

# The KidsRights Index:

## Explanation for Striking Results Based on the Domain 'Child Rights Environment', by Karin Arts (19/11/2013)

Domain 'Child Rights Environment' Indicators:

1. non-discrimination
2. best interest of the child
3. respect for the views of the child/child participation
4. enabling legislation
5. best available budget
6. collection and analysis of disaggregate data
7. state-civil society cooperation for child rights

Country	Non-discrimination	Best interest 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
Australia 2012	2	1	2	2	1	2	NA
Brunei Darussalam 2003	1	1	2	2	NA	1	1
Canada 2003	2	1	2	2	1	1	NA
Egypt 2011	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Germany 2004	2	2	2	2	NA	2	NA
Italy 2011	1	1	2	NA	1	2	NA
Luxembourg 2005	2	1	1	NA	NA	1	NA
New Zealand 2011	2	NA	1	1	2	NA	NA
Portugal 2001	2	NA	3	3	2	2	3
Thailand 2012	2	2	2	3	2	2	NA

**Scoring system:**

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

### Relatively Highly Ranking States (e.g. as compared to UNDP's Human Development Index, HDI)

- Portugal KRI 1 (HDI 43)
- Thailand KRI 18 (HDI 103)
- Egypt KRI 43 (HDI 112)

### Relatively Low Ranking States (e.g. as compared to HDI)

- Germany KRI 20 (HDI 5)
- Canada KRI 60 (HDI 11)

- Australia KRI 26 (HDI 2)
- New Zealand KRI 75 (HDI 6)
- Italy KRI 82 (HDI 25)
- Luxemburg KRI 100 (HDI 26)
- Brunei Darussalam KRI 109 (HDI 30)

## General Explanations for KRI Rankings that Potentially Deviate from Expectations

- 1. The Scope for Realizing the Full Spectrum of Children's Rights (as laid down in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child) is not only determined by income, or by level of economic or human development**  
In all instances of unexpected rankings in the KRI, the scores on the domain 'child rights environment' play a major role. These stem from in total 7 scores for the general equipment of a state for realizing the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, based on the Concluding Observations of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. These scores relate to:
  - a) the extent to which the general principles of the CRC are operationalized (non-discrimination; best interests of the child; respect for the views of the child/participation) and
  - b) the extent to which there is a basic 'infrastructure' for 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.
- 2. Availability of data**  
The (non-)availability of data plays a key role. For the unexpectedly high ranking countries only maximally 1 score out of the 7 scores in total is missing (for Thailand and Portugal, for Egypt all are available). For more than half of the 7 unexpectedly low ranking countries two or more scores out of the 7 scores in total are missing (Germany and Italy miss 2 scores each; New Zealand and Luxemburg miss 3 scores each; the others (Brunei, Australia and Canada) miss only 1 score.
- 3. The Importance of Making All-Round Efforts**  
The unexpectedly high ranking countries perform well on almost all accounts. Of the 7 lower ranking countries, 4 (Canada, Australia, Italy and Luxemburg) score poorly on the principle of the best interests of the child, and most have a poor score on the non-discrimination principle.  
Interesting too is that 3 of the lower ranking countries are federal/decentral states (Germany, Canada and Australia). This is a well-known potential complication for the introduction of legislation (and quite often there are discrepancies between the legislation of the various parts of the federal state) and for the implementation of legislation and policy measures in all parts of the country.

## Complications for Interpreting KRI Rankings and Valuing the Appropriateness of the Policy Recommendations Made

- 1. The CRC Committee's Concluding Observations (i.e. the basis of the scores on the domain 'child rights environment') are contextual.** Different standards of CRC implementation may apply to different states, depending e.g. on level of economic development, availability of resources, knowledge, and implementation capacity.  
Counter-argument: this is a realistic and pragmatic approach, and in line with the nature of the state's child rights

obligations under the CRC.

2. The Concluding Observations date from different years and some are rather old (which then creates the risk that the policy recommendation will already have been acted upon and thus is outdated). Counter-argument: this is correct but there is no alternative if one wishes to base oneself on one and the same source of information for all states in the world; over time this will hopefully be remedied by less delays in CRC state reporting procedure and/or adding reliable alternative sources.

## Country-Level Explanations for Rankings that Potentially Deviate from Expectations and Recommendations for Priority Action.

### High Rankers

- **Portugal (CO data from 2001, 1 score missing)**  
Overall record strong. Next to one missing score, it does not get the lowest score (of 1) on any of the indicators. Scores the maximum (of 3) on 3 indicators (legislation; respect for the views of the child/participation and state-civil society cooperation) and scores 2 (middle-range) on 3 indicators (non-discrimination; best available budget; data).
- **Thailand (CO data from 2012, 1 score missing)**  
Overall record strong. Besides one missing score (on state-civil society cooperation), does not get the lowest score (of 1) on any of the indicators. Scores the maximum (of 3) on 1 indicator (legislation) and scores the middle-range (of 2) for 5 indicators (non-discrimination; best interests; respect for the views of the child/participation; best available budget; data).
- **Egypt (CO data from 2011, all scores available)**  
Overall record reasonably strong. Does not get the lowest score (of 1) on any of the indicators. Scores the middle range (of 2) on all indicators.

### Low Rankers

- **Germany (CO data from 2004, 2 scores missing)**  
Overall record reasonably strong. Does not get the lowest score (of 1) on any of the indicators. Scores the middle level score (of 2) on 5 indicators (non-discrimination; best interests; respect for the views of the child/participation; legislation; state-civil society cooperation).
- **Canada (CO data from 2012, 1 score missing)**  
Overall record reasonable. Gets the lowest score (of 1) on two indicators (best interests and data gathering). Scores the middle level score (of 2) on 4 remaining indicators (legislation; respect for the views of the child/participation and state-civil society cooperation).
- **Australia (CO data from 2012, 1 score missing)**  
Overall record reasonable. Gets the lowest score (of 1) on one indicators (best interests). Scores the middle level score (of 2) on 5 remaining indicators (non-discrimination; legislation; respect for the views of the child/participation; best available budget; and state-civil society cooperation).
- **New Zealand (CO data from 2011, 3 scores missing)**  
Overall record is low. Next to 3 missing scores (for best interests, data and state-civil society cooperation), it gets the lowest score (of 1) on two indicators (respect for the views of the child/participation, and legislation). Scores the middle level score (of 2) on the 2 remaining indicators (non-discrimination; best available budget).

- **Italy (CO data from 2011, 2 scores missing)**

Overall record is low. Next to 2 missing scores (for legislation and state-civil society cooperation), it gets the lowest score (of 1) on three indicators (non-discrimination; best interests; and best available budget). Scores the middle level score (of 2) on the 2 remaining indicators (respect for the views of the child/participation; data).

- **Luxemburg (CO data from 2005, 3 scores missing)**

Overall record is low. Next to 3 missing scores (for legislation, best available budget and state-civil society cooperation), it gets the lowest score (of 1) on two indicators (; best interests; respect for the views of the child/participation; data). Scores the middle level score (of 2) on the remaining indicator (non-discrimination).

- **Brunei Darussalam's (CO data from 2003, 1 score missing)**

Overall record is low. Next to 1 missing score (for best available budget) it gets the lowest score (of 1) on four indicators (non-discrimination; best interests; data; state-civil society cooperation). Scores the middle level score (of 2) on the remaining indicators (respect for the views of the child/participation; legislation).