



What is the NextGen Index?

The NextGen Index is a new comparative tool that ranks States on their progress in ending child immigration detention. The Index uses a standard scoring framework to assess the key factors that ensure national migration management systems are sensitive to the needs of children and, importantly, avoid child detention.

The scoring framework analyses the strengths and weaknesses of current systems in protecting and respecting the rights and best interests of the child at all times, regardless of their migration status. Scorecards are accompanied by tailored recommendations on how each country can improve their scores in the future. National scores will be updated each year to track a country's progress over time.

The NextGen Index is an initiative of the Global Campaign to End Child Detention. Its central coordination team is made up of staff working for the Global Campaign to End Child Detention, referred to collectively as the Global NextGen Index Team.

<http://next-gen-index.org/>



What factors are included in the NextGen scoring framework?

The NextGen Index reviews the fundamental policies and protections that ensure children are not harmed while a migration matter is resolved. Broadly, the scoring categories are:

- **Treaties:** Full score if the country has ratified the core international treaties that protect the rights of children in the context of international migration
- **National laws:** Full score if the country has enacted a law that prohibits or avoids immigration detention of all children
- **Processing:** Full score if the country has implemented policies to identify and protect children in the context of migration
- **Placement:** Full score if the country has ensured child-sensitive placement options are available
- **Rights:** Full score if the country has ensured the fundamental rights of all children are fulfilled regardless of migration status
- **Oversight:** Full score if the country has established independent oversight of immigration detention systems
- **Points off:** Points off for instances of child immigration detention
- **Bonus points:** Bonus points for positive progress, such as a recent political commitment to work to end child immigration detention



How is a score determined?

Country scores are determined by a National NextGen Committee, with oversight by the Global NextGen Index Team.

The role of the National NextGen Committee is to score their national context using the standardised scoring framework, provide evidence and justification for those scores, consider and integrate the feedback from the Global NextGen Index Team, lead national government engagement strategy, and to promote the NextGen Index in the national context.

The role of the Global NextGen Index Team is to guide the National NextGen Committees to ensure they understand the Scoring Framework, to interrogate and strengthen score justifications, to ensure an appropriate quality and quantity of supporting evidence is provided, and to harmonise scoring across countries in light of international norms and diverse national contexts.

The scorecard is an NGO-led initiative, and responsibility for the transparency and accuracy of the data will lie with the Global Campaign to End Immigration Detention and our Country Committee partners.

How did you choose which countries to score?

Ideally, we would have the resources to score all countries. However, resource limitations mean that we had to select a smaller cross-section of countries for the first year of scoring. Countries were chosen according to a variety of factors. Firstly, it was important that the international comparative aim was met by ensuring countries with a range of national contexts were represented. Second, it was important that the national civil society groups working on the issue of immigration detention were able and willing to complete the scorecard and believed it would be a useful tool to promote their national advocacy work. Finally, we chose some countries that are well known for either positive or negative practices regarding children. Some Country Committees undertook the scoring process but decided to only release the narrative component of the scorecard in line with national advocacy strategies and responding to current political contexts.



Tell me more about National NextGen Committees

National NextGen Committees consist of representatives from organisations within each country who support the Global Campaign to End Child Detention, and who have engagement strategies with government. Committee Members include civil society groups, UN bodies, academics, and advocacy networks. National NextGen Committee Members are voluntary positions. Members commit to:

- Collaborating together to complete scoring by:
 - o Scoring each item in the scoring framework
 - o Writing justifications for each score
 - o Producing evidence and references for each item
 - o Drafting recommendations
- Participating in 3 committee meetings at each stage of the scoring process
- Reviewing the advocacy document produced by the Global NextGen Index Team based on their national scorecard
- Coordinating government engagement, including presenting an advance copy of the Scorecard to the government for response prior to public launch
- Launching the final scorecard in the national context

Why will a scorecard like this make a difference?

We envisage that the scorecard can be used as a practical tool to show States what can be done, and to showcase what is already being done, worldwide. It provides motivation for States to improve their scores, by pushing for greater transparency and oversight of the treatment of children and supporting governments that are making progress in the right direction. The central platform and international comparisons ensure a broad international audience will be aware of the treatment of children in different countries and that this broad supporter base will create more impetus for positive change.



How was the Scoring Framework developed?

The Scoring Framework went through a thorough drafting and testing process to create a reliable and transparent standardised scoring mechanism that could be applied to a diverse range of country contexts and repeated on an annual basis to track change over time. The Global NextGen Index Team collaborated closely with the International Detention Coalition (IDC) to develop the Scoring Framework. The IDC is a well-regarded international NGO with technical expertise on human rights-based border control, particularly alternatives to immigration detention. The Scorecard builds on existing policy frameworks and standards on child-sensitive migration systems including the IDC's [Community Assessment and Placement Model](#) and the UNHCR's [Beyond Detention Checklist](#).

The first draft of the Scorecard was tested and circulated amongst key stakeholders in June and July 2017. We asked these experts to review the scorecard with an eye to whether it included all relevant factors in different country contexts, whether the scoring mechanism and protocol for each item would accurately assess the factor described, and whether the framework was missing any relevant factors relating to the protection of children. Experts were identified in the global, regional and national context to provide feedback of how the scorecard would be perceived, including advisors from the government sector.

Experts in several countries were also engaged to test the scorecard in their country against the criteria. This national testing was used to determine whether the factors could be accurately condensed and reflected in numerical scores, whether key items or issues were not represented, and whether the overall score reflected the expert's broad understanding of that country's treatment of children.

The Scoring Framework was then revised in line with the feedback received from stakeholders and national testing sites. The final Scoring Framework was approved by the Global NextGen Index Team and the IDC in late August 2017.



Why didn't you use the term Alternatives to Detention?

Some stakeholders would have preferred the NextGen Index to use the term “Alternatives to immigration detention” in the Scorecard Framework. We decided not to use this term because there is no common understanding of alternatives to detention globally. We did not want terminology to create confusion for the Country Committees or for the public. Instead, we decided to list the elements of a child-sensitive migration system independently for scoring, rather than categorising sections as ‘alternatives to detention’ or not. To learn more about alternatives to detention, see the International Detention Coalition’s report [*There are Alternatives: A handbook for preventing unnecessary immigration detention.*](#)

How current is the data in the 2018 NextGen Index?

There are some limitations on the currency of data at the point of public release in August 2018. The aim of the Index is to produce a comparative dataset over an established time period. The majority of Country Committees produced the draft of their national scorecard in the last quarter of 2017, with the aim of reporting against the previous 12-months (July 2016 – June 2017). However, it was not possible to limit all scorecards to precise timeframes due to the lack of regular government reporting on the issues scored. For instance, many governments do not produce immigration detention statistics regularly but rather publish one-off reports or respond to questions by oversight bodies as required. In a few cases, the Committees incorporated recent major changes in the final score when they were in the review process. For example, Australia ratified OPCAT after the draft Scorecard had been completed by the Country Committee and the Global NextGen Index Team decided it was appropriate to incorporate this in the final score. Some Country Committees also revised their Scorecard in line with new data or information that was provided by government after reviewing the draft scorecard. It is hoped that, as we move beyond the Baseline Year to yearly review, the NextGen Index will create more accurate and comparable information on an annual basis.



Why did you ask for raw numbers of children detained?

Some people have asked us why the Scoring Framework penalises countries based on the number of children detained, as a raw number, rather than on the proportion of children detained compared with the number of children in migration procedures. There are two reasons for this. First, one child detained is one too many. From a child's point of view, it doesn't matter if they are the only child detained or one of hundreds of children detained. Detention is never appropriate. We wanted to keep this at the forefront of our minds. Second, it was hard to identify a comparative category to use as the denominator figure that was consistently reported in most countries. Very few countries publish data on the number of children in migration procedures at any one time. Requiring Country Committees to try and produce such a percentage figure would have created a meaningless category that could only be completed in a handful of cases.

I have more questions – where can I go?

Please contact the Global NextGen Index Team via the Global Campaign to End Child Immigration Detention team at media@endchilddetention.org