|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| INDICATOR\_NUM | METADATA\_CATEGORY | METADATA\_CATEGORY\_DESC | METADATA\_DESCRIPTION |
| V.3 | 1 | Contact point in international agency | Claudia Cappa  Senior Adviser, Statistics, Child Protection and Development  UNICEF [ccappa@unicef.org](mailto:ccappa@unicef.org)  [data.unicef.org](data.unicef.org) |
| V.3 | 2 | International agreed definition | \*\*Definition\*\* This indicator can be measured among smaller age groups, with the experience of younger women representing FGM/C that has occurred more recently and the experience of older women representing levels of the practice in the past. At the regional and global level, this indicator is currently being reported as the proportion of adolescent girls aged 15-19 years who have undergone female genital mutilation.  \*\*Concepts\*\* Female genital mutilation \(FGM\) refers to “all procedures involving partial or total removal of the female external genitalia or other injury to the female genital organs for non-medical reasons" \(World Health Organization, Eliminating Female Genital Mutilation: An interagency statement, WHO, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNIFEM, OHCHR, UNHCR, UNECA, UNESCO, UNDP, UNAIDS, WHO, Geneva, 2008, p.4\). |
| V.3 | 3 | Method of computation | Proportion of girls and women aged 15-49 years who have undergone female genital mutilation = \(Number of girls and women aged 15-49 who have undergone FGM / total number of girls and women aged 15-49 in the population\) x 100  \*\*Regional aggregates\*\* are weighted averages of countries with available data within the region.  \*\*Disaggregation\*\* Age \(15-49 years at the national level, 15-19 years at the regional level\) |
| V.3 | 4 | Importance of the indicator in addressing gender issues and its limitation | \*\*Rationale\*\*  FGM is a violation of girls’ and women’s human rights. There is a large body of literature documenting the adverse health consequences of FGM over both the short and long term. The practice of FGM is a direct manifestation of gender inequality. FGM is condemned by a number of international treaties and conventions. Since FGM is regarded as a traditional practice prejudicial to the health of children and is, in most cases, performed on minors, it violates the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Existing national legislation in many countries also include explicit bans against FGM.  \*\*Comments and limitations\*\* There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. The modules used to collect information on the circumcision status of girls aged 0-14 and girls and women aged 15-49 in the DHS and MICS have been fully harmonized.  Data on FGM inform policymakers of critically important variables in an effort to better understand the practice and develop policies for its abandonment. That said, these data must be analysed in light of the extremely delicate and often sensitive nature of the topic. Self-reported data on FGM need to be treated with caution for several reasons. Women may be unwilling to disclose having undergone the procedure because of the sensitivity of the issue or the illegal status of the practice in their country. In addition, women may be unaware that they have been cut or of the extent of the cutting, particularly if FGM was performed at an early age.  Data users should also keep in mind the retrospective nature of these data, which results in this indicator not being sensitive to recent change. For more details on interpretation and common pitfalls for this indicator, see: A Generation to Protect: Monitoring violence exploitation and abuse of children within the SDG framework \(UNICEF 2020\). |
| V.3 | 5 | Sources of discrepancies between global and national figures | The estimates compiled and presented at global level come directly from nationally produced data and are not adjusted or recalculated. |
| V.3 | 6 | Process of obtaining data | Household surveys such as UNICEF-supported MICS and DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1980s. In some countries, such data are also collected through other national household surveys.  UNICEF undertakes a wide consultative process of compiling and assessing data from national sources for the purposes of updating its global databases on the situation of children. Up until 2017, the mechanism UNICEF used to collaborate with national authorities on ensuring data quality and international comparability on key indicators of relevance to children was known as Country Data Reporting on the Indicators for the Goals \(CRING\).  As of 2018, UNICEF launched a new country consultation process with national authorities on selected child-related global SDG indicators it is custodian or co-custodian to meet emerging standards and guidelines on data flows for global reporting of SDG indicators, which place strong emphasis on technical rigour, country ownership and use of official data and statistics. The consultation process solicited feedback directly from National Statistical Offices, as well as other government agencies responsible for official statistics, on the compilation of the indicators, including the data sources used, and the application of internationally agreed definitions, classification and methodologies to the data from that source. Once reviewed, feedback is made available to countries on whether or not specific data points are accepted, and if not, the reasons why. |
| V.3 | 7 | Treatment of missing values | \*\*At country level\*\* When data for a country are entirely missing, UNICEF does not publish any country-level estimate.  \*\*At regional and global levels \*\* Regional aggregates are only published when at least 50 per cent of the regional population for the relevant age group are covered by the available data. |
| V.3 | 8 | Data availability and assessment of countries’ capacity |  |
| V.3 | 9 | Expected time of release | UNICEF will undertake an annual country consultation likely between December and January every year to allow for review and processing of the feedback received in order to meet global SDG reporting deadlines.  Data release calender: March 2021 |
| V.3 | 10 | Data source | Data and metadata were extracted from Global SDG Indicators Database on 10 August 2021.  For more information, please go to the following:   * [https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database/](https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database/) * [https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/files/Metadata-05-03-02.pdf](https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/files/Metadata-05-03-02.pdf) |