



## **Report of the Expert group meeting on Youth Development Indicators**

**United Nations Headquarters, New York, 12-14 December 2005**

---

### CONTENTS

A.	Background to the Meeting .....	2
B.	Opening of the Workshop.....	3
C.	Adoption of the agenda.....	3
D.	Summary of deliberations.....	3
E.	Adoption of the report of the Workshop.....	13
Annex I.	List of participants.....	14
Annex II.	Agenda and time table of the workshop.....	18

## **A. Background to the Meeting**

1. The Expert Group Meeting on Youth Development Indicators was held at United Nations Headquarters in New York, from 12-14 December 2005. The Meeting was organized by the United Nations Programme on Youth, within the Division for Social Policy and Development, Department of Economic and Social Affairs. It brought together academia, policy advisers, youth organizations, United Nations Agencies, and intergovernmental organizations, to provide inputs on a draft set of indicators that could monitor and measure youth development over time.

2. The “World Youth Report 2005, Young people today and in 2015” makes a strong argument to scale up the investment in youth development. The challenges are clear: 200 million youth live on less than US\$1 a day, 130 million are illiterate, 10 million live with HIV, and 88 million young people are unemployed. While Member States and United Nations Agencies increasingly recognize the importance of investing in youth, it is very difficult to measure the success of their interventions. Programmes and policies are insufficiently monitored and many existing data are not age-disaggregated.

3. The World Programme of Action for Youth (WPAY) was instrumental in setting a global agenda for young people on the basis of 10 priority areas in 1995<sup>1</sup>. In 2005, the General Assembly added five new priority areas of concern<sup>2</sup>. However, the WPAY did not provide a set of verifiable indicators that could be used to monitor the progress achieved in these priority areas.

4. At its sixtieth session, the General Assembly adopted a resolution (60/2) on “policies and programmes involving youth”, which requests the United Nations Secretariat, in collaboration with other relevant United Nations programmes and agencies, to establish a broad set of indicators related to youth, which Governments and other actors may choose to use to monitor the situation of young people related to the priority areas identified in the World Programme of Action for Youth.

5. The objective of the meeting was to define, for the fifteen priority areas identified in the World Programme of Action for Youth, a set of suitable indicators that would allow to:

- Measure youth development
- Compare progress in and between countries
- Identify areas that need increased action
- Advocate for youth: develop policy and encourage collection of youth related data
- Explore the possibility to develop a Youth Development Index

6. The report of the meeting and proposed set of indicators will be used for a publication that will be shared with a wide audience, in order to further the debate and to increase support amongst Member States, youth organizations, NGOs and international institutions for the implementation of the World Programme of Action for Youth, and to report to the General Assembly, as requested in resolution 60/2.

---

<sup>1</sup> Education, employment, hunger and poverty, health, environment, drug abuse, juvenile delinquency, leisure-time activities, girls and young women, youth participation in decision-making.

<sup>2</sup> Globalization, information and communication technology, HIV/Aids, youth and armed conflict, intergenerational relations.

## **B. Opening of the Workshop**

7. In his opening remarks, Mr. Johan Schölvinn, Director, Division for Social Policy and Development, UNDESA, welcomed all participants to the meeting. He underlined the urgent need to invest in young people. He also emphasized that youth are key agents for social change, economic development and technological innovation. While the World Programme of Action for Youth offers a comprehensive framework for youth development, the indicators to measure the progress achieved in implementing the World Programme of Action have not been established yet. The reasons to establish such indicators are to enable stakeholders to distinguish between different age groups and their socio-economic situations in order to better understand their specific needs; to measure youth development over time; to compare progress in and between countries and regions; to monitor the impact of investment in youth; to help identify areas that need increased action; and to advocate for youth and underline the importance of investing in young people.

8. All participants introduced themselves.

## **C. Adoption of the agenda**

9. The Workshop adopted the agenda and corresponding time table which is attached to this report as Annex II.

10. All available papers and presentations that were presented during the Workshop will be made available via the website of the United Nations Programme on Youth, UNDESA: [www.un.org/youth](http://www.un.org/youth).

## **D. Summary of deliberations**

11. Joop Theunissen, UN Focal Point on Youth, made a presentation on "What is youth development, how can it be measured?". He presented the World Programme of Action for Youth (WPAY) with its 15 priority areas, in which youth is defined as the age group between 15 to 24, as the framework on youth development according to the United Nations. He referred to the 15 priority areas of the WPAY, which can be divided into three different clusters: "Youth in a Global Economy", "Youth in a Civil Society" and "Youth at Risk." Mr. Theunissen referred to youth as an age group with certain characteristics. Firstly, it is understood as a transition phase between childhood and adulthood. Secondly, the definition of youth changes throughout history as it responds to cultural and socio-economic conditions in a society. Therefore and finally, the interpretation on "What is youth?" differs on the regional, national and even local conditions. This has to be taken into consideration, if youth development is going to be discussed. Mr. Theunissen summarized the objectives and the expected outcomes of the meeting.

12. Various issues were brought to the attention in the following discussion. Firstly, the participants discussed different definitions on youth, mainly regarding the age definition. With reference to the latest General Assembly resolution, it was emphasized that it would be effective to agree to the UN definition, since they respond to the mandate. Secondly, certain areas outside of the WPAY, such as family, migration, urban vs. rural youth, legislation, which needed to be captured, were addressed. Third, it was suggested that participants draw upon the indicators from the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) but go beyond these indicators as the WPAY is more comprehensive and focused on youth. Fourth, it was discussed whether the indicators should be policy indicators to use

as an advocacy tool or as outcome indicators to increase knowledge regarding youth. It was agreed to do both. Finally, it was underlined that indicators should not just measure youth development but in the end include young people and their perspective, particularly on the local level. In this regard, it was agreed that effective youth participation would need to be discussed and defined during the meeting to come up with appropriate indicators.

13. *Two presentations were made on existing youth development indicators and available data on youth.*

14. Charlotte van Hees, United Nations Programme on Youth, presented a list of existing indicators divided along the 15 priority areas of the WPAY, which are monitored; for some areas, no indicators are available or the quality and/or quantity of existing data vary greatly. Finally she explained that the list included different types of indicators such as process, and outcome indicators, which were recognized for further discussion.

15. Mr. Serguey Ivanov, United Nations Population Division, presented some indicators that were not included in the list. He also presented a set of demographic indicators, including mid-year population, change in youth population (estimated and projected) and the percentage of working population in this age group. For the area "Health", he presented the added indicators "Life expectancy at age 15", "Gender gap in life expectancy at age 15" and the "Probability, for 15 year olds, to reach age 24". Furthermore, he introduced gender-sensitive indicators, such as "Employment of gainfully employed women". For the priority area "HIV/AIDS" he suggested the "Percentage of young people who completely understand HIV/AIDS" and "Youth who use condoms".

16. In the following discussion, clarification regarding sources of the raw data, problems with the reliability of data, and challenges of data gathering as well as comparability were addressed. It was also emphasized that the presented list of available data was incomplete. Additions to the list could be submitted via email to the UN Programme on Youth to extend the list of existing indicators. Furthermore, it was recognized that it is equally important to develop new innovative indicators, and use the existing resources effectively.

17. *Three presentations were made on the roles of the various stakeholders in the data gathering process.*

18. Francesca Coullare, Statistics Division, UNDESA, shared experiences regarding the process of developing a set of indicators to measure the progress of the MDGs. She presented the key elements which need to be thought of when measuring and monitoring development on the basis of indicators: firstly, identifying indicators, secondly, involving stakeholders to implement the developed indicators. She also distinguished different types of indicators, such as outcome indicators, process indicators (context) and indicators to inform policies. Furthermore, she presented characteristics, which should be taken into account when identifying suitable indicators (data availability/quality of data, frequency of the data, policy relevancy, facilitate to interpret, relevance at regional level). Finally, she explained the difference between global and national indicators and strongly recommended to employ already existing data.

19. Lydiah Kiburu, World Organization of the Scout Movement (WOSM), Africa Regional Office, presented characteristics of the WOSM structure, and reflected on the role of youth organizations in the process of data gathering. Ms. Kiburu pointed out that youth organizations can facilitate data collection, due to a specific infrastructure (organized centrally, regional and local representations,

partnerships with various development partners and alliances with other youth organizations), structure of membership (outreach to certain sub-groups, such as street children, refugees and internally displaced persons) and their specific youth program (i.e. activities, age structured educational programs, youth events/forums). She underlined that data are available for various age groups, and on different levels (global, regional, national, local).

20. Bettina Schwarzmayr, European Youth Forum, presented 11 youth policy indicators developed by the Council of Europe, which are used to monitor youth development in Europe. Ms. Schwarzmayr introduced the participants to the procedure of how youth policies are reviewed on national level, including a report in order to gain appropriate information in preparation for necessary research and allow comparison between countries. An Advisory Panel, including young people, reviews policies, reports about their status and makes recommendations to the national governments. She also drew the attention of the participants to the European Knowledge Center, which is an Internet-based resource supported by 16 countries, where youth researchers network and information on youth related data and youth policy reports are made available.

21. In the following discussion, the participants addressed the need to involve youth in gathering data and to include them in reviewing policies. Also, the role of different youth organizations (institutionally established vs. internet based grassroots) as valuable partners and resources was critically discussed. It was again emphasized that youth participation has to be taken seriously and should be part of the following discussions about a suitable set of indicators.

*22. Four presentations were made on national and regional perspectives to monitoring youth development.*

23. Mr. Waiselfisz, UNESCO regional coordinator, Brazil, introduced a number of studies on youth development that UNESCO Brazil has conducted since 1997. This led to the publication of the Youth Development Report 2003, which introduced an analysis of youth development measured along various indicators in the fields of health, education and income. The report has two parts, one analytical part discussing the findings related to these three fields, and the second part discussing the Youth Development Index. Data were disaggregated to the age categories of 15-17, 18-19 and 20-24, as well as to urban and rural backgrounds and black and white youth. Mr. Waiselfisz further presented some of the main findings of the 2003 report and compared some of the findings with the forthcoming Youth Development Report 2005. The report had increased the public awareness on youth problems. Also as a spin-off, various bodies, including the National Youth Council, were created, and the report received international attention.

24. In the discussion that followed, questions were raised regarding the way data was gathered. Mr. Waiselfisz explained that UNESCO had not been able to collect data itself due to a lack of resources. Qualitative indicators were not available, and as it was not necessarily positive that youth of 15 years of age were employed; he suggested to use a negative indicator of employment.

25. Mr. Baby Jacob, Regional College of Management, in Orissa, India, introduced the various surveys used to monitor youth programmes in India, where youth is defined as the population between 13 and 35 years old. The main survey is the Synchronous Decennial Census, which is conducted every 10 years. He briefly explained that the central, state and municipal governments implemented various youth programmes for students and non-student youth. The Central Statistical Organization (CSO) in India developed 22 youth indicators in

1998, but they have not (yet) been picked up by the Synchronous Decennial Census. Mr. Jacob compared the table of available indicators, compiled by UNDESA, to data that are available in India, and he suggested some new indicators to that, including hygiene education in schools and indicators on youth and power and decision-making (e.g. the number of young people in parliament and young candidates in elections). He further suggested to include the role of faith based organizations in the discussions.

26. Mr. Su, of the Sociology Institute of Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences in China, introduced some of the studies undertaken in China to monitor youth development. His listing included studies done by the China Youth Research Centre, the Shanghai Committee of Youth Leaders, the Hong Kong Social Service Foundation, and various universities. Hundreds of indicators had been defined for different purposes, that Mr. Su has put together in a listing for distribution. He then introduced the mechanisms used to monitor these indicators. For each of China's provinces, four small cities or counties are chosen, from where schools, universities or enterprises are selected as units in which to monitor the indicators.

27. In the discussion that followed, questions were raised regarding the stakeholders involved in the data gathering process. The indicators were developed top-down and the main absentee seemed to be youth organizations. Another point of discussion was whether youth indicators for large countries, such as China and India, need to be specified by region or by country. The situation of youth will be very different throughout these countries; however, national indicators are necessary for country comparisons. Agreement was reached that for these large countries we need both the regional and national data.

28. Mr. Carles Feixa, of the University of Lleida, Spain, presented the System of Key Indicators of Infancy and Adolescence (SICIA) developed by the Institute of Childhood and Urban World (CIIMU) in Catalonia. These were initially local indicators that were later adopted on regional and national level. The SICIA offers various key indicators that evaluate the quality of life, detect needs, and guide policies. He argued that if indicators on youth were developed, one must first need to establish a conceptual framework that was based on presuppositions or hypotheses about the what youth development was. One of the ingredients of the SICIA framework was to perceive youth both as individuals and as being part of a social group. The SICIA system contains around 10 areas, similar to the ones described in the World Programme of Action for Youth, but also add some new ones, including housing, family policies, the transition from school to work and demographics. For each area, Mr. Feixa presented the applicable indicators.

29. *Presentations were made on the four priority areas within the cluster "Youth in a Global Economy".*

30. Maria-Helena Henriques-Mueller, Chief of the Youth Coordination Section, UNESCO, together with Diane Stukel of the Institute of Statistics of UNESCO, presented a few key indicators on youth education. In this discussion two factors have to be taken into account: the limitations of the budget, and the reliability and periodicity of data. Besides gathering data on global indicators, she suggested to also develop specific indicators for the local level. On a local level the quality of education could be measured, possibly in partnership with youth organizations. On a global level they recommended to include the indicator on literacy rates (15-19 and 20-24 yr), the gross and net enrolment rates for secondary education, the gross enrolment rate for tertiary education, ratio of newcomers to secondary to the people that finished primary education.

31. In the discussion that followed various other data collectors were mentioned that fill some of the gaps in data related to education, including on city level data, longitudinal studies, vocational training, non formal learning and digital literacy. UNESCO does measure interruptions of schooling.

32. David Gordon, Head of the Centre for the Study of Poverty and Social Justice within the University of Bristol presented possible indicators related to poverty and hunger. The indicators drawn from the MDGs are not age disaggregated. He presented an alternative set, distinguishing between deprivation and severe deprivation of basic human needs, including deprivation of food, water, sanitation, health, shelter, education and information. The data are available disaggregated by age for most countries. Food deprivation is available only for the age category between 16 and 24 years. The absolute poverty threshold is equal to 2 or more (severe) deprivations of basic human need. To measure hunger for the youth population, age disaggregated data are available for the body mass index.

33. Steven Kapsos of the Employment Trends Team within ILO presented possible indicators on youth employment. Youth employment has gained importance within ILO, as they are in charge of monitoring target 16 of the MDGs on creating decent and productive employment for youth. Young people face unique challenges, as they are more than three times as likely than adults to be unemployed and they are more likely to be in precarious employment situations. Mr. Kapsos updated the list of available indicators provided by UNDESA. Although the existing indicators offer a solid starting point on youth employment, there is currently no agreed method to measure the quality of employment. No definition is available for decent and productive employment for young people. Besides looking at youth employment indicators in isolation, he suggested to also focus on the following indicators: the ratio of youth to adult unemployment; the youth share of total unemployment; the employment to population ratio by sex, and the youth labour force. The main databases of ILO are the KILM and LABORSTA databases.

34. The discussion that followed focused on the way to measure the transition from school to work. ILO has done a school to work survey in a few countries. Questions were also raised about ILO's definition of employment of one hour of work per week for pay, profit, or family income. Many participants thought that this definition was too limited. Further, it was discussed to what extent employment for youth is a good thing. It was felt that it was important that youth are free and have the means to choose their own path to education or employment. Many other relevant indicators are available, but these are not disaggregated by age, or by part-time versus full-time employment, wages, hours of work, self-employment and underemployment.

35. David Gordon, Head of the Centre for the Study of Poverty and Social Justice within the University of Bristol, presented possible ways to measure the impact of globalization on young people. Instead of looking at youth in relationship to the national economy or the international trade, he suggested to look at the effects of globalization on an individual level. Possible indicators could concentrate on migrations flows within countries and abroad, remittance flows from and to young people, and changes in employment (mainly in the manufacturing sector).

36. During the discussion other indicators were suggested, including the number of youth studying overseas, access to and usage of global media, access to the internet, transnational connections of youth through organizations, the

ability to speak native and foreign languages, travels abroad and the number of youth employed in the tourist sector.

37. *Six presentations were made on defining youth development indicators for "Youth and their wellbeing".*

38. Kenneth Land, Professor at Duke University and the University of Texas, presented an evidence-based approach to the measurement of trends in child and youth well-being, and specifically introduced a conceptual framework which can possibly be used to develop youth indicators. After summarizing approaches to develop social indicators in the past, Mr. Land drew attention to the process of developing subjective indicators, known as quality-of-life studies (i.e. "overall life satisfaction"). He then presented the conceptual framework for the Child Wellbeing Index (CWI), reflecting a composite measure of trends over time. The CWI is composed of 28 key indicators in 7 quality-of-life domains. Its main objective is to chart the overall direction of change to the well-being of children and youth. Focusing on indicators on delinquency, he introduced 5 indicators in the domain of "Safety/Behavioural Concerns", such as rates of violent crime, cigarette smoking, alcohol consumption, and illicit drug use. Finally, he presented some findings of his recent research and a structure of communication between national and local level in order to interpret the findings appropriately.

39. In the following discussion, the value of quality of life studies for the development of youth development indicators was underlined, since information about subjective perception of well-being of young people is necessary to capture a comprehensive picture. Such research has mainly been undertaken in the USA and Europe. Changes in social context that effect young people's life, should be noted and appropriate indicators should be employed/developed to capture these.

40. Gautam Babbar, Expert Adviser on Drug Demand Reduction within UNODC, presented five possible indicators on drugs: youth and drug abuse, youth and drug trafficking, negative legal and social impact of drug abuse, the negative health impact of drug abuse, and dependence and addiction. He also proposed three indicators for crime: youth as victims, youth as perpetrators, and youth in the criminal justice system. He emphasized that data are not available for all these suggested indicators. Indicators for which data are readily available are: the youth lifetime prevalence rate of drug use and the total number of juvenile suspects.

41. In the following discussion, the reliability of existing data was addressed. It was suggested to go beyond data that can be provided by the United Nations, as this data are reported by the Member States, which might make the data less reliable. In order to create a suitable and meaningful set of indicators for youth development other data sources should be considered. Also, the definition of the term "crime" was discussed, as without a universal definition, data might not be comparable. Crime is currently defined as a violation of national and international laws. It was also stated that data on youth as victims of crime hardly exist, but are necessary to capture a comprehensive picture of youth and crime.

42. Krishna Bose, Department of Child and Adolescent Health and Development, WHO, presented a framework for country programming for adolescent health. The framework is developed by WHO, UNFPA and UNICEF along five dimensions, namely health and development outcomes, behavioural outcomes, protective and risk factors, and interventions. Ms. Bose emphasized the importance of combining an analysis of actual problems with an analysis of contextual aspects. Therefore, she introduced evidence of common determinants influencing the risky behaviours of youth, such as the relationship with parents,

conflicts in the family, a positive school environment and friends who are negative role models. Furthermore, she identified four different types of indicators, reflecting different layers to measure and monitor youth development: programmatic, determinant, behaviour and impact indicators.

43. In the discussion that followed, several questions were raised regarding the availability of data within WHO (e.g. data on HIV/AIDS and youth and risky behaviour affected by armed conflicts). It was further suggested to approach participation as an overarching topic for all 15 priority areas of the WPAY. The importance of involving youth in measuring and monitoring aspects of their life, including their health, was underlined.

44. Laura Laski, Coordinator of the Adolescent and Youth Cluster, UNFPA, presented indicators on HIV/AIDS and sexual and reproductive health. Ms Laski referred to Millennium Development Goal 6 on combating HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases. She discussed the indicators for HIV among young people, such as HIV prevalence among 15 to 24 year old women and men, sexual activity, drug abuse and child marriage. Building on the four types of indicators that were identified by Ms Bose in the previous presentation, she presented some core indicators. Core indicators for programmatic indicators are a national policy index related to young people and HIV, the provision of HIV education in school, the institutionalization of youth friendly health services, and the use of health services by youth and condom availability. Determinant indicators include the knowledge of HIV prevention and adult support of education on condom use. Behavioural indicators should include sex before the age of 15, condom use among young people who had higher risk sex in the preceding year, and safe sexual behaviour. Finally, impact indicators should focus on HIV prevalence rates among pregnant women and among youth in community based surveys and among youth with sexually transmitted infections. Suggested reproductive health indicators are adolescent fertility rate (15-19), the percentage of service delivery points providing adolescents with reproductive health services and the percentage of obstetric/gynaecological admissions due to abortion complications.

45. The participants discussed the different understanding of sexual education on the national level and related that to differing terminology in general, which makes collecting and interpreting data more complicated. This has to be recognized for all indicators and data. It was also addressed that data regarding HIV/AIDS prevalence should be available for the age groups 15-19 and 20-24, since this differentiation presents the appropriate results. Also HIV/AIDS prevention efforts on national levels, such as the strategy “abstinence above condom use” in Uganda were touched upon. Finally, it was concluded that the mortality rate of young people due to AIDS cannot be included as an indicator as people contract HIV during their youth, but most do not die during their youth.

46. Angela Langenkamp, Gender and Youth Expert, German Technical Cooperation (GTZ), introduced the participants to female youth and their well-being, while discussing disadvantages of girls over boys, addressing gender based discrimination and violence as well as touching upon the threat of sexual violence for young women. She emphasized that women are not just a vulnerable group but are subject of pressing challenges due to disadvantages. Furthermore, she discussed ways to measure progress on gender equality and finally proposed new indicators to monitor progress in achieving female youth well being and equal right to development, which are not existing yet, such as the availability of secure and adequate gender responsive infrastructure, equal opportunities and adequate access to training and productive resources for young women and men, number of sexually and/or physically abused and/or exploited girls, number of girls being trafficked, etc.

47. In the following discussion, it was agreed that looking at new and already existing indicators is as equally important as recognizing existing data that is just not exposed yet. Related to this, it was emphasized that violence against women is a burning issue and that the term “gender” refers to boys as well, which has to be considered when developing indicators for this priority area.

48. Colette Daiute, City University of New York, presented indicators for the priority area youth in armed conflict. She first referred to qualitative research material on youth experiences of conflict and then presented a definition of youth in armed conflicts, emphasizing that effects of armed conflicts on young people can not be reduced to a traumatic experience, but need to be understood as a process effecting a wide period of time in a life of a young person. Ms Daiute presented developmental effects of participation in armed conflict and communal violence, such as socialization in a culture of war and the uncertainty about economic, family and civic possibilities. Building onto that, she introduced the participants to developmental goals drawn from the presented effects, such as re-socialization to a culture of peace and the creation of structures for youth determination in civic and family life on local and national level. Finally, she shared her thoughts regarding dimensions and tensions of youth development indicators and explored possibilities towards indicators of youth development in and after armed conflicts.

49. Jane Kembabazi added to this presentation various sources that could provide additional on youth in armed conflicts. In the discussion, participants debated whether – in the absence on high quality indicators specified on this issue – it would be worthwhile to include non youth specific (contextual) indicators that are also determining the situation of youth in armed conflicts. It was suggested to further discuss the possibility to include contextual indicators in general. It was also mentioned that it is not possible to restrict the understanding of young people in armed conflicts to child soldiers, since indicators have to capture all youth effected by these conflicts. Finally, specific contextual indicators were suggested: the availability of small arms and the existence of peace education before and after armed conflicts.

50. *Presentations were made on the five priority areas within the cluster “Youth in Civil Society”.*

51. Roger Hart, Professor at the Graduate School of the City University of New York and Co-Director of the Children’s Environments Research Group, presented his thoughts on possible indicators on civil society participation. He opened the discussion by saying that participation is voluntary; it is not just a top down given opportunity for young people to be mobilized. There are enormous cultural variations in methods and means of participation. To get to the core of development, he suggested we had to measure the freedom of youth to engage in terms of the available legislative opportunities. These legislated (civil and political) freedoms of engagement of a young citizen includes an uncensored press, internet access, and the right to information. Indicators should also monitor youth participation at the level of local government, both in terms of decision making and setting budget priorities. He further suggested to incorporate membership in politically neutral organizations; the ability to self organize and be at the helm of leadership within organizations; and the degree to which youth can practice and reproduce their culture. Mr. Hart mentioned the utility of lowering the voting age as it can increase civic awareness and participation in the political system and stimulate discussion in schools.

52. The discussion opened with a comment about including an indicator on the age to run for office. Participants also brought up the virtue of participation in itself and suggested looking at the Freedom House indicators on this subject. We need to ask youth what quality participation looks like, even for the exercise of creating youth indicators. It was also stressed that it is necessary to preserve the inter-generational dialogue as a way of averting conflict. Mr. Hart mentioned that a youth participation index can help tease out the lack of participation in a undemocratic society. The question was raised if we speak of democracy when we speak of participation.

53. Carles Feixa, University of Lleida and researcher at the Institute of Childhood and Urban World presented indicators related to leisure. He discussed the distinctions between free time, recreation, and discretionary time, the latter being indicative of social inclusion or exclusion. He presented an hourglass model for leisure time, in which youth cultures undergo rites of passage which are typified by leisure activities. Leisure time can be divided into 5 domains: leisure culture (leisure time, leisure activities, leisure budget), media culture (visual culture, written culture, oral culture), body culture (sports, fashion, cosmetics), music culture (production, reproduction, consuming), and public culture (museums, libraries, youth centres), each of which has an indicator to represent it. Mr. Feixa argued the importance of measuring the time available for leisure, the quality of leisure, and the content of leisure. The following indicators for leisure, most of which are divided into sex and age groups (in Spain and some other Western countries), were suggested: availability of leisure time, leisure activities performed during the last 30 days, sports activities performed during the last 30 days, regular radio listening, and magazine readership.

54. In the following discussion it was addressed that we should not over-determine what happens during leisure time, that play needs to be structured out of issues that arise. Leisure time may be a space in which to mobilize young people to work on community based projects. It was noted that the best available data often comes from marketing companies. An example of the commercialization of leisure time for youth in Kenya was given, describing how this resulted in new kinds of advertisements, FM stations, stores, movie theatres, and career paths for youth. There are enormous cultural differences between the concepts and manifestations of leisure time, as well as between youth in rural and urban areas, and young women and men. The discussion explored the distinction between voluntary and chosen activities, and who is providing those activities, how democratic the process is, and what they are providing. Leisure was also recognized as a time when experimentation with sex and drugs occurs. It was raised that we need to address leisure time as youth see it, in terms of rap, hip hop, capoeira, or whatever the latest trend is, and not judge leisure activities by our own standards. In China, because students study so hard, they have no spare time for leisure activities, and for those who are working, their leisure time is almost exclusively occupied by television. Mr. Feixa reiterated that his presentation was specific to the Spanish context. He proposed three concepts of free time: time without compulsory activity, time with activities that youth like to do, and leisure, a mixture between free time and recreation.

55. Kenneth Land, Professor at Duke University and the University of Texas, introduced the discussion on the priority area intergenerational relations. He argued that for much of what we want to know on intergenerational issues, we need information across time periods and countries, however the data are scattered both geographically and in databases. Mr. Land brought up the changing roles in the family due to the effects of HIV/AIDS. He also commented on the transformation of the composition of the family itself due to this issue and many other special cases; this phenomenon has been measured in most areas.

There are also some databases that contain surveys that address the question whether youth have talked about certain issues with a parent in the last month.

56. In the discussion, the question was raised to what extent care given by youth for the elderly can be described as a free choice or forced action. It was mentioned that intergenerational relations refers to youth interaction with parents *as well as* older adults who are not related to them. Consistent reference to the “generation gap” has an innately negative emphasis that ignores the psycho-social support and positive outcomes facilitated by parents. It is often the parent or other close relative who has the most rational interest in protecting, caring for and guiding the youth. In some cultures, young women and men stay at home during university and remain living in this environment while employed and earning a salary; this has, in some areas, had the effect of delaying marriage or the first birth of a baby. Often times, there is competition for resources with little effort made to collaborate or identify issues important to the younger and the older generations. It was suggested that perhaps people who leave home for university at 18 have a better long term relationship with their parents. Intergenerational sex and intimate relations have significant consequences for several WPAY priority areas, specifically HIV, gender, health and education.

57. Roger Hart, City University of New York and Co-Director of the Children's Environments Research Group, presented indicators related to environment. He began by problematizing the word environment, discussing the current mainstream usage as merely relating to the natural environment. The definition of the physical environment must include the natural, the built, and the living environments, taking into consideration sustainable development, environmental integrity, and development for all. It is important to look at youth habitats, and accessible free and safe public spaces for gatherings, sports, and recreation. Neighbourhood safety and security are identified as important. Possible indicators include the number of violent experiences observed in the past year and the number of times helped by others in the past year. In terms of the natural environment, access, educational curricula, and locally meaningful engagement are all important. Youth are, and can be even more so, involved in participatory community-based monitoring of environments, resources, programmes and services.

58. Yamina Djacta from UN-HABITAT discussed indicators on environment existing within Habitat. Five indicators within goal 7, target 11 of the MDGs are particularly important to youth: durable structures, sufficient living area, access to safe water, access to improved sanitation, and connection to services. The indicators used by Habitat are: under-five mortality, HIV prevalence, literacy rate, urban population growth, unemployment, and solid waste disposal. UN-HABITAT collect indicators at the city level and disaggregates data according to slums versus non-slums. During the discussion, it was mentioned that it is difficult to mainstream sustainable development in the United Nations, and to gather data for the physical environment, and although there are currently 450 indicators available, they are not geographically representative, nor necessarily accurate. For this reason, the United Nations feels it cannot yet begin to gather age or sex-disaggregated data, although some environmental indicators are available for children. It was asserted that the environment ought to be looked at as a cross-cutting issue, rather than simply as a priority area.

59. Carles Feixa, Professor at the University of Lleida and researcher at the Institute of Childhood and Urban World, presented possible indicators related to Information and Communication Technology (ICT). Youth are the pioneers of ICT both in the creation of content and technology and also as users however there is virtually no concrete information by age group on access. Young people not only

learn about the these innovations very quickly but teach them to the rest of society. The experiences of youth with ICT covers games, blogs, personal communication and chat and the development of technology itself. The rate of growth in access is reflected in the proliferation of online communities and the ability of young people to form “nations” of young people with common interests. Due to the cost and the requirement of an access code, the time a youth spends on computers can be regulated. Though young people are at the forefront of ICT, there are many people in the world who are still excluded from the internet revolution. Five proposed indicators are: internet access during the last month, mobile phones by age and income, possession of an email address, pc’s per student at secondary schools, and cyber-cafes per 1000 inhabitants.

60. The discussion that followed focused on the use of ICT to prevent social exclusion both of youth (specifically female youth) and, in the intergenerational context, of older people. It was suggested that there might be significant elements missing in communication and the making of claims, and the assertion of rights through the internet/email. With this in mind, there question was raised if there is more of an immediate accountability in face to face meetings. Another participant mentioned that though looking at *who* has access is important, the *way* it is being used is just as relevant – this includes networks and new forms of “socialibility”.

61. *Presentations on DevInfo, the Youth Development Index and final observations.*

62. Mr. Nicolas Pron, project manager of DevInfo within UNICEF, presented the indicators and data available within the DevInfo software.

63. Mike Thiedke, United Nations Programme on Youth, introduced the pros and cons of a possible Youth Development Index (YDI), which could build on the Human Development Index (HDI). Mr. Thiedke addressed that a YDI could be used to measure youth development, identify areas that need further attention, compare progress between countries, advocate for youth and develop youth policies, as well as encourage the collection of youth related data. He also discussed the disadvantages of a YDI, e.g. the difficulty to select significant indicators for an index, reflect the dynamic social strata of youth, weigh indicators meaningful, collect necessary data and consider the political sensitivity with regard to the UN Member states. He suggested to use indicators identified during this meeting and its follow-up process and from indicators drawn from the MDGs targeting youth.

64. Joop Theunissen, Focal Point on Youth, shared a number of general observations that could be drawn from the presentations of the past three days. He stressed the need for the United Nations Secretariat to respond to the General Assembly request for indicators within 2006. Also, while there had been many fields in which a large number of indicators had been already become available, there were a number of priority areas in the WPAY where those indicators did not exist. He proposed that all participants would inform the Secretariat before the end of January 2006 with a set of 3-4 core indicators, any additional indicators, as well as contextual indicators for the priority areas of their concern for possible inclusion in the World Youth Report 2007, to be issued at the occasion of the Commission for Social Development in February 2007

## **E. Adoption of the report of the Workshop**

65. At its closing session, the participants to the meeting adopted the report on 14 December 2005.

**Annex I. List of participants**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Email</b>
City University of New York	Mr. Roger Hart	Professor, Environmental Psychology Program; and Co-Director, Children's Environments Research Group	RHart@gc.cuny.edu
City University of New York	Ms Colette Daiute	Professor of Psychology, City University of New York, The Graduate School and University Center	CDaiute@gc.cuny.edu
Duke University	Mr. Kenneth Land	John Franklin Crowell Professor, Department of Sociology; and Director, Center for Demographic Studies; and Senior Fellow, Center for the Study of Aging	kland@soc.duke.edu
European Youth Forum	Ms Bettina Schwarzmayr	Vice President	bettina.schwarzmayr@youthforum.org
German Technical Cooperation (GTZ)	Ms Angela Langenkamp	Senior policy advisor to the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	Angela.Langenkamp@bmz.bund.de
Kim Sabo Consulting	Ms Kim Sabo		KimSabo@aol.com
Regional College of Management, Orissa	Mr. Baby Jacob	Head of the Dept of Social Work and Consultancy Division, Regional College of Management, Orissa; and visiting Professor, Centre for Social Science Research, Orissa and IGNOU.	bjacob48@yahoo.com
Sociology Institute of Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences	Mr. Su Songxing	Professor, Sociology Institute of Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences; Executive Director, China Youth and Children Research Association	songxing@eastday.com
The Summit Foundation	Ms Suzanne Petroni	Senior Program Officer	spetroni@summitfdn.org
University of Bristol	Mr. David Gordon	Professorial Research Fellow and Head of the Centre for the Study of Poverty and Social Justice, University of Bristol; and Director of the Townsend Centre for International Poverty Research.	Dave.Gordon@bristol.ac.uk
University of Lleida	Mr. Carles Feixa	Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Lleida; and Researcher at the Institute of Childhood and Urban World	Feixa@geosoc.udl.es

Report on the Expert Group Meeting on Youth Development Indicators  
 – New York, 12-14 December 2005 -

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Email</b>
University of Tennessee	Mr. Brian Barber	Founding Director, Center for the International Study of Youth and Political Violence; and Professor of Child and Family Studies, and Adjunct Professor of Psychology, University of Tennessee	bbarber1@utk.edu
World Organization of the Scout Movement, Africa Regional Office	Ms Lydia Kiburu	Assistant Director - Communications	Lkiburu@africa.scout.org
n/a	Ms Jane Kembabazi	Expert on HIV/ AIDS, post-conflict justice, peace building, and reconstruction in Africa	jkembabazi@gmail.com
<b>Intergovernmental Organizations</b>			
Agence Intergouvernementale de la Francophonie	Mr. Jean-Pierre McLaughlin	Coordinator Youth Programmes	Jean-Pierre.McLaughlin@francophonie.org
Agence Intergouvernementale de la Francophonie	Mr. Mohamed Salem	Coordinator of the "Conseil international des organisations de jeunes de la Francophonie (CIJEF) (International council of the youth organizations of la Francophonie)	mohamed.salem@francophonie.org
Commonwealth Secretariat	Mr. Andrew Simmons	Commonwealth Youth Programme	A.Simmons@commonwealth.int
Organización Iberoamericana de Juventud	Mr. Paul Giovanni Rodriguez		PGRODRIGUEZ@oj.org
<b>United Nations Agencies</b>			
International Labour Organization	Mr. Steven Kapsos	Employment Trends Team	kapsos@ilo.org
UNESCO	Ms Maria-Helena Henriques-Mueller	Head of the Section for Youth, Bureau of Strategic Planning	Mh.Henriques-mueller@unesco.org
UNESCO	Ms Diane Stukel	Head of Unit, Methodology, Institute for Statistics	d.stukel@uis.unesco.org
UNESCO	Mr. Julio Jacobo Waiselfisz	Sociologist, UNESCO Regional coordinator Pernambuco, Brazil	julio.jacobo@unesco.org.br
UNICEF	Ms Mary Mahy	Programme Officer (HIV/AIDS), Division of Policy and Planning	mmahy@unicef.org
UNICEF	Mr. Nicolas Pron	DevInfo Project Manager	npron@unicef.org
United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs	Mr. Serguey Ivanov	Population Affairs Officer, Population Division	ivanov@un.org

Report on the Expert Group Meeting on Youth Development Indicators  
 – New York, 12-14 December 2005 -

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Email</b>
United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs	Ms Francesca Coullare (for Ms Francesca Perucci)	Chief, Statistical Planning and Development Section, Statistics Division	perucci@un.org
United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs	Mr. Bob Huber	Chief, Generational Issues and Integration Section, Division for Social Policy and Development	huber@un.org
United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs	Mr. Joop Theunissen	Focal Point on Youth, Division for Social Policy and Development	theunissen@un.org
United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs	Ms Patience Stephens	Social Affairs Officer, Social Analysis and Policy Section, Division for Social Policy and Development	stephensp@un.org
United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs	Mr. Fred Doulton	Associate Social Affairs Officer, Programme on Youth, Division for Social Policy and Development	doultonf@un.org
United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs	Ms Julie Larsen	Associate Social Affairs Officer, Programme on Youth, Division for Social Policy and Development	larsenj@un.org
United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs	Ms Emily Krasnor	Associate Social Affairs Officer, Programme on Youth, Division for Social Policy and Development	krasnor@un.org
United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs	Ms Charlotte van Hees	Associate Expert in Youth Policies and Programmes, Division for Social Policy and Development	vanhees@un.org
United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs	Mr. Mike Thiedke	Consultant, Programme on Youth, Division for Social Policy and Development	thiedke@un.org
United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs	Mr. Frank Cohn	Intern, Programme on Youth, Division for Social Policy and Development	cohn@un.org
United Nations Environment Programme	Mr. Jim Sniffen	Regional Office New York	sniffenj@un.org
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime	Mr. Gautam Babbar	Expert Adviser, Global Challenges Section	gautam.babbar@unodc.org
United Nations Population Fund	Ms Laura Laski	Senior Technical Adviser, Adolescent/Youth Cluster, Reproductive Health Branch, Technical Support Division	laski@unfpa.org
United Nations Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)	Ms Yamina Djacta	New York Office	djacta@un.org
World Bank	Ms Sulekha Patel	DEC network	Spatel1@worldbank.org

Report on the Expert Group Meeting on Youth Development Indicators  
– New York, 12-14 December 2005 -

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Email</b>
World Bank	Ms Silvia Paruzzolo	Children and Youth Unit	sparuzzolo@worldbank.org
World Health Organization	Ms Krishna Bose	Department of Child and Adolescent Health and Development	bosek@who.int

## **Annex II. Agenda and time table of the workshop**

### **Monday 12 December**

- 9.00-9.45: **Welcome and introduction**  
Johan Schölvinc, Director, Division for Social Policy and Development
- 9.45-10.00: **Practicalities of the meeting**  
Charlotte van Hees, United Nations Programme on Youth
- 10.00-11.00: **What is youth development, how can it be measured?**  
Joop Theunissen, UN Focal Point on Youth, followed by discussion
- 11.00-11.15: *Coffee break*
- 11.15-12.00: **Existing youth development indicators and data on youth**  
Presentations, followed by discussion  
11.15-11.40: Charlotte van Hees, United Nations Programme on Youth (within the framework of the World Programme of Action)  
11.40-12.00: Serguey Ivanov, United Nations Population Division (youth demographics)
- 12.00-13.00: **Data gathering, roles of various stakeholders**  
Presentations, followed by discussion  
12.00-12.30: Francesca Perucci, United Nations Statistics Division (data gathering mechanisms in the international statistical system)  
12.30-13.00: Lydiah Kiburu, World Organization of the Scout Movement, Africa Regional Office (role of youth organizations).
- 13.00-14.00: *Lunch*
- 14.00-17.00: **National/regional perspectives to monitoring youth development**  
Presentations, followed by discussion  
14.00-14.45: Julio Jacobo Waiselfisz, UNESCO Brazil (Youth Development Indicators and Index in Brazil)  
14.45-15.15: Bettina Schwarzmayr, European Youth Forum (youth policy indicators developed by the Council of Europe)  
15.15-15.45: Baby Jacob, Regional College of Management, Orissa (India)  
15.45-16.00: *Coffee break*  
16.00-16.30: Su Songxing, Sociology Institute of Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences (China)  
16.30-17.00: Carles Feixa, University of Lleida and Institute of Childhood and Urban World (Spain)
- 17.00: *Reception in the conference room on the 13<sup>th</sup> floor, 2 UN Plaza*

## Tuesday 13 December

- 9.00-12.00: **Defining youth development indicators for “Youth in a Global Economy”**  
All priority areas are introduced by an expert, followed by discussion
- 9.00-9.40: David Gordon, Centre for the Study of Poverty and Social Justice, University of Bristol (hunger/poverty)
- 9.40-10.20: Maria-Helena Henriques-Mueller, Youth Coordination Section, UNESCO (education)
- 10.20-10.35: *Coffee break*
- 10.35-11.15: Steven Kapsos, Employment Trends Team, ILO (employment)
- 11.15-11.55: David Gordon, Centre for the Study of Poverty and Social Justice, University of Bristol (globalization)

12.00-13.00: *Lunch*

- 13.00-17.00: **Defining youth development indicators for “Youth and their wellbeing”**  
All priority areas are introduced by an expert, followed by discussion
- 13.00-13.35: Kenneth Land, Duke University and University of Texas (delinquency)
- 13.35-14.10: Gautam Babbar, Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Unit, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (drugs)
- 14.10-14.45: Krishna Bose, Department of Child and Adolescent Health and Development, World Health Organization (health)
- 14.45-15.10: *Coffee break*
- 15.10-15.45: Laura Laski, Adolescent and Youth Cluster, United Nations Population Fund (HIV/AIDS and reproductive health)
- 15.45-16.20: Angela Langenkamp, German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) (gender)
- 16.20-16.55: Colette Daiute, City University of New York (armed conflict)

## Wednesday 14 December

- 9.00-12.30: **Defining youth development indicators for “Youth in Civil Society”**  
All priority areas are introduced by an expert, followed by discussion
- 9.00-9.35: Roger Hart, City University of New York and the Children’s Environments Research Group (participation)
- 9.35-10.10: Carles Feixa, University of Lleida and the Institute of Childhood and Urban World, Spain (leisure)
- 10.10-10.45: Roger Hart, City University of New York and the Children’s Environments Research Group (environment)
- 10.45-11.00: *Coffee break*
- 11.00-11.35: Carles Feixa, University of Lleida and the Institute of Childhood and Urban World, Spain (ICT)
- 11.35-12.10: Kenneth Land, Duke University and University of Texas (intergenerational relations)

12.15-13.30: *Lunch*

- 13.30-14.30: **Youth Development Index**  
Mike Thiedke, United Nations Programme on Youth, followed by discussion

- 14.30-15.30: **Finalize the report of the meeting**  
Joop Theunissen, United Nations Focal Point on Youth

- 15.30-16.30: **Agreements for follow up and evaluation of the meeting**  
Joop Theunissen, United Nations Focal Point on Youth