Note on the global consultation to develop the statistical framework for measuring the gender-related killing of women and girls (femicide/feminicide)

<u>Prepared by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women</u>

<u>With the support of the Spotlight Initiative</u>

I.   Introduction

1. In March 2019, the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) at its 50th session stressed the need to improve data on gender-based violence on the characteristics of victims and perpetrators, and to measure and monitor the effectiveness of State responses to this phenomenon.

2. The UNSC therefore outlined the importance of developing a *statistical framework on gender-sensitive crime statistics, with a focus on the gender-related killing of women and girls (femicide/feminicide)* based on the International Classification of Crimes for Statistical Purposes (ICCS).

3. The statistical framework will serve as an operational tool independent from legal definitions, which will assist data producers to determine and operationalize what constitutes the "gender motivation" of gender-related killings (femicide/feminicide).

4. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) worked jointly to address the need outlined by the UNSC and this note describes the consultation process held to develop the framework for measuring the gender-related killing of women and girls (femicide/feminicide).

II.   The consultation process

5. Following the UNSC request, UNODC and UN Women jointly organized an Expert Inter-Agency Meeting with partner United Nations agencies and other regional organizations (20–21 June 2019). As outcome of the meeting, an extended list of 32 characteristics was identified as potentially related to the gender-related motivations of the killing of women and girls. The list related to characteristics of the victim, the perpetrator, the modus operandi, and the situational context of these crimes.

Table 1. List of proposed characteristics

Type	Characteristic	Short[1]
Victim	The victim was involved in the sex industry	Sex industry
	The victim was a women's rights defender	WR defender
	The victim was a human rights defender	HR defender
	The victim was pregnant	Pregnant
	The victim had a minority racial or ethnical background	Minority
	The victim had a disability	Disability
	The victim was a migrant/ displaced/ refugee	Migrant
	The victim had a non-conforming gender identity	Gender identity
	The victim had a non-conforming sexual orientation	Sexual orientation
	The victim was elderly	Elderly
	The victim was under the prison system (inmate)	Prison system
	Female infanticide	Infanticide
Perpetrator	The perpetrator of the killing is a male	Male perpetrator
	The relationship between the perpetrator and the victim and was intimate (current/ former)	Intimate partner
	The relationship between the perpetrator and the victim was that of a family member (immediate/ extended)	Family member
	The relationship between the perpetrator and the victim was of authority and/ or care	Authority/care
	Other form of unequal relationship between the perpetrator and the victim	Other known perpetrator
Modus Operandi	Killing involving mutilation of reproductive parts and/or degrading treatment of the body	Mutilation
	Killing where the body was disposed of and exposed on a public place	Body exposed
	Killing where the victim was abducted prior to the murder	Abduction
	Killing involving sexual violence	Sexual violence
	Killing involving sexual exploitation	Sex. exploitation
	The victim was reported as a missing person	Missing
	The killing was committed in the context of organized crime: Trafficking in persons	TiP
	The killing was committed in the context of organized crime: Smuggling of migrants	SoM
	The killing was committed in the context of organized crime: Drug trafficking	Drug traffic
	The killing was committed in the context of organized crime: Gangs	Gangs
Situational context	Killings preceded by history of violence against women and girls	VAW history
	Harmful traditional practices (honor-, dowry-, ritual-, sorcery accusation, genital mutilation-related deaths)	Trad. practices
	Killing aimed at impairing/ nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise of political rights	Political rights
	Killing aimed at preventing the exercise of other rights and woman empowerment	Empowerment
	Humanitarian crisis / Conflict-related killing	Conflict-related

---

[1] For practical purposes, subsequent tables and analysis will refer to the characteristics by their short name. It should be noted that throughout the consultation process, agencies always used and referred to the full characteristic description.

6. Object of the consultation was to assess the *validity* of each characteristic in determining the gender-related motivation of crime; their *relevance* for the development of evidence-based prevention policies; and their *feasibility* in terms of the technical and operational capacity to produce corresponding data. The consultation also referred to proposed disaggregations of all characteristics and their suitability to be used for statistical purposes.

7. A global consultation among national institutions from all UN Member States was launched in the period from April to July 2021. Target institutions included national statistical offices, law enforcement entities, national prosecutors' offices, judiciary institutions, public health institutions, and women's advancement and gender equality entities. Furthermore, other relevant stakeholders such as civil society organizations, the academia, and international organizations were also consulted.

8. Overall, UNODC and UN Women received feedback of 67 national institutions from 54 countries. The ensuing analysis of the responses was a joint effort by the UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence in Statistical Information on Government, Crime, Victimization and Justice and the UN Women-INEGI Global Centre of Excellence on Gender Statistics, with the support of the UNODC Research and Trend Analysis Branch and financial support from the EU-UN Spotlight Initiative.

III. Results analysis

a. General distribution

9. Most answers were submitted by national statistical offices, the police, and the judiciary. These three kinds of institutions make up 69% of all institutions that have participated in the consultation.

Table 2. Response distribution by type of institution

Institution	Proportion
National Statistical Office	38.8%
Police	17.9%
Judiciary	11.9%
Ministry of Interior	7.5%
Civil Society	6.0%
Prosecutor	4.5%
International Organization	4.5%
Other	4.5%
Human Rights Institute	3.0%
Health Institute	1.5%
Total	**100%**

10. In terms of geographic distribution, several responding entities were based in Europe, followed by institutions from the Americas.

Table 3. Response distribution by continent

Continent	Proportion
Europe	49.3%

Americas	26.9%
Asia	16.4%
Africa	7.5%
Total	**100%**

Table 4. Response distribution by continent and type of institution

Institution	Europe	Americas	Asia	Africa	Total
National Statistical Office	46.2%	26.9%	11.5%	15.4%	**100%**
Police	33.3%	16.7%	50.0%	-	**100%**
Judiciary	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%	-	**100%**
Ministry of Interior	80.0%	20.0%	-	-	**100%**
Civil Society	50.0%	50.0%	-	-	**100%**
Prosecutor	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	-	**100%**
International Organization	66.7%	33.3%	-	-	**100%**
Other	66.7%	33.3%	-	-	**100%**
Human Rights Institute	100%	-	-	-	**100%**
Health Institute	-	-	-	100%	**100%**
Total	**49.3%**	**26.9%**	**16.4%**	**7.5%**	**100%**

b. Validity

Table 5. Question on the validity of criteria

Question	**Is the proposed criterion determinant to identify the gender motivation of the crime?**
Type	Single selection
Options	Fully determinant. The criterion reveals a gender motivation of the homicide in itself.
	Partially determinant. The criterion can point towards a gender motivation only when combined with other context variables.
	Non-determinant. The criterion does not provide gender-motivation information.
	Don't know

11. Countries were asked whether they considered the proposed characteristics to be fully indicative of a gender motivation in homicide cases. They distinguished between characteristics that were fully determinant and characteristics that might be only partial determinant in indicating a gender motivation when analyzed in conjunction with other elements of the crime.

12. The perpetrator being an intimate partner was considered fully determinant by over 60% of respondents. Sexual violence, previous history of violence against women, harmful traditional practices and the perpetrator being a family member were considered fully determinant by over 50% of respondents.

13. Other characteristics such as body mutilation, sexual exploitation, the victim being involved in the sex industry and the victim having a non-conforming gender identity were considered fully determinant by over 40% of respondents.

Table 6. Question on the validity of the disaggregating variables

Question	**Does this disaggregation and its related categories comprehensively capture the intention of the criterion?**

Type	Single selection
Options	Yes, they comprehensively capture the intention of the criterion.
	No, they don't reflect the data needed to assess the criterion.
	Don't know

14. In addition to assessing the validity of the characteristics, countries also reviewed the specific disaggregations proposed to operationalize them. Respondents were invited to indicate how valid such disaggregations were in capturing the various modalities of the characteristic.

    a. When possible, the consultation used the disaggregating variables already contained in the ICCS.

    b. When the characteristics were not contained in the ICCS disaggregating variables, new standard, mutually exclusive, and comprehensive categories were developed.

    c. In a few instances, the characteristics relied on recording concurring criminal acts perpetrated along with the homicide. The consultation provided a list of ICCS criminal codes to be used for such records.

15. The categories that received more positive feedback in terms of being fully relevant to identify the gender motivation of the killing of women or girls referred to the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim (intimate partner or family member), the killing in a context of sexual violence, and the killing following a record of violence against women.

Table 7. Responses: Is the proposed criterion determinant to identify the gender motivation of the crime?

Characteristic	Fully determinant	Partially determinant	Non-determinant	Don't know	No response	Total
Intimate partner	67.3%	14.5%	5.5%	9.1%	3.6%	**100%**
Sexual violence	54.5%	12.7%	3.6%	16.4%	12.7%	**100%**
VAW history	54.5%	16.4%	5.5%	16.4%	7.3%	**100%**
Family member	52.7%	18.2%	10.9%	10.9%	7.3%	**100%**
Trad. practices	52.7%	7.3%	7.3%	23.6%	9.1%	**100%**
Sex. exploitation	47.3%	18.2%	3.6%	18.2%	12.7%	**100%**
Mutilation	47.3%	12.7%	9.1%	21.8%	9.1%	**100%**
Authority/care	43.6%	27.3%	5.5%	16.4%	7.3%	**100%**
Gender identity	43.6%	16.4%	12.7%	18.2%	9.1%	**100%**
Male perpetrator	40.0%	29.1%	12.7%	10.9%	7.3%	**100%**
Empowerment	40.0%	12.7%	9.1%	27.3%	10.9%	**100%**
Sexual orientation	38.2%	18.2%	12.7%	21.8%	9.1%	**100%**
Other known perpetrator	38.2%	32.7%	7.3%	16.4%	5.5%	**100%**
Body exposed	38.2%	18.2%	16.4%	18.2%	9.1%	**100%**
TiP	36.4%	21.8%	7.3%	21.8%	12.7%	**100%**
Sex industry	36.4%	29.1%	10.9%	16.4%	7.3%	**100%**
Political rights	36.4%	14.5%	16.4%	23.6%	9.1%	**100%**
Infanticide	34.5%	21.8%	18.2%	16.4%	9.1%	**100%**
Pregnant	34.5%	25.5%	20.0%	12.7%	7.3%	**100%**
Migrant	34.5%	18.2%	23.6%	16.4%	7.3%	**100%**

Elderly	30.9%	18.2%	27.3%	16.4%	7.3%	**100%**
Abduction	30.9%	23.6%	10.9%	23.6%	10.9%	**100%**
Gangs	27.3%	20.0%	16.4%	25.5%	10.9%	**100%**
WR defender	27.3%	27.3%	20.0%	18.2%	7.3%	**100%**
Drug traffic	27.3%	14.5%	18.2%	29.1%	10.9%	**100%**
Disability	27.3%	20.0%	23.6%	23.6%	5.5%	**100%**
SoM	27.3%	18.2%	14.5%	29.1%	10.9%	**100%**
Minority	27.3%	20.0%	27.3%	18.2%	7.3%	**100%**
Conflict-related	23.6%	16.4%	18.2%	32.7%	9.1%	**100%**
Prison system	23.6%	16.4%	30.9%	21.8%	7.3%	**100%**
Missing	23.6%	18.2%	18.2%	25.5%	14.5%	**100%**
HR defender	16.4%	27.3%	30.9%	18.2%	7.3%	**100%**

Note: The table shows only the responses from National Statistical Offices, Police, Judiciary, Ministries of Interior, Prosecutor Offices, and Health Institutes.

Table 8. Responses: Does this disaggregation and its related categories comprehensively capture the intention of the criterion?

Characteristic	Yes	No	Don't know	No response	Total
Intimate partner	82.1%	4.5%	9.0%	4.5%	**100%**
Male perpetrator	79.1%	7.5%	9.0%	4.5%	**100%**
Authority/care	71.6%	6.0%	14.9%	7.5%	**100%**
Family member	70.1%	10.4%	9.0%	10.4%	**100%**
Migrant	70.1%	6.0%	16.4%	7.5%	**100%**
Sexual violence	67.2%	3.0%	14.9%	14.9%	**100%**
WR defender	67.2%	7.5%	16.4%	9.0%	**100%**
VAW history	65.7%	9.0%	14.9%	10.4%	**100%**
Pregnant	65.7%	14.9%	13.4%	6.0%	**100%**
Sex industry	64.2%	14.9%	16.4%	4.5%	**100%**
Sex. exploitation	62.7%	3.0%	16.4%	17.9%	**100%**
Gender identity	61.2%	7.5%	19.4%	11.9%	**100%**
Trad. practices	59.7%	9.0%	20.9%	10.4%	**100%**
Other known perpetrator	59.7%	14.9%	17.9%	7.5%	**100%**
Elderly	58.2%	17.9%	16.4%	7.5%	**100%**
Sexual orientation	58.2%	9.0%	22.4%	10.4%	**100%**
Body exposed	56.7%	10.4%	22.4%	10.4%	**100%**
Empowerment	56.7%	6.0%	26.9%	10.4%	**100%**
HR defender	56.7%	17.9%	17.9%	7.5%	**100%**
Disability	56.7%	14.9%	20.9%	7.5%	**100%**
Mutilation	55.2%	11.9%	22.4%	10.4%	**100%**
TiP	53.7%	7.5%	25.4%	13.4%	**100%**
Gangs	53.7%	7.5%	26.9%	11.9%	**100%**
Drug traffic	52.2%	7.5%	26.9%	13.4%	**100%**
Political rights	52.2%	11.9%	26.9%	9.0%	**100%**
SoM	50.7%	4.5%	31.3%	13.4%	**100%**
Abduction	50.7%	7.5%	28.4%	13.4%	**100%**
Missing	49.3%	10.4%	22.4%	17.9%	**100%**
Infanticide	47.8%	28.4%	16.4%	7.5%	**100%**

Prison system	44.8%	20.9%	22.4%	11.9%	**100%**

c. *Feasibility*

Table 9. Question on data collection and availability status

Question	Are data according to this criterion currently collected/produced in your institution?
Type	Single selection
Options	Yes, with all the disaggregation categories proposed.
	Yes, with related disaggregation categories, but different from those proposed.
	No, but we could collect/ produce data on the proposed disaggregation categories within 1-2 years.
	No, but we could collect/ produce data on the proposed disaggregation categories after 3 years or more.
	No and we don't know if and when it will be possible to collect/produce data on this criterion.
	Don't know

16. Countries were asked to indicate whether they already collected or produced data on each characteristic and if they did so as per the proposed categories. In case that no current collection on a given characteristic was conducted, they were asked to indicate how feasible would it be to do it and the perceived timeframe by which it could be done.

17. Only four characteristics had over 50% of respondents indicating current data availability. These characteristics refer to the sex of the perpetrator (to identify whether they were a male), the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim (to identify whether they were an intimate partner or a family member) and the age of the victim (to identify if she was elderly). The infanticide disaggregation by sex was reported as available in 49% of responses.

18. Other than these cases, respondents reported fairly low availability for most characteristics. Overall, 81% of all characteristics were reported with current availability below 30%.

19. Some countries considered that the collection or production of data as per the proposed categories could be feasible in the medium to long terms, suggesting that improvements are possible in the collection of more comprehensive data on various characteristics of intentional homicides of women and girls

Table 10. Question on data collection and availability challenges

Question	If you answered "No" in the previous question, what would be the top-most challenges your institution would meet when trying to collect or produce these data? Please rank up to 3 options
Type	Ranking
Options	We would need legislative/ normative reforms
	We would need to raise awareness on the importance of these data
	We would need to change internal administrative procedures on the way data are recorded and processed
	We would need to modify the way data are recorded when they are entered in the data collection system
	We would need to change the data transmission/sharing process
	We would need financial resources to put the changes in place
	Other
	Don't know

20. Countries who answered that they currently do not collect nor produce data as per the proposed disaggregations were also asked to select the most critical challenges they would face upon trying to introduce that sort of collection in their institutions. A list with pre-determined challenges was provided for them to rank.

21. The most common challenge mentioned by institutions, appearing in 17% of the responses, was the need to change internal administrative procedures. It was followed by the need to modify data collection systems with 15% and awareness raising with 13%. The need for financial resources was mentioned in 8% of the responses. The least frequently mentioned challenges were the need for legislative reform and the need to change data transmission processes.

Table 11. Responses: Are data according to this criterion currently collected/produced in your institution?

Characteristic	Yes, they currently collect/produce data			No, they currently don't collect/produce data				Don't know	No response	Total
	Sub total	w/ same categories	w/ related categories	Sub total	Possible in 1-2 years	Possible in 3+ years	Not know if possible			
Male perpetrator	**58.2%**	45.5%	12.7%	**38.2%**	9.1%	3.6%	25.5%	3.6%	-	**100%**
Elderly	**56.4%**	34.5%	21.8%	**38.2%**	5.5%	3.6%	29.1%	3.6%	1.8%	**100%**
Intimate partner	**56.4%**	25.5%	30.9%	**40.0%**	5.5%	9.1%	25.5%	3.6%	0.0%	**100%**
Infanticide	**49.1%**	29.1%	20.0%	**41.8%**	3.6%	7.3%	30.9%	1.8%	7.3%	**100%**
Family member	**47.3%**	20.0%	27.3%	**45.5%**	9.1%	9.1%	27.3%	1.8%	5.5%	**100%**
Other known perp.	**34.5%**	14.5%	20.0%	**54.5%**	10.9%	5.5%	38.2%	9.1%	1.8%	**100%**
Sexual violence	**29.1%**	9.1%	20.0%	**56.4%**	3.6%	9.1%	43.6%	3.6%	10.9%	**100%**
Authority/care	**27.3%**	5.5%	21.8%	**67.3%**	12.7%	5.5%	49.1%	3.6%	1.8%	**100%**
Minority	**21.8%**	12.7%	9.1%	**72.7%**	9.1%	7.3%	56.4%	3.6%	1.8%	**100%**
Prison system	**20.0%**	7.3%	12.7%	**67.3%**	5.5%	3.6%	58.2%	5.5%	7.3%	**100%**
Sex industry	**18.2%**	5.5%	12.7%	**76.4%**	10.9%	3.6%	61.8%	3.6%	1.8%	**100%**
Body exposed	**18.2%**	5.5%	12.7%	**69.1%**	3.6%	3.6%	61.8%	7.3%	5.5%	**100%**
VAW history	**18.2%**	3.6%	14.5%	**70.9%**	5.5%	3.6%	61.8%	5.5%	5.5%	**100%**
Pregnant	**16.4%**	7.3%	9.1%	**76.4%**	9.1%	7.3%	60.0%	3.6%	3.6%	**100%**
Sex. exploitation	**16.4%**	3.6%	12.7%	**65.5%**	3.6%	9.1%	52.7%	5.5%	12.7%	**100%**
Disability	**16.4%**	5.5%	10.9%	**74.5%**	9.1%	5.5%	60.0%	5.5%	3.6%	**100%**
Abduction	**16.4%**	3.6%	12.7%	**63.6%**	5.5%	7.3%	50.9%	7.3%	12.7%	**100%**
Migrant	**14.5%**	1.8%	12.7%	**76.4%**	9.1%	5.5%	61.8%	3.6%	5.5%	**100%**
Gangs	**12.7%**	3.6%	9.1%	**69.1%**	1.8%	5.5%	61.8%	7.3%	10.9%	**100%**
Sexual orientation	**10.9%**	1.8%	9.1%	**78.2%**	1.8%	9.1%	67.3%	5.5%	5.5%	**100%**
Political rights	**9.1%**	5.5%	3.6%	**74.5%**	3.6%	5.5%	65.5%	9.1%	7.3%	**100%**
TiP	**9.1%**	1.8%	7.3%	**74.5%**	7.3%	9.1%	58.2%	5.5%	10.9%	**100%**

Gender identity	**9.1%**	1.8%	7.3%	**72.7%**	1.8%	5.5%	65.5%	9.1%	9.1%	**100%**
Conflict-related	**7.3%**	3.6%	3.6%	**69.1%**	5.5%	1.8%	61.8%	14.5%	9.1%	**100%**
Missing	**7.3%**	3.6%	3.6%	**74.5%**	5.5%	5.5%	63.6%	7.3%	10.9%	**100%**
Drug traffic	**7.3%**	1.8%	5.5%	**72.7%**	5.5%	7.3%	60.0%	7.3%	12.7%	**100%**
Mutilation	**7.3%**	3.6%	3.6%	**78.2%**	5.5%	7.3%	65.5%	7.3%	7.3%	**100%**
WR defender	**5.5%**	1.8%	3.6%	**81.8%**	3.6%	9.1%	69.1%	5.5%	7.3%	**100%**
HR defender	**5.5%**	1.8%	3.6%	**83.6%**	5.5%	5.5%	72.7%	5.5%	5.5%	**100%**
Trad. practices	**3.6%**	1.8%	1.8%	**78.2%**	7.3%	7.3%	63.6%	9.1%	9.1%	**100%**
Empowerment	**3.6%**	1.8%	1.8%	**78.2%**	5.5%	7.3%	65.5%	9.1%	9.1%	**100%**
SoM	**3.6%**	1.8%	1.8%	**78.2%**	3.6%	12.7%	61.8%	7.3%	10.9%	**100%**

Note: The table shows only the responses from National Statistical Offices, Police, Judiciary, Ministries of Interior, Prosecutor Offices, and Health Institutes.

d. Relevance

Table 12. Question on gender-based relevance of the disaggregation

Question	According to available data on homicide as identified by this criterion, is the proportion of female victims significantly higher than male victims?
Type	Single selection
Options	Yes, data shows that the proportion of female victims is significantly higher than male victims
	No, data does not show a significant proportion of female victims
	We do not have available data on homicide identified by this criterion
	Don't know

22. Countries were asked if, according to available data on homicide as disaggregated by each characteristic, the proportion of female victims was significantly higher than that of male victims. This assessment could back the assumption that the proposed characteristics are pointedly present in intentional homicide of women, and subsequently in gender-related killings.

23. However, respondents reported considerable lack of information for most of them. On average, 50% of the overall responses stated that homicide data was not disaggregated by the listed characteristics, with another 14% of respondents not knowing whether evidence showed a significantly higher proportion of female victims for each variable.

24. Yet, 11 characteristics were found to have a significantly higher proportion of female victims, including the perpetrator being an intimate partner, preceding history of violence against women, sexual violence accompanying the killing, the victim being involved in the sex industry and the victim being pregnant.

Table 13. Question on policy relevance of the disaggregation

Question	How does/would your institution use the disaggregated data for this criterion? Please rank up to 3 options.
Type	Ranking
Options	Producing estimates or disaggregated data for public dissemination
	Developing policy formulations/decisions
	Developing specific reports/analyses
	Report to other relevant authorities
	Producing data for specific groups of interest or vulnerable groups
	Monitoring institutional performance
	No specific use
	Other
	Not applicable / Don't know

25. Finally, countries were asked to describe how did they (or would they) use the proposed disaggregated data. Once again, a list with pre-determined usages or data applications was provided for them to rank.

26. The development of specific reports and analysis was mentioned the most by the majority of institutions. It was followed by reporting to other relevant authorities and producing estimates or disaggregated data for public dissemination. One of the least frequently mentioned usages for the data was the monitoring of institutional performance.

27. It should be noted that the frequency of institutions stating they would have no specific use for the proposed variables was considerably low, appearing roughly on 2% of the overall responses. This is a clear reflection of the relevance of the proposed disaggregations, though a more in-depth analysis could point towards differences between each specific characteristic.

Table 14. Responses: How does/would your institution use the disaggregated data for this criterion?

Charact.	Developing specific reports/ analyses	Report to other relevant authorities	Producing estimates or disag. data for public dissem.	Producing data for specific groups of interest or vulnerable groups	Developing policy formul./ decisions	Monitoring institutional perform.	No specific use	Other	N/A or don't know	No response	Total
Intimate partner	19.9%	12.9%	12.9%	8.0%	9.5%	4.5%	1.0%	1.5%	0.5%	29.4%	**100%**
Family member	18.9%	12.4%	13.4%	8.5%	9.5%	4.0%	1.5%	1.5%	-	30.3%	**100%**
Male perpetrator	18.9%	12.4%	12.9%	8.0%	9.5%	5.5%	2.0%	1.5%	0.5%	28.9%	**100%**
Elderly	17.9%	10.9%	12.9%	9.5%	6.0%	2.5%	2.5%	1.0%	1.5%	35.3%	**100%**
VAW history	17.4%	11.4%	10.0%	6.5%	8.0%	3.5%	0.5%	1.0%	3.5%	38.3%	**100%**
Sex industry	16.9%	12.4%	10.4%	10.0%	6.0%	3.5%	2.0%	1.0%	4.5%	33.3%	**100%**
Other known perpetrator	16.9%	12.9%	10.4%	9.0%	7.0%	4.0%	3.0%	1.5%	1.5%	33.8%	**100%**
WR defender	16.9%	11.4%	9.5%	7.0%	4.0%	3.0%	2.0%	1.0%	5.0%	40.3%	**100%**
HR defender	16.9%	10.9%	8.5%	8.5%	4.0%	3.0%	2.0%	1.0%	4.5%	40.8%	**100%**
Authority/ care	16.4%	10.4%	10.0%	9.5%	6.5%	3.0%	2.5%	1.5%	3.0%	37.3%	**100%**
Infanticide	16.4%	11.9%	11.4%	9.5%	5.5%	2.5%	2.5%	1.5%	1.0%	37.8%	**100%**
Sexual orientation	15.9%	10.9%	7.5%	9.0%	6.0%	2.0%	1.0%	1.5%	4.0%	42.3%	**100%**
Migrant	15.9%	12.9%	8.5%	9.0%	5.0%	2.0%	2.5%	1.0%	3.5%	39.8%	**100%**
Minority	15.4%	11.4%	10.0%	10.0%	6.0%	2.5%	1.0%	1.0%	5.0%	37.8%	**100%**
Disability	15.4%	11.9%	10.0%	10.0%	4.5%	2.0%	2.5%	1.0%	4.0%	38.8%	**100%**
Sexual violence	14.9%	12.4%	10.0%	7.0%	5.0%	3.0%	1.5%	1.0%	3.5%	41.8%	**100%**
Trad. practices	14.4%	10.0%	8.0%	6.0%	7.0%	3.5%	1.0%	1.5%	5.0%	43.8%	**100%**
Gender identity	14.4%	10.9%	8.0%	8.5%	5.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	4.5%	43.8%	**100%**
Pregnant	14.4%	10.9%	9.0%	10.4%	6.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.0%	4.0%	39.8%	**100%**
Gangs	13.9%	10.4%	8.5%	6.5%	5.5%	2.5%	1.5%	1.0%	5.5%	44.8%	**100%**
Political rights	13.9%	10.9%	8.0%	5.5%	6.0%	3.0%	1.0%	1.0%	6.5%	44.3%	**100%**
Empowerment	13.9%	11.4%	7.5%	5.5%	6.0%	3.0%	1.0%	1.0%	7.0%	43.8%	**100%**

Charact.	Developing specific reports/ analyses	Report to other relevant authorities	Producing estimates or disag. data for public dissem.	Producing data for specific groups of interest or vulnerable groups	Developing policy formul./ decisions	Monitoring institutional perform.	No specific use	Other	N/A or don't know	No response	Total
Sex. exploitation	13.4%	11.4%	7.5%	7.5%	5.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	3.5%	45.8%	**100%**
Abduction	13.4%	10.9%	7.5%	7.5%	5.0%	2.5%	1.5%	1.0%	5.0%	45.8%	**100%**
SoM	13.4%	10.0%	7.5%	7.5%	5.0%	2.5%	1.5%	1.5%	4.5%	46.8%	**100%**
Prison system	13.4%	11.4%	7.5%	7.5%	5.5%	3.0%	2.5%	1.0%	3.5%	44.8%	**100%**
Mutilation	12.9%	10.4%	8.0%	6.5%	4.5%	2.5%	2.0%	1.0%	5.0%	47.3%	**100%**
Missing	12.9%	10.0%	8.0%	7.5%	4.0%	2.5%	1.0%	1.0%	6.0%	47.3%	**100%**
Drug traffic	12.9%	10.4%	7.5%	7.5%	5.0%	2.5%	2.5%	1.5%	4.0%	46.3%	**100%**
Body exposed	12.9%	11.4%	8.5%	8.0%	4.0%	3.0%	2.5%	1.0%	4.5%	44.3%	**100%**
TiP	12.9%	11.9%	7.5%	7.5%	5.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	4.0%	45.3%	**100%**
Conflict-related	12.4%	10.4%	8.5%	5.5%	5.5%	2.5%	1.0%	1.0%	7.5%	45.8%	**100%**