain well-resourced countries might nevertheless have failed to adequately address discrimination of children or may not have been active on gathering disaggregated data on the situation of (particular groups of) children in that country. This explains why in certain situations perhaps rather unexpected scores may be obtained on the KidsRights Index. Only one of the countries that were assessed by the CRC Committee in 2016 managed to obtain the maximum score of 3 (indicating the presentation of positive remarks only in the CRC Concluding Observations). Latvia scored the maximum score on *enabling legislation*. In the KidsRights Index 2016 eight countries scored the maximum score (*on enabling legislation and State- civil society cooperation*). This might be caused by the fact that the CRC Committee assesses a state more strictly over time (for example because previous Concluding Observations were not acted upon).

According to the CRC Committee, New Zealand (158<sup>th</sup>), the United Kingdom (156<sup>th</sup>) Italy (83<sup>rd</sup>) and Luxembourg (56<sup>th</sup>), for example, could do more to improve the enabling environment they have built for children's rights. These wealthy countries should be able to invest more in children's rights, but fail to do so sufficiently.

Thailand (8<sup>th</sup>) and Tunisia (9<sup>th</sup>) on the other hand deserve honourable mentions. These countries rank relatively high compared to their economic status, as they do exceptionally well in cultivating an enabling environment for child rights. Thailand for examples scores 'good' on the enabling legislation for children's rights. In the 2017 ranking Thailand even climbed from rank 21 in the KidsRights Index 2016 to rank 8, especially owing to improved scores on *primary and secondary school participation* in domain 3 'Education). Tunisia scores well on domain 5 'the enabling environment for child rights. The country also has a low *adolescent births rate*, therefore scoring relatively high on domain 4 'Protection' (rank 22).

## 2. The results of the KidsRights Index 2017

### 2.1 Overall ranking

Portugal ranks number one in the KidsRights Index 2017. Runners up in the top ten are Norway, Switzerland, Iceland, Spain, France, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia and Finland.

Overall Rank	Country/165	Overall score
1	Portugal	0,932
2	Norway	0,920
3	Switzerland	0,917
4	Iceland	0,910
5	Spain	0,902
6	France	0,900
7	Sweden	0,875
8	Thailand	0,867
9	Tunisia	0,867
10	Finland	0,862

This year's overall worst performing countries are the United Kingdom, Papua New Guinea, New Zealand, Guinea-Bissau, Equatorial Guinea, Chad, Vanuatu, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan and Central African Republic.

Overall Rank	Country/165	Overall score
156	United Kingdom	0,377
157	Papua New Guinea	0,375
158	New Zealand	0,367
159	Guinea-Bissau	0,338
160	Equatorial Guinea	0,303
161	Chad	0,290
162	Vanuatu	0,287
163	Sierra Leone	0,232
164	Afghanistan	0,183
165	Central African Republic	0,143

### 2.2. Striking differences

Compared to the KidsRights Index 2016, the KidsRights Index 2017 leads to striking differences for 11 countries. These 11 countries moved 25 positions or more in the overall ranking. Besides these 11 countries, two new countries were added to the KidsRights Index. For the first time, sufficient data was available on Nauru and Samoa to allow their inclusion in the KidsRights Index 2017. They entered the KidsRights Index at rank 89 (Nauru) and rank 52 (Samoa).

Out of the 11 countries that show striking differences in the KidsRights Index 2017, 9 were subject to the CRC state reporting procedure in 2016 and thus received a new score for domain 5 'Enabling Environment for Child Rights'. This will be discussed further in section three of this document. Among these countries, Brunei Darussalem (111 → 65), Peru (87 → 62) and South Africa (109 → 84) deserve honourable mentions for having risen among the ranks significantly since last year's Index. These countries score relatively high as they have improved substantially in fostering an enabling environment for children's rights. To the contrary, the United Kingdom (11 → 156), New Zealand (45 → 158), Slovakia (6 → 107), Saudi Arabia (80 → 144), Maldives (62 → 111) and Ireland (7 → 41) score remarkably poor compared to 2016 and are urged to do more to foster the rights of their youngest generation.

The remaining two countries with striking differences between the 2017 and the 2016 results are Canada (72 → 45) and Turkmenistan (85 → 42). For these countries, data on indicators that was previously not available caused a jump in their ranking. The data that was already available in the KidsRights Index 2016 has not changed significantly in the KidsRights Index 2017. This means that the rise in ranking for Canada and Turkmenistan was mostly caused by the availability of data, not by the improved performance of the countries on children's rights.



## The results of the KidsRights Index 2017

### 2.3. Cluster analysis

The countries of the KidsRights Index are ranked individually and then grouped into relevant ranking clusters. The clusters are also expressed in coloured world maps on [www.kidsrightsindex.org](http://www.kidsrightsindex.org). The different clusters of countries display a more or less similar performance level, as each cluster concerns countries for which the scores belong to the same distribution range. Within a cluster, the scores of countries are thus more similar than across clusters.

The overall total KidsRights Index, ranking a total of 165 countries, shows four clusters representing the following performance patterns: the first cluster, of highest scoring countries, consists of 66% of all countries whilst the fourth cluster, of lowest scoring countries, is made up by only 2% of the countries (see figure 2).

The African region (figure 3) and the Asia and Pacific region (figure 4) are represented in all four clusters of the overall KidsRights Index. With the largest group of African countries scoring in the third cluster, the African region clearly falls behind other regions. Only 16% of the countries fall into the first cluster. The Middle Eastern and North African region is represented in three different clusters (figure 5), with 72% in the first cluster. Both the Industrialized group of countries and the Latin American and Caribbean region score well in the first cluster, respectively 94% and 96%. All 20 CEE/CIS countries fall in the first cluster.

### Overall KidsRights Index - 165 countries




Figure 2

### Africa - 43 countries




Figure 3

### Asia Pacific - 23 countries




Figure 4

### MENA - 18 countries





Figure 5



## 2.4 Overall conclusions

**When taking a closer look especially at domain 5 ‘Enabling Environment for Child Rights’, the KidsRights Index generates material for some notable conclusions.**

### 1) Worst scores on ‘non-discrimination’

All over the world groups of children are suffering from discrimination. They lack access to education and basic health care and they are not given the same opportunities to develop themselves as other children. Unfortunately there are no exceptions; none of the countries in the KidsRights Index receive ‘good’ scores on the *non-discrimination* indicator in domain 5. And even more worrisome, of all indicators in this domain, on average countries score worst on the principle of *non-discrimination* and 64 (out of 165) countries score ‘bad’ on *non-discrimination*. Vulnerable and marginalised children such as girls, refugee children, migrant children, disabled children, street children or indigenous children especially continue to face discrimination in the societies they live in.

In order for all children to fully enjoy their rights, it is absolutely crucial that countries ban discrimination of marginalised groups of children. Countries need to grant equal opportunities for all children to develop, go to school and have access to health care. Sustainable development can only happen with educated, safe and healthy children, who are able to grow up in inclusive, supportive and peaceful societies.

### 2) The principle of the ‘best interests of the child’ is nowhere fully implemented

According to the CRC, the best interests of the child should be a primary consideration in all actions concerning children, so that when decisions are taken about the child they reflect what will serve the child best. On taking the best interests of the child at heart, there is not a country in the world that scores ‘good’, while 48 countries score ‘bad’, including Australia, Canada, Italy, Japan and the United Kingdom. All over the world decisions are taken about the child without considering the best interests of the child adequately, especially in cases where children are being separated from their parents or for migrant and refugee children. Judges and other professionals working for and with children should be trained on how the principle of the best interests of the child should be implemented in judicial and administrative decisions and other interventions.

### 3) Legislation should be improved

Of all indicators in domain 5, countries on average score best on *enabling legislation*. This shows that countries in general do have fairly appropriate legal frameworks that recognise and guarantee the rights of all children. This is a major achievement that has been stimulated by the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Unfortunately, for a lot of countries the level of implementation is low and gaps can still be identified where the rights of children are not sufficiently protected in legislation. States should enact enabling legislation for child rights and implement this legislation in all procedures. Laws and procedures should be in conformity with the CRC.

### 4) Countries allocate insufficient budget

Governments should allocate their best available budget to realize the rights of children. In 2017 none of the countries in the KidsRights Index scores ‘good’ on *best available budget*. 64 (out of 165) countries score ‘bad’ on *best available budget*. The latter include wealthy countries such as Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden. Even more so, it is striking that, of all regions, the industrialised countries score relatively worst on *best available budget*. The Latin American and Caribbean region scores relatively the best.

These outcomes are partly explained by the fact that, as explained before according to the CRC (art. 4), states have to mobilize ‘the maximum extent of their available resources’. This may have different actual implications for some states as compared to others. For example, a highly developed country can be expected to mobilize more resources than a least developed country. Accordingly, in situations in which relatively limited means are available to implement the CRC, political will to genuinely prioritize children’s rights by allocating the maxim/best available budget can make a significant difference.

### 5) Participation of children is lacking behind

There is still a lot to achieve on the aspect of *respecting the views of the child*. At present, none of the countries in the KidsRights Index score ‘good’. This means that none of the 2.2 billion world’s children have their views fully heard on matters that affect them directly. 41 (out of 165) countries score ‘bad’ on *child participation*. Of all regions, the Asia and the Pacific region and the African region score worst on *child participation*.

Structurally engaging children and youth in decision-making processes affecting their lives is an important children’s right and should be implemented worldwide. Children are not mere beneficiaries of support, they can be agents of change. We need to get the views and ideas of children and youth and make them count. Only then shall they be able to hold their governments accountable.

Countries therefore should take measures to implement legislation recognising the rights of the child to be heard in relevant legal and administrative proceedings and meaningful and empowered participation of all children should be promoted and implemented.

#### 6) More data collection is crucial

Disaggregated data, that is data collected on the situation of (particular groups of) children in a country, are important to be able to drive decisions on the development of children's rights. Better collection and analysis of the data can assist in realizing and protecting the rights of all children as decisions can be taken on the specific needs of particular groups of children, based on for example income, sex, age, race or ethnicity. As discussed previously, countries worldwide should do more to collect disaggregated data.

The (non-)availability of data remains influential. Of the twenty-seven countries that were subjected to CRC state reporting in 2016 thirteen countries realized the lowest possible score on the indicator *collection and analysis of disaggregated data* (indicating that the CO contains only negative remarks on this aspect). These countries are Benin, Brunei Darussalam, France, Haiti, Ireland, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia and the United Kingdom. The remaining countries realized an 'average' score (indicating a combination of positive and negative remarks in the latest Concluding Observations).

Only thirteen countries of the twenty-seven countries that were subjected to CRC state reporting in 2016 received a score on all seven indicators. These countries are Haiti, Iran, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Nauru, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia and South Africa. For the remaining countries at least one indicator was missing.

#### 7) Cooperation between the state and civil society should improve

For effective implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child governments need to work together with civil society organisations. Unfortunately, cooperation between the state and civil society is in some countries far from a positive reality. Alarming is the growing concern for the safety of children's rights defenders, journalists and civil society activists, working to protect the rights of all children in societies. The KidsRights Index 2017 makes notice of at least 24 countries where children's rights defenders are harassed, under threat, abused and jailed. Countries should ensure that abuses against children's rights defenders, journalists and civil society activists are prevented and otherwise independently investigated. The people responsible should be held accountable and punished where due.

35 (out of 163) countries score 'bad' on *state-civil society cooperation*. A lot of data is missing for this indicator in the KidsRights Index, as only for 115 (out of 165) countries information is available on *state-civil society cooperation*.

### 3. Results CRC reporting

As explained earlier, in the KidsRights Index 2017, domain 5 ('Enabling Environment for Child Rights') has been updated with all Concluding Observations (COs) adopted by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child in 2016. The following twenty-seven states that appear in the KidsRights Index 2017 were subject to the CRC state reporting procedure in 2016 and thus received a new score for the domain 'Child Rights Environment': Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, France, Gabon, Haiti, Iran, Ireland, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, Suriname, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

#### 3.1 CRC reporting per country

##### Scoring System:

- Score 1 'bad' = only negative remarks
- Score 2 'average' = negative and positive remarks
- Score 3 'good' = only positive remarks
- NA = not addressed

Color	Meaning
Red	Negative change
Orange	Stayed the same
Green	Positive change

##### Benin (CO data from 2016, 6 scores available)

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Benin 2006	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
Benin 2016	NA	2	2	2	1	1	2

The record of Benin in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows twice the lowest score (on *best available budget and data*) and four times an average score (on *best interests of the child, respect for the views of the child, enabling legislation and state-civil society cooperation*). No changes occurred in the scores on *best interests of the child, respect for the views of the child and enabling legislation*. On two indicators (*budget and data*), Benin's score dropped from an average to a low score. The score on the indicator *state-civil society cooperation* dropped from the highest to an average score and the score on *non-discrimination* went down from an average score to non-availability. With no score available on *non-discrimination*, which was present in 2006, the completeness of the Benin's scores deteriorated. No improvements of scores occurred.

##### Brunei Darussalam (CO data from 2016, 6 scores available)

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Brunei Darussalam 2003	1	1	2	2	NA	1	1
Brunei Darussalam 2016	2	2	2	1	NA	1	2

Brunei Darussalam's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows twice the lowest score (on *enabling legislation and data*) and four times an average score (on *non-discrimination, best interests of the child, respect for the views of the child and state-civil society cooperation*). No maximum scores are on record. On three indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2003 (*respect for the views of the child, budget and data*). On three indicators (*non-discrimination, best interests and state-civil society cooperation*) Brunei Darussalam's scores improved from the lowest to an average score. The score on *enabling legislation* dropped from an average score to the lowest score. With no score available on *state-civil society cooperation*, which was also not present in 2003, the completeness of the Brunei Darussalam's scores remains incomplete.

**Bulgaria (CO data from 2016, 6 scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Bulgaria 2008	2	NA	2	2	2	2	2
Bulgaria 2016	2	2	2	2	1	2	NA

Bulgaria's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows once the lowest score (on *budget*) and five times an average score (on *non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation* and *data*). No maximum scores are on record. On four indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2008 (*non-discrimination*, *respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation* and *data*). On the indicator *best interests of the child*, Bulgaria's score improved from non-availability to an average score. The score on *budget* dropped from an average score to the lowest score. With no score available on *state-civil society cooperation*, which was present in 2008, the completeness of the Bulgaria's scores deteriorated.

**France (CO data from 2016, 5 scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
France 2009	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
France 2016	2	2	2	2	2	1	NA

The record of France in the 2016 Concluding Observations show five times an average score (on *non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation*, and *budget*) and once the lowest score (*data*). No maximum scores are on record. On the five indicators, the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2009 (*non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation* and *budget*). The score on *data* and *state-civil society cooperation* dropped, respectively, from an average to the lowest score and non-availability. With no scores available on *state-civil society cooperation*, which was present in 2009, the completeness of France scores deteriorated.

**Gabon (CO data from 2016, 6 scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Gabon 2002	2	1	2	2	2	2	1
Gabon 2016	1	NA	2	1	2	2	2

Gabon's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows twice the lowest score (on *non-discrimination* and *enabling legislation*) and four times an average score (on *respect for the views of the child*, *budget*, *data* and *state-civil society cooperation*). No maximum scores are on record. On three indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2002 (*respect for the views of the child*, *budget* and *data*). On the indicator *state-civil society cooperation*, Gabon's score improved from the lowest to an average score. The scores on *non-discrimination* and *enabling legislation* dropped from an average to the lowest score. With no score available on *best interests of the child*, which was present in 2002, the completeness of Gabon's scores deteriorated.

**Haiti (CO data from 2016, all scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Haiti 2003	2	1	2	2	2	1	1
Haiti 2016	2	1	1	2	2	1	2

Haiti's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows thrice the lowest score (on *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child* and *data*) and four times an average score (on *non-discrimination*, *enabling legislation*, *budget* and *state-civil society cooperation*). No maximum scores are on record. On five indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2003 (*non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child*, *enabling legislation*, *budget* and *data*). On the indicator *state-civil society cooperation*, Haiti's

score improved from the lowest to an average score. The score on *respect for the views of the child* dropped from an average to the lowest score.

#### Islamic Republic of Iran (CO data from 2016, all scores available)

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Iran (Islamic Republic of) 2000	1	1	2	2	2	NA	1
Iran (Islamic Republic of) 2016	1	2	1	2	1	2	1

Iran's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows four times the lowest score (on *non-discrimination*, *respect for the views of the child*, *budget* and *state-civil society cooperation*) and thrice an average score (on *best interests of the child*, *enabling legislation*, and *data*). No maximum scores are on record. On three indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2000 (*non-discrimination*, *enabling legislation* and *state-civil society cooperation*). On the indicators *best interests of the child* and *data*, Iran's score improved respectively from the lowest and non-availability to an average score. The scores on *respect for the views of the child* and *budget* dropped from an average to the lowest score.

#### Ireland (CO data from 2016, 6 scores available)

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Ireland 2006	2	2	2	2	NA	2	3
Ireland 2016	1	1	2	2	2	1	NA

Ireland's records in the 2016 Concluding Observations show thrice an average score (on *respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation* and *budget*) and thrice the lowest score (*best interests of the child*, *non-discrimination* and *data*). No maximum scores are on record. On two indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2006 (*respect for the views of the child* and *enabling legislation*). Ireland's score on the indicator *budget* improved from non-available to an average score. The scores on *non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child* and *budget* dropped from an average to the lowest score. With no score available on *state-civil society cooperation*, which was present in 2006 with the highest score, the completeness of Ireland's scores deteriorated.

#### Kenya (CO data from 2016, all scores available)

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Kenya 2007	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Kenya 2016	1	2	2	2	2	2	2

Kenya's records in the 2016 Concluding Observations show six times an average score (on *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation*, *budget*, *data* and *state-civil society cooperation*) and once the lowest score on the indicator *non-discrimination*. No maximum scores are on record. Only the score of one indicator (*non-discrimination*) changed in comparison to the scores in 2007, dropping from an average score to the lowest score. The scores of the other indicators remain the same as in 2007.

#### Latvia (CO data from 2016, all scores available)

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Latvia 2006	2	1	2	3	2	2	NA
Latvia 2016	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Latvia's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows in all seven indicators an average score. On four indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as it was in 2006 (*non-discrimination*, *respect for the views of the child*, *budget* and *data*). On the indicators

(*best interests of the child* and *state-civil society cooperation*) Latvia's scores improved respectively from the lowest score and non-availability to an average score. The score on *enabling legislation* went down from the highest to an average score.

**Maldives (CO data from 2016, all scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Maldives 2007	1	2	2	2	1	2	2
Maldives 2016	1	1	1	1	2	2	1

Maldives' record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows twice an average score (*budget* and *data*) and five times the lowest score (*non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation* and *state-civil society cooperation*). On the indicators *non-discrimination* and *data* the scores of 2016 stayed the same as it was in 2007. On the indicator *budget* Maldives' scores improved from the lowest to an average score. The scores on *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation* and *state-civil society* dropped from an average to the lowest score.

**Nauru (CO data from 2016, all scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Nauru 2016	2	2	2	2	2	1	1

Nauru's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows five times an average score (*non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation* and *budget*) and twice the lowest score (*data* and *state-civil society cooperation*). No maximum scores are on record. Since this is the first time the CRC Committee has reviewed Nauru's state report, there are no previous Concluding Observations, and therefore no scores for comparison.

**Nepal (CO data from 2016, 6 scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Nepal 2005	2	NA	2	2	2	1	1
Nepal 2016	2	1	1	2	2	1	NA

Nepal's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows thrice an average score (*non-discrimination*, *enabling legislation* and *budget*) and thrice the lowest score (on *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child* and *data*). No maximum scores are on record. No changes occurred in the scores for *non-discrimination*, *enabling legislation*, *budget* and *data*. On *best interests of the child* Nepal's score improved from non-availability to the lowest score. The scores on *respect for the views of the child* dropped from an average to the lowest score, and on *state-civil society cooperation* the scores dropped from the lowest score to non-availability. With no score available on the *state-civil society cooperation* the scores of Nepal remain incomplete.

**New Zealand (CO data from 2016, 6 scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
New Zealand 2011	2	NA	1	1	2	NA	NA
New Zealand 2016	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA

New Zealand's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows six times the lowest score (on *non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation*, *budget*, and *data*). No maximum or average scores are on record. On three indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2011 (*respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation* and *state-civil society cooperation*). On two indicators (*best interests of the child* and *data*) New Zealand's scores improved from non-available to the lowest score. The scores on *non-discrimination* and *budget* dropped from an average to the lowest score. With no score available on *state-civil society cooperation*, which was also not present in 2011, the scores of New Zealand remain incomplete.

**Oman (CO data from 2016, all scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Oman 2006	2	1	2	2	NA	2	3
Oman 2016	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Oman's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows in all seven indicators an average score. On four indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2006 (*non-discrimination, respect for the views of the child, enabling legislation and data*). The scores on *best interests of the child* and *budget* improved respectively from the lowest and non-availability to an average score. The score on *state-civil society cooperation* dropped from the highest score to an average score.

**Pakistan (CO data from 2016, all scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Pakistan 2009	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
Pakistan 2016	1	2	1	2	2	1	2

Pakistan's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows four times an average score (*best interests of the child, enabling legislation, data and state-civil society cooperation*) and three times the lowest score (*non-discrimination, respect for the views of the child and data*). On five indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2009 (*non-discrimination, best interests of the child, enabling legislation, budget and state-civil society cooperation*). The scores on *respect for the views of the child* improved and *data* dropped from an average score to the lowest score.

**Peru (CO data from 2016, all scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Peru 2006	1	2	2	1	2	2	NA
Peru 2016	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Peru's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows in all seven indicators an average score. On four indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2006 (*best interests of the child, respect for the views of the child, budget and data*). The scores on *non-discrimination* and *enabling legislation* improved from the lowest to an average score and *state-civil society cooperation* improved from non-available to an average score.

**Samoa (CO data from 2016, 5 scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Samoa 2006	2	2	2	2	1	2	2
Samoa 2016	2	NA	2	2	2	2	NA

Samoa's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows five times an average score (on *non-discrimination, respect for the views of the child, enabling legislation, budget and data*). No maximum or lowest scores are on record. On four indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2006 (*non-discrimination, respect for the views of the child, enabling legislation and data*). On the indicator *budget* Samoa's score improved from the lowest to an average score. The scores on *best interests of the child* and *state-civil society cooperation for child rights* dropped from an average to non-available. With no score available on *best interests of the child* and *state-civil society cooperation*, which were present in 2006, the completeness of Samoa's scores deteriorated.



**Saudi Arabia (CO data from 2016, all scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Saudi Arabia 2006	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
Saudi Arabia 2016	1	1	1	2	1	1	1

Saudi Arabia's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows once an average score (*enabling legislation*) and six times the lowest scores (*non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *budget*, *data* and *state-civil society cooperation*). On three indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2006 (*non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child* and *enabling legislation*). The scores on *respect for the views of the child*, *budget*, *data* and *state-civil society cooperation* dropped from an average score to the lowest score.

**Senegal (CO data from 2016, 6 scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Senegal 2006	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
Senegal 2016	2	2	2	2	2	2	NA

Senegal's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows four times an average score (*non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation*, *budget* and *data*). On five indicators the scores of 2016 stayed the same as they were in 2006 (*best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *enabling legislation*, *budget* and *data*). The score on *non-discrimination* improved from the lowest to an average score. The score on *state-civil society cooperation for child rights* dropped from an average to non-available. With no score available on *state-civil society cooperation*, which was present in 2006, the completeness of Senegal's scores deteriorated.

**Sierra Leone (CO data from 2016, all scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Sierra Leone 2008	2	2	2	3	2	1	2
Sierra Leone 2016	1	1	1	2	1	1	1

Sierra Leone's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows once an average score (*enabling legislation*) and six times the lowest score (*non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *budget*, *data* and *state-civil society cooperation*). The score of 2016 on *data* stayed the same as in 2008. On five indicators the scores dropped from an average score to the lowest score (*non-discrimination*, *best interests of the child*, *respect for the views of the child*, *budget* and *state-civil society cooperation*). The score on *enabling legislation* declined from the highest to an average score.

**Slovakia (CO data from 2016, all scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Slovakia 2007	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
Slovakia 2016	1	2	1	3	1	1	1

Slovakia's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows once the highest score (*enabling legislation*) and once an average score (*best interests of the child*) and five times the lowest score (*non-discrimination*, *respect for the views of the child*, *budget*, *data* and *state-civil society cooperation*). The score on *best interests of the child* of 2016 stayed the same as in 2007. The score on *enabling legislation* improved from an average to the highest score. On four indicators, the scores of 2016 declined from an average to the lowest score (*non-discrimination*, *respect for the views of the child*, *budget* and *data*). The score on *state-civil society cooperation* dropped from the highest to the lowest score.

**South Africa (CO data from 2016, all scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
South Africa 2000	2	NA	2	2	2	1	2
South Africa 2016	1	2	2	2	2	2	2

South Africa's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows six times an average score (*best interests of the child, respect for the views of the child, enabling legislation, budget, data and state-civil society cooperation*) and once a low score (*non-discrimination*). The score of 2016 on four indicators stayed the same as they were in 2000 (*respect for the views of the child, enabling legislation, budget and state-civil society cooperation*). The scores on *best interests of the child* and *data* improved, respectively, from non-available and the lowest score to an average score. The score on *non-discrimination* dropped from an average to the lowest score. With a score available on *best interests of the child*, which was not present in 2000, the completeness of South Africa's scores improved.

**Suriname (CO data from 2016, 6 scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Suriname 2007	1	2	2	1	2	2	2
Suriname 2016	1	1	2	2	2	2	NA

Suriname's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows four times an average score (*respect for the views of the child, enabling legislation, budget and data*) and twice the lowest score (*non-discrimination and best interests of the child*). The score of 2016 on four indicators stayed the same as they were in 2007 (*non-discrimination, respect for the views of the child, budget and data*). The score on *enabling legislation* improved from the lowest to an average score. The scores on *best interests of the child* and *state-civil society* dropped, respectively, from an average to the lowest score and non-availability. With no score available on *state-civil society cooperation*, which was present in 2007, the completeness of Suriname's scores deteriorated.

**United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island (CO data from 2016, 6 scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
United Kingdom 2008	2	1	2	2	2	NA	3
United Kingdom 2016	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA

United Kingdom's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows on all six available indicators the lowest score (*non-discrimination, best interests of the child, respect for the views of the child, enabling legislation, budget and data*). The score on *best interests of the child* stayed the same as it was in 2008. The score of 2016 on *data* improved from non-available to the lowest score. The scores on *non-discrimination, respect for the views of the child, enabling legislation and budget* dropped from an average to the lowest score. The score on *state-civil society cooperation* dropped from the highest score to non-availability. With no score available on *state-civil society cooperation*, which was present in 2008, the completeness of the United Kingdom's scores deteriorated.

**Zambia (CO data from 2016, 6 scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Zambia 2003	2	2	2	2	2	2	NA
Zambia 2016	2	2	1	2	2	2	NA

Zambia's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows five times an average score (*non-discrimination, best interests of the child, enabling legislation, budget and data*) and once the lowest score (*respect for the views of the child*). The scores of 2016 on six indicators stayed the same as they were in 2003 (*non-discrimination, best interests of the child, enabling legislation, budget, data and state-civil society cooperation*). The score on *respect for the views of the child* dropped from an average to the lowest score. With no score available on *state-civil society cooperation*, which was also not present in 2003, the scores record of Zambia remains incomplete.

**Zimbabwe (CO data from 2016, 6 scores available)**

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interests of the child	Respect for the views of the child	Enabling legislation	Best available budget	Collection and analysis of disaggregated data	State-civil society cooperation for child rights
Zimbabwe 1996	1	1	2	1	NA	1	3
Zimbabwe 2016	2	2	2	2	1	2	NA

Zimbabwe's record in the 2016 Concluding Observations shows five times an average score (*non-discrimination, best interests of the child, respect for the views of the child, enabling legislation and data*) and once the lowest score (*budget*). The score of 2016 on *respect for the views of the child* stayed the same as it was in 1996. The scores on four indicators improved from the lowest to an average score (*non-discrimination, best interests of the child, enabling legislation and data*). The score on *budget* improved from non-availability to the lowest score. The score on *state-civil society cooperation* declined from the highest score to non-availability. With no score available on *state-civil society cooperation*, which was present in 1996, the completeness of Zimbabwe's scores deteriorated.

## Annex 1 - Domains & Indicators

	<b>Domains:</b>	<b>Indicators:</b>
1	<b>Right to Life</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under 5 mortality</li> <li>• Life expectancy at birth</li> <li>• Maternal mortality ratio</li> </ul>
2	<b>Right to Health</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of under five year olds suffering from underweight</li> <li>• Immunization of 1 year old children</li> <li>• % of population using improved sanitation facilities (urban and rural)</li> <li>• % of population using improved drinking water sources (urban and rural)</li> </ul>
3	<b>Right to Education</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school participation</li> <li>• Secondary school participation</li> <li>• Primary school enrolment ratios (female as % of male)</li> <li>• Secondary school enrolment ratios (female as % of male)</li> <li>• Survival rate to last grade of primary (female as % of male)</li> <li>• Primary school net attendance ratio (urban and rural)</li> </ul>
4	<b>Right to Protection</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Child labour</li> <li>• Adolescent birth rate</li> <li>• Birth registration</li> </ul>
5	<b>Enabling Environment for Child Rights</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-discrimination</li> <li>• Best interests of the child</li> <li>• Respect for the views of the child/child participation</li> <li>• Enabling legislation</li> <li>• Best available budget</li> <li>• Collection and analysis of disaggregate data</li> <li>• State-civil society cooperation for child rights</li> </ul>

## Annex 2 - Regions

### Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CEE/CIS) – 20 countries

Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia (the former Yugoslav Republic of), Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

### Asia and the Pacific – 23 countries

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Lao, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Vanuatu, Vietnam

### Africa – 43 countries

Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Congo Democratic Republic of the, Cote d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe

### Industrialized countries – 36 countries

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea Republic of, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Russian Federation, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

### Latin America and Caribbean – 25 countries

Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela

### Middle East and North Africa (MENA) – 18 countries

Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

### Countries partly in the Index – 2 countries <sup>3</sup>

Liechtenstein, Poland

### Countries not in the Index – 34 countries

**Asia and the Pacific:** Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Korea Democratic People's Republic of, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Niue, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu

**Africa:** Cape Verde, Seychelles, Somalia, South Sudan

**Industrialised countries:** Andorra, Hong Kong, USA

**Latin America and Caribbean:** Antigua and Barbuda, Anguilla, Barbados, British Virgin Islands, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Turks and Caicos Islands

**Middle East and North Africa (MENA):** State of Palestine, Sudan

<sup>3</sup> The score for a domain is not calculated if more than half of the indicators of that domain have a missing value. A country is not included in the overall Index if the score on domain 5 'Child Rights Environment' is missing. A country is also not included if more than half of the domain scores are missing. Poland and Liechtenstein cannot be scored for domain 5, and are therefore not included in the Index. Poland and Liechtenstein are included in the ranking of domains 1 to 4 of the KidsRights Index 2017.

The KidsRights Index is the only annual global ranking on how countries worldwide are adhering to children's rights.

**165**  
COUNTRIES

**Unique:** domain Child Rights Environment provides insight into the extent to which a country is equipped to carry out the UN CRC.

**Online:** the KidsRights Index is accessible for everybody on [kidsrightsindex.org](http://kidsrightsindex.org)



**The goal of the KidsRights Index**

is to stimulate compliance with children's rights worldwide.

The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child is the global framework for children's rights.



**1989**

UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.



The KidsRights Index uses existing data from two reputable sources: quantitative data published and regularly updated by UNICEF at [www.data.unicef.org](http://www.data.unicef.org) and the *Concluding Observations* by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child.

The KidsRights Index: **23 indicators: 16 quantitative and 7 qualitative indicators**

### 1. Life

- Under 5 mortality rate
- Life expectancy at birth
- Maternal mortality ratio



### 2. Health

- % of under five year olds suffering from underweight
- Immunization of 1 year old children
- % of population using improved sanitation facilities (urban and rural)
- % of population using improved drinking water sources (urban and rural)



### 3. Education

- Primary school participation
- Secondary school participation
- Primary school enrolment ratios (female as % of male)
- Secondary school enrolment ratios (female as % of male)
- Survival rate to last grade of primary (female as % of male)
- Primary school net attendance ratio (rural)



### 4. Protection

- Child labour
- Adolescent birth rate
- Birth registration



### 5. Child Rights Environment

- Non-discrimination
- Best interests of the child
- Enabling legislation
- Best available budget
- Respect for the views of the child/child participation
- Collection and analysis of disaggregate data
- State-civil society cooperation for child rights



The KidsRights Index is an initiative of the KidsRights Foundation, in cooperation with Erasmus University Rotterdam; Erasmus School of Economics and the International Institute of Social Studies.



KidsRights Foundation

Noorderakerweg 90  
1069 LW Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Tel: +31 20 225 82 25

[info@kidsrights.org](mailto:info@kidsrights.org) 

[www.kidsrights.org](http://www.kidsrights.org) 