Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
25 May 2012

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixtieth plenary session
Paris, 6-8 June 2012
Item 10(b) of the provisional agenda
International classification of crimes for statistical purposes

Principles and framework for an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes

Country comments

Note by the secretariat

Summary

The present note summarizes the comments by countries and international organizations on the draft Principles and framework for an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes. Most comments contained positive remarks towards the Principles or towards the effort to create an international statistical crime classification. No country opposed efforts to create an international statistical crime classification, although a number of them pointed out particular practical difficulties.

In view of the general support by countries and organizations, the Principles and framework for an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes are submitted to the Conference of European Statisticians for approval, subject to the inclusion of the amendments indicated in this document.

The summary of the Principles is contained in document ECE/CES/2012/6 and their full text is available at:

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/ece/ces/bur/2011/8Add1-crime_classification_report.pdf.

The Principles result from the work of the joint Task Force on Crime Classification of the United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The present note summarizes the comments by countries and international organizations on the draft *Principles and framework for an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes,* circulated in April 2012, resulting from the work of the joint UNODC/UNECE Task force on crime classification. The Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians discussed the document at its November 2001 meeting. The Bureau supported the work and requested that the draft document be sent for electronic consultation to all CES members with a view to being endorsed by the CES 2012 plenary session. The CES Bureau also endorsed the revised TOR of the Task Force to continue the work.

II. Summary

2. Eighteen countries and three international organizations replied to the request for comments: Austria, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Eurostat, the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS-Stat) and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

3. Of these respondents, 16 made positive comments either towards the report itself, or towards the effort to create an international statistical crime classification, with the remaining countries either making no further comment, accepting the report without comment, or supplying a statement containing contextual information about national practices for recording or compiling crime data. No country indicated that they opposed efforts to create an international statistical crime classification in principle, although a number indicated that particular practical difficulties may exist, for example in relation to difficulty of implementation, or to do with attempting to harmonize penal codes, if this were attempted.

III. General comments

4. A number of themes emerged from the responses. Individual responses are contained in an annex to this document. Responses were generally supportive of the effort to develop an international statistical crime classification, although a number of potential difficulties were highlighted, particularly with regard to implementation.

5. A number of countries described gaps in existing systems or practices for recording crimes according to the proposals in the report. These were variously related to **national penal code classifications**, **data gaps in existing administrative systems**, or **access to original microdata**.

6. Regarding **national penal codes**, several countries cited differences between their penal codes and the crime classifications (Bosnia and Herzegovina, France and Greece). France wished to engage in further work regarding what constitutes a crime (for example in relation to seriousness, or other non-criminal delinquency). Austria felt that supplementary guidance would be needed in addition to the proposed classification structure, to ensure consistency of classification between different countries within the proposed categories. CIS-Stat expressed concern that harmonizing national penal codes may be beyond the competence of National Statistical Offices.

7. Regarding **data gaps in existing administrative systems,** several countries responded that their current systems do not record those attributes being proposed as tags,

particularly in relation to victims and perpetrators. Some responses (Israel, Finland) considered IT system redesign to facilitate the collection of tag attributes, whereas others (UK) felt that the high cost of implementing changes to disparate IT systems to be unrealistic.

8.   A number of countries (Belarus, Slovak Republic, Slovenia) indicated that their NSOs receive aggregated crime data from a crime agency or interior department of government, and therefore do not have **access to original microdata**, to enable editing of tag attributes or to provide complex breakdowns of aggregate data.

9.   No country opposed the principle of event-based classification, although it was pointed out that not all of the attributes of the crime may be known or knowable either at the time of the offence, or ever. Greece cited the example of an unknown perpetrator, whilst Portugal cited intent (which might not be revealed until well into an investigation), or consequence (for example if a victim does not die instantly). These may have implications for data quality with regard to missing data.

10.   Another topic that was discussed in many responses was the burden of work upon the providers of the data (for example by police forces) and the degree to which these data providers would comply with the proposed data collection. Some countries felt this burden to be acceptable (Finland, Israel, Slovak Republic), whilst some did not (UK). Some felt that some of the crime breakdowns were excessively detailed in this context. With regard to compliance of data providers, Finland indicated that making the recording of attributes mandatory.

11.   In view of the various practical concerns described above, many respondents suggested a gradual implementation of the proposed crime classification (CIS-Stat, Finland, OECD, Slovakia). CIS-Stat suggested starting with more easily comparable crimes, whilst Poland and the Slovak Republic wanted a pilot evaluation. (Eurostat has suggested piloting the classification in EU Member States with financial support from the European Commission.) The OECD has suggested investigating how well the classification would work in Asian countries and other major economies.

12.   Poland suggested that countries who are not able to comply fully with the proposed crime classification should supply notes along with the data, detailing any recording practices that may affect its comparability with data from other countries.

13.   Some responses pertained to Victimization Surveys. Greece felt that it would be easier to implement the crime classification as a victimization survey rather than via administrative sources of recorded crime. The OECD suggested further investigation of the relationship between Recorded Crime and Victimization Surveys in the context of the Report.

14.   Finally, the OECD requested that age be recorded within tags, whilst Greece discussed a hierarchical set of counting rules to avoid double counting of offences where multiple offences were committed within the same act.

15.   The overall conclusion from the comments received is that most countries are supportive of the Report in principle, although many feel that potential obstacles to implementation exist.

IV. Comments on specific parts of the guidelines

16.   The comments that follow relate to specific parts of the Report and exclude comments that concern the whole document (these were reflected in part III above). Some of the comments are more general and do not imply a change in the text of the Guidelines.

For the more specific recommendations for changes, proposed amendments to the Guidelines are presented.

A.   Part IV: developing an international crime classification

17.   Comment from <u>Slovenia</u>: We propose the correction of the text relating to the pages 10 and 39 of the document. Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia has no microdata on police criminal statistics. Slovenian Ministry of the Interior has access to microdata and provided information for your questionnaire. Slovenian Statistical Office is responsible for compiling statistical data about legal convictions (judicial criminal statistics).

Proposal for amendment in the Report:

18.   To amend paragraph 4 and the chart below in light of the correction that the Slovenian NSO does not receive microdata.

19.   Comment from <u>Greece</u>: With regards to perpetrator tags (pages 15, 16 & page 18 top row) in addition to 'intimate partner', 'family/ friend/ neighbour/ acquaintance' ought to be added as they are important characteristics of child or elderly abuse cases.

B.   Part V: classification case studies

20.   Comment from <u>Greece</u>: Referring to "events leading to death", it might be advisable to include an additional category, namely, that of intentional "bodily injury /harm leading to death" (or assault leading to death). This event is not registered in Greek crime statistics, and may be in other continental countries under "homicide" but under "bodily injury/harm "leading to death" (or assault).

C.   Annex 1

21.   Comment from <u>Slovenia</u>: We propose the correction of the text relating to the pages 10 and 39 of the document. Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia has no microdata on police criminal statistics. Slovenian Ministry of the Interior has access to microdata and provided information for your questionnaire. Slovenian Statistical Office is responsible for compiling statistical data about legal convictions (judicial criminal statistics).

Proposal for amendment in the Report:

22.   On p39, in the section for Slovenia, in the column for "Receive Microdata?", replace "Y" with "N".

23.   Comment from <u>Lithuania</u>: Annex I – Responses received to questionnaire on crime and criminal justice data collection" on the page 37 "Lithuania" of section 4, "Offence variables" have to be completed with variables: "Completed/attempted", "Proceeding decision" and "Date of decision".

Proposal for amendment in the Report:

24.   On p39, in the section for Lithuania, in the column for "Offence variables", append these items to the list:

      (a)   Completed/attempted;

      (b)   Proceeding decision;

(c)   Date of decision.

25.   Comment from <u>Bosnia and Herzegovina</u>: To include the following table.

Proposal for amendment in the Report:

26.   To include the following table in Annex 1 of the Report.

	Respondi ng Entity	Receive Microdata?	Variables recorded		Classification Top-level Categories
			Offence variables	Offender/victim variables	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NSO	N	• Offence type (based on the criminal code) • Object of offence • Degree of material damage • Whether a criminal offence remained an attempt • Date of offence • Time of offence • Criminal offences/number of criminal offences committed	• Offender name, date of birth, age, permanent residence, position by activity, position by occupation, occupation, nationality, citizenship, marital status, level of education • Victim sex, age, number of victims (in the future years we will also include citizenship and relationship to offender)	• Offences against life and limb • Offences against freedoms and rights of man and citizen • Offences against humanity and values protected by international law • Offences against sexual freedom and morality • Offences against health • Offences against property • Offences against bribery and criminal offences against official and other responsible functions

V.   Proposal

27.   In view of the general support by countries and organizations, **it is proposed that the Conference of European Statisticians adopts the *Principles and framework for an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes*, subject to the inclusion of the amendments indicated above.**

Annex 1

Detailed individual responses

I. Austria

1.   Statistics Austria appreciates the work of the Task Force on developing an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes. We agree with the proposed framework although some information on the horizontal attribute tags will not be available in Austria. In order to improve comparability across countries auxiliary guidance on the use of the classification (e.g. a manual) would be helpful.

II. Belarus

2.   The Main Department of Service and Demographic Statistics would like to inform you that the classification of crimes in the Republic of Belarus is based on the terminology and categories of the Criminal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code.

3.   The information on the registered crimes provided by the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Belarus is aggregating by the crime types according to the above mentioned Codes. Therefore it is necessary to develop accurate and more detailed recommendations connected to "legal inclusions" for the recoding of the received information in accordance with the international classification of crimes.

III. Bosnia and Herzegovina

Email

4.   Based on everything that is written in the document "Principles and framework for an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes", I would say that this is an excellent report because it indicates that the countries keep quality records of crime trends and have excellent statistics, and that is necessary to accurately and clearly make a from for collecting statistical data from each country individually, given the specificity of the legal and institutional frameworks in some countries but in a way that the collected data would be compatible with a unique form at the EU level, so that they could be also presented and shown at the EU level.

Attached document

5.   Recommendations in the document "Principles and framework for an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes" (Report of the UNODC/UNECE Task force on crime classification) are of great importance for other countries as well as to Bosnia and Herzegovina, because the gradual or step-wise adoption and implementation of the guidelines are a vital step towards bringing existing national statistics mechanisms toward compliance with relevant international and EU acquis, standards and best practices. The following guidelines systematically indicate potential areas for improvement, which constitutes a substantial project output in itself. It also indicates areas for the further development of a standard system of classification of criminal offences for statistical purposes in the medium or long term.

6.   The standard classification system of statistics on crime in Bosnia and Herzegovina, used at all levels of governmental organizations, is based on the four criminal codes, which

are in use in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Each entity, as well as Brcko District of B&H, has its own Criminal Code, and in addition, there is a Criminal Code at the State level covering only certain forms of serious crimes. These four different criminal codes in Bosnia and Herzegovina are: Criminal Code of B&H, Criminal Code of Federation of B&H, Criminal Code of Republic of Srpska and Criminal Code of Brcko District. These four different Criminal Codes are more harmonised than in the past. However, some differences remain that impact upon the classification scheme used for statistical purposes. While most crimes in the criminal codes are similar, there are several differences, for example concerning the definition of moral crimes, the age of juveniles or the definition of criminal drug offences. As a consequence, data on the number of offences or the number of perpetrators, by specific crime type, are not routinely available at the State level. Reported incidents should be classified using a standard offence classification system and should have a clearly defined relationship with the 'charge' assigned to a suspected offender. The crime classification scheme should be applied uniformly by all police stations.

7.   In Bosnia and Herzegovina local police organizations should report on statistics, the institutions at the central level in a single format using the standardise scheme of a classification in criminal offences. In view of the different entities and institutions involved in collecting crime data in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in view of the different criminal codes, data on the State level are compiled only by broader crime categories.

8.   Other laws of Bosnia and Herzegovina, entities and Brcko District, which are prescribed by the relevant criminal offences – in all the laws that constitute additional criminal legislation, penalties, etc. may be prescribed in accordance with the provisions of the criminal law system. In a broad sense here is to include criminal procedural law and the Law on Execution and Criminal Sanctions. Special criminal law (e.g. The Law on Gender Equality) which also must be in accordance with criminal law in respect of conditions of responsibility and punishability.

9.   The recording of crime is not uniform throughout all of Bosnia and Herzegovina. While data entry is similar at all levels of the police in B&H, some important differences exist. In all entities and at all levels in B&H, police data on crime are recorded in the crime registry when there is enough evidence to submit a report to the prosecutor. The data recorded in the crime registry generally include data on the case, victim and perpetrator, but few details on the personal characteristics on offenders and victims are recorded.

10.   At all levels of the criminal justice system of Bosnia and Herzegovina a separate unique identifier is assigned to each case. These police-level identifiers are not coordinated between the different police forces in B&H. This could cause double counting of the same case at the levels of the cantons, entities and the State level when cases are transferred between different competencies.

11.   It should be emphasized that one of the main tasks of the Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina on the State level is to aggregate crime data from both of the Statistical offices on the entity level, and further to compile, consolidate and publish it.

(Annex I – Responses received to questionnaire on crime and criminal justice data collection)

	Responding Entity	**Receive Microdata?**	**Variables recorded**		**Classification Top-level Categories**
			Offence variables	Offender/victim variables	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NSO	N	• Offence type (based on the criminal code) • Object of offence • Degree of material damage • Whether a criminal offence remained an attempt • Date of offence • Time of offence • Criminal offences/number of criminal offences committed	• Offender name, date of birth, age, permanent residence, position by activity, position by occupation, occupation, nationality, citizenship, marital status, level of education • Victim sex, age, number of victims (in the future years we will also include citizenship and relationship to offender)	• Offences against life and limb • Offences against freedoms and rights of man and citizen • Offences against humanity and values protected by international law • Offences against sexual freedom and morality • Offences against health • Offences against property • Offences against bribery and criminal offences against official and other responsible functions

IV.   Finland

12.   Statistics Finland supports the idea of constructing a general acts and event-based classification for crimes for statistical purposes. The work of the UNODC/UNECE task force on the crime classification has been very valuable. The proposed new Crime Classification is a good basis for the production of more comparable international crime statistics

13.   Statistics Finland also sees some problems in the further implementation of the new classification. The current crime nomenclature-based classification will be needed in Finland for national purposes. Thereby, the new classification for international purposes would mean double work in some cases. However, Statistics Finland considers the work manageable. Statistics Fin-land welcomes the idea of a gradual implementation of the classification, as the currently collected police data in Finland do not make the full implementation of the new classification possible.

14.   The basis of crime statistics in Finland is the data collected from the Police Offence Recording System. In this system, all crimes are recorded according to the Finnish Crime Nomenclature (updated by Statistics Finland). The commissioning of the new Police Offence Recording system is planned for the year 2014. The new more advanced system will provide more possibility-ties for data collection than the current one.

15.   The crime nomenclature is supplemented with so-called specifiers used by the police. They offer more detailed information on the offences in question. In Finland, the implementation of the proposed new classification on levels 2 and 3 would require the police to use these specifiers in a statistically meaningful way. That is to say, the usage of certain specifiers must be obligatory, which currently is not the case. In addition, at least a few new specifiers should be added to the current list of specifiers used by the police. Statistics Finland cannot do the marking of the specifiers afterwards, therefore the use of specifiers by the police is essential in order to make reliable statistics.

16.   At the moment, a major obstacle for the full implementation of the new classification in Finland is horizontal tagging. The information on the victims of the offences is currently obligatory only in some selected violence offences. The new classification would mean that police should start marking the victims in all relevant offences in order to get the victim information for the statistics. In Finland, detailed information on the perpetrators is usually pre-scented only on the offences cleared by the police, not on all offences known to police.

17.   Some examples of the possible problems with horizontal tagging: the "Conspiring or Planning" tag might be problematic in Finland, since according to the legislation in force, it is not a crime. As for the "Accessory/Accomplice" tag, it is currently possible only if all offenders are recorded in the same notification. The "With firearm" tag is currently not possible either; it might be from 2014 onwards with the new Police Offence Recording System. The tag "Intimate perpetrator" could also be possible from 2014 onwards.

18.   Statistics Finland's view is that in order to implement fully the new classification of crimes in Finland as proposed, the Finnish police (the Ministry of the Interior, The National Police Board) must be involved in the implementation process. The commitment of the police to the implementation of this new classification is essential. As all the resources are currently very limited, also in Finland, Statistics Finland supports the task force's suggestion of a progressive implementation of the new classification and is eager to hear results from the planned piloting exercises.

V. France

Email (Translated from French)

19.   Member of the sub-working group of Eurostat data on crime ("crime data availability"), responsible for harmonizing the statistics of Member States of the European Union, ONDRP naturally supports the proposed International Classification of offenses UNODC / UNECE. The ONDRP proposes to bring his expertise by becoming an active member of this working group, if it thinks fit.

20.   It is unfortunate that the joint work of UNODC / UNECE, the HEUNI (European institute for crime prevention and control) which, in collaboration with UNODC again, periodically publishes a collection of administrative data on crime worldwide (International statistics on crime and justice), and Eurostat are not further explained.

21.   It seems that the proposed international classification is more consistent with Western systems of law, which is natural given the lack of Asian and African countries. The possible participation of these states certainly need to lighten the nomenclature that is proposed today.

22.   Regarding the data of crime and delinquency recorded in France, ONDRP could, given the means available to date, to recode the needs of the working group to national statistics (translation or mapping of Existing Statistical data).

Attached document (Translated from French)

23.   The joint working group of UNODC and UNECE (UN Economic Commission for Europe) on statistical indicators in the field of crime, due to report to the plenary session of the Conference of European Statisticians in June.

24.   France, which is not part of the working group, has not to our knowledge been questioned during the preparation of the document and is available here as a member of the Conference of European Statisticians.

The international classification of offenses

Unit of account: the fact may constitute an offense.

Principles:

1 / We will only consider the offenses of some gravity and regarded as such in most states. This also applies offenses called "administrative".

2 / Each component of the offense must be classified.

3 / Each indicator should be described in detail: a person or item in question, gravity aim of the author and modus operandi; degree completion due; degree of involvement of any co-authors, sex and age of victims and authors.

4 / Development of the classification will be gradual, so initially on a limited number of offenses.

Proposed structure: the classification may be based on four data types:

1 / Three levels of classification of the offense

Level 1 ranking in because one of the ten major categories descriptive

Level 2 classification is a sub-category descriptive

Level 3, circumstances, optional details

2 / The transverse characteristics

25.   These include the degree of completion of fact, the degree of involvement of any co-authors, sex and age of victims, use of a weapon and possible relationships of a spouse or former spouse between respondent and victim.

3 / Elements of the fact

4 / The legal description

26.   This information may require a "translation" of the national registration in the international system. For this, a list of types of offenses nationally recognized with their correspondence in the international system can be established.

27.   Use: the international system may be used upon registration of the facts, double the national or local level, then, by recoding from national statistics. The first case would be most effective and limit errors, but the cost in financial and human resources is such that it could be implemented only for a limited number of offenses for which the interest of a comparison International is paramount.

Observations

28.   Member of the sub-working group of Eurostat data on crime ("crime data availability"), responsible for harmonizing the statistics of Member States of the European Union, ONDRP naturally supports the proposed International Classification of offenses

UNODC / UNECE. The ONDRP proposes to bring his expertise by becoming an active member of this working group, if it thinks fit.

29.   It is unfortunate that the joint work of UNODC / UNECE, the HEUNI (European institute for crime prevention and control) which, in collaboration with UNODC again, periodically publishes a collection of administrative data on crime worldwide (International statistics on crime and justice), and Eurostat are not further explained.

30.   It seems that the proposed international classification is more consistent with Western systems of law, which is natural given the lack of Asian and African countries. The possible participation of these states certainly need to lighten the nomenclature that is proposed today.

31.   Regarding the data of crime and delinquency recorded in France, ONDRP could, given the means available to date, to recode the needs of the working group to national statistics (translation or mapping of Existing Statistical data).

32.   The statistical tool of crime and delinquency recorded in France is the "state 4001", which covers crimes and misdemeanours, committed or attempted, recorded in a proceeding to be sent to the judicial authority. It does not therefore include offenses that are not classified as a felony or misdemeanour by the French Penal Code, which specifically excludes acts of minor violence. It also excludes traffic offenses and violent involuntary (including manslaughter). The main units of account of this tool are, according to the types of offenses, the victim, the complainant, the procedure, the offense or the author.

33.   Composed of one hundred index, the 4001 state provides more or less accurate according to the categories of offense. Y are recorded the facts found, the cases solved, police custody and those implicated. The French or foreign nationality, the majority or not, and sex of the respondents are recorded. Depending on the type of offense, the state 4001 may therefore respond more or less precisely the requirements of the International Classification Working Group, particularly with regard to the constituent elements of the facts (act / event elements) and cross-sectional information (horizontal tags, including those on the victims).

VI.   Greece

34.   Warm congratulations to the Task Force members for compiling this admirable and coherent Report. Please find herein few comments that may be incorporated in the feedback given by the Working Group on the Safety from Crime European Statistics, Division of Social Statistics, Hellenic Statistical Authority (EL.STAT.).

35.   Greece as a participant in the "European Handbook of Crime and Criminal Justice" agrees   with   the   Principles   of   exhaustiveness/structure/mutual exclusion/description/progressive implementation". We also basically agree with the prepared "Framework" by UNODC / UNECE.

36.   The Task Force decided that the unit of classification should be the *act or event* that may constitute a crime.' In our view this is the right way forward.

37.   What should be underlined, according to our opinion, is the fact that the proposed crime classification and definitions are for statistical purposes and therefore, there is no need to amend Criminal/Penal Codes but to alter certain methods of collecting crime statistics or simply, reporting the requested data after some additional work concerning what acts/events are included or excluded in each category. Needless to point out that it will be easier to collect most of the information required via a crime/victimization survey, where questions will lead to the proposed classification system.

38.   To a large extent, the proposed crime classification system is in conformity with Greek crime statistics, especially with "police –recorded crime". E.g.

a. In the Greek Penal Code there is no such crime as " theft of a motor vehicle". Car thefts are included in the general category of "thefts". Yet in "Police-recorded crime" data on "thefts of motor vehicles" are kept separately and are not included in the larger category of "thefts". Data on "theft from a motor vehicle" are not kept presently in crime statistics.

b. In the Greek Penal Code there is no such crime as "burglary". Only Police is keeping data on 'burglary". Thus, administrative crime statistics present problems in the area of burglary.

c. Furthermore: A) In Greece "prosecution statistics" are not published and what is registered is prosecution statistics is the "case flow " or in-put and out-put of cases and not the particular crimes. B) Court statistics follow the Greek Penal Code, and therefore they deviate from the proposed definitions. C) Correction statistics are kept for different purposes and, therefore, do not include all the information suggested.

39.   **In the well-designed case study referring to "events leading to death", it might be advisable to include an additional category, namely, that of intentional "bodily injury /harm leading to death" (or assault leading to death). This event is not registered in Greek crime statistics, and may be in other continental countries under "homicide" but under "bodily injury/harm "leading to death".(or assault).**

40.   With regards to 'Comparability Challenges' the first two are impossible (or/ and perhaps undesirable to address –member states may want to safeguard the sovereign independence of their criminal law & criminal justice system and how it operates) in the short run.

41.   However there is always a way round the remainder challenges:

(a)   'Differences in reporting behaviour of victims and witnesses' can be accounted for via a comparative –such as the ICVS- survey that estimates police reporting across countries;

(b)   With regards to the following Victimization survey statistics:

(i)   Differences in sample frame;

(ii)   Differences in survey mode;

(iii)   Differences in questionnaire wording;

(iv)   Differences in interviewer training and quality.

42.   A harmonized victimisation survey across member states with sample sizes proportional to the national population can employ the same methodology, questionnaire and training while the last issue of cultural differences can be addressed via development of cross-cultural methodology.

43.   With regards to the discussion of the principles of 'exhaustiveness' & 'structure' I fully agree with the authors and their concern of potential clashes between international human rights law and national law whereby the former should prevail.

44.   With regards to mutual exclusiveness (pages 12, 13) to avoid inflationary (double/ triple etc.-counting) crime rates I would suggest that the counting rules (an event being classified as the most serious offence that took place during its occurrence) are applied to all crime events and therefore each crime event corresponds to one and only one offence type. I guess however that the counting rules differ across countries in which case the Task

Force on Crime Classification ought to come up with its own counting rules. Perhaps if a 'hierarchical' offence classification is required (see also page 15: framework levels) it might be done for a small subset of crimes for further analysis by those interested. That subset should be enough to draw inferences but also should not be massively time consuming or complex for compilation.

45. With regards to perpetrator tags (pages 15, 16 & page 18 top row) in addition to 'intimate partner', 'family /friend /neighbour/ acquaintance' ought to be added as they are important characteristics of child or elderly abuse cases.

46. **With respect to "horizontal tags" Greece will have difficulties. E.g. Data on perpetrators are absent when the event is registered by the Police and the perpetrator at this time is "unknown". Moreover, data on victims are not kept. Only a crime or victim survey could provide such statistical information in Greece.**

47. The following information might be useful. It mainly refers to court statistics, which from the point of view of variables are rather detailed:

Offence variables	Offender/victim variables	
Offence classification Completed/attempted Crime scene (according to regions) Reported/detected cases	Offender sex, age, nationality, marital, educational, occupational status, recidivism, sanctions imposed No data on Victims	Offences included in the Penal Code and Offences included in Special laws (e.g. data protection, money laundering, family violence etc.

48. Greece will be willing to give you additional, specific information, if needed.

VII. Hungary

49. Hereby we inform you that Hungary accepts the draft Principles and framework for an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes without any remark.

VIII. Israel

50. Israel favours the suggested classification which will make possible more systematic and internationally accepted approach to crime statistics.

51. After consultations with the authorities responsible for the data entry, data collection and coding, we foresee possible obstacles in the need to change report formats and databases which were just recently modified by the Israeli Police.

52. Nevertheless, we will adjust data collection to the internationally accepted classifications.

IX. Kazakhstan

53. I write you from the Agency on Statistics of the Republic of Kazakhstan concerning the document **"Principles and framework for an international classification of crimes**

for statistical purposes". Our colleagues considered this document, and we would like to inform you we have not any comments to this document.

X. Lithuania

54.   Lithuania supports the draft "Principles and framework for an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes" and hopes that the Report of the Task Force on Crime Classification and proposed "framework" for an international crime classification system will be helpful in further work on crime statistics.

55.   However, we would like to propose that in the final version of the Report the „Annex I – Responses received to questionnaire on crime and criminal justice data collection" on the page 37 "Lithuania" of section 4, "Offence variables" have to be completed with variables: "Completed/attempted", "Proceeding decision" and "Date of decision".

XI. Montenegro

56.   Data on adult and juvenile perpetrators of crime act are collected by regular annual statistical surveys based on individual statistical and filled in by competent state prosecutor's offices and competent courts. Following surveys are conducted:

(a)   Survey on adult persons against whom the preliminary hearing s and legal proceedings have been conducted;

(b)   Survey on adult persons against whom the legal proceedings have been concluded by finally binding court decision;

(c)   Survey on juvenile persons against whom the preliminary hearing and preparatory proceeding have been conducted;

(d)   Survey on juvenile persons against whom the legal proceeding in the juvenile court have been concluded by finally binding court decision.

57.   Coverage of the crime as socially negative phenomena is full because statistical surveys include all adult and juvenile perpetrators of crime acts (including crime act performed by anonymous perpetrators).Statistical Office of Montenegro covers by its surveys this phenomena from the moment of crime is reported until finally binding finalization of the procedure by competent body (state prosecutor's offices and courts).

58.   Crime acts are presented according to certain groups of crime acts, based on Classification of crime acts deriving from Criminal Code of Montenegro ("Official Gazette of Montenegro ", 70/03).

59.   Data on courts and judges are received from record of competent institutions.

60.   Other data for the needs of international institutions Statistical Office of Montenegro receives from Police Administration (crime indicators derived from police statistics) and Institute for Executions of Criminal Sanctions.

XII. Poland

61.   The CSO of Poland support a proposal for classification aiming to improve the consistency and comparability of statistical information at the international level despite the differences in the existing legal systems.

62.   Further work related to the classification of offences in terms of statistics should aim towards testing the developed model in terms of (a) its conformity with the categorization codes of criminal and (b) the opportunities of collecting relevant statistics by individual countries. Due to a broad catalogue of crime pilot work could be carried out in stages. Therefore the proposed principle of "progressive implementation", which assumes a carefully piloting with the use of limited number of crimes, in the first instance, is highly appreciated.

63.   Despite all efforts it should be taken into account that the individual countries would not fully comply with the proposed classification, and therefore it will be very important to receive from countries, detailed information about the compliance of data with the given definition (as it is practised by the OECD for example in OECD health data, where in the file Sources and methods each country for each variable gives detailed information about data sources, inclusions and exclusions).

XIII. Portugal

64.   The idea of developing an harmonized crime classification for statistical purposes suitable for implementation by all E.U. Member States as a fundamental tool to guarantee the international comparisons of the indicators, is welcomed even though ambitious. Nevertheless, as mentioned in the report this essential step onwards should come with further guidance and standards on data collection; without an harmonization of these procedures data will keep limited.

65.   In what concerns the proposed classification structure and according to our experience –which is based on the national procedures, although, surely, common to other Member States – it figures out that it should consider in different ways the element "intention" and the element "result". It happens that, in the cases where a classification is applied at the moment when the police authorities take knowledge of the crime there are not yet enough evidences to evaluate the perpetrator intention or its final result. For example, without this evidences it can become impossible to make a distinction among grievous bodily harm and an attempt to a voluntary manslaughter or an grievous bodily harm aggravated by the final result.

66.   About the use of an international crime classification the third option is in our opinion the one that seems to be more suitable at the present having in mind, on one hand the need of maintaining an internal classification corresponding to the present national needs and on the other hand the technological status of the occurrences register platforms, which are, in our case, partially done by mapping rather than by informatics micro data. Knowing this, the draft of an international crime classification as well as the data collection procedures will be very useful in a guidance version which tending progressively to a larger harmonization.

XIV. Slovak Republic

67.   Slovakia welcomes the Report of the UNODC/UNECE Task Force on Crime Classification and appreciates its quality. An important distinction should be, however, made in terms of the theoretical value and the practical implications of the document.

68.   Having regard to the fact that the submitted proposal presents general principles and a framework for a classification, Slovakia supports the Report. However, corresponding future data outputs from the crime statistics databases in Slovakia are questionable with regard to the ambitions of the document. Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic currently administers only police-recorded crime data. Victimization survey-based data have not been

collected and produced yet. The Statistical Office operates within existing aggregated databases produced by the Police Force (Ministry of Interior) and does not affect the system at the point of recording data. Currently, the police system of statistical processing of data does not give a subsequent possibility to link crime perpetrators and victims within recorded crime events. The information on perpetrators and victims is separately aggregated. The system does not allow complex statistical outputs such as described in the following example extracted from the report. "For example an act such as a member of an organized criminal group shooting at a female with intent to kill or seriously injure but missing, would be coded as "1.1.At.Fi.FV.OC" where 1.1 is the category for intentional homicide, 'At' represents the tag for attempted, 'Fi' for use of a firearm, 'FV' for female victim, and 'OC' for involvement of an organized criminal group." (page 16 of the Report) The scope above is excessively detailed. In Slovakia, implementation of the system proposed in the Report would simply mean recoding of existing statistical data into the categories indicated by the international classification. Despite the extensive work which this entails, the system of three 'event-based' classification levels seems acceptable. On the other hand, the proposed horizontal attribute 'tags' are problematic with respect to the limited number of variables at disposal in our databases and the aggregated format of data.

69.   To sum up, providing data outputs in accordance with the proposed classification is methodologically eligible, but, in practice, it constitutes a laborious and time-consuming administrative technique. Moreover, compliance with the structure of descriptive tags, victim tags, and perpetrator tags will be limited. Slovakia supports the piloting of progressive implementation of an international classification of selected crimes. The possibility to dismiss the implementation in case of inefficient outcomes of the pilot should be, however, overtly accepted.

XV.   Slovenia

70.   I would like to inform you that we support the work done and welcome the development of international classification of crimes for statistical purposes. However, we have a remark and we propose the correction of the text relating to the pages 10 and 39 of the document. Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia has no microdata on police criminal statistics. Slovenian Ministry of the Interior has access to microdata and provided information for your questionnaire. Slovenian Statistical Office is responsible for compiling statistical data about legal convictions (judicial criminal statistics).

XVI.   Sweden

71.   The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention has no further comments on the draft **"Principles and framework for an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes"**.

72.   As mentioned at the earlier round of consultation in April 2011 the Council is very positive to the work of the Task Force on Crime Classification on and the proposed system for an international crime classification.

73.   Considering the remark on the possible addition of a classification category/-categories for "other events/acts" at the Level 2 or 3 (p 54) the Council wants to underline that there is no crimes known at the present that cannot be subsumed under any of the listed Level 2 and 3 categories.

XVII.   Switzerland

74.   We appreciate the initiative to build an international classification in crime statistics and would like to thank for that report. I can inform you that the Swiss experts do not have any further comments to that paper you sent to us in April.

XVIII.   United Kingdom (Statistics Authority)

75.   The UK generally supports the proposal for the report to be endorsed by the CES at its June 2012 plenary session.

76.   However, while the Task Force recognises the challenges of differing legal systems, recording practices and variety in policing structures, it remains quite optimistic about how these obstacles could be overcome, whereas we have more reservations. For example, in section V (paras 70 and 71), the Task Force suggests that the international crime classification system could be used by police officers at the point of act/event reporting to classify the event in an equivalent manner in all contexts commenting that "where national crime registration systems cannot easily be changed due to the need to reflect reported events according to criminal code articles, coding under the international classification system could be carried out in parallel". This would be unrealistic in the UK context given the large number of individual police forces and bespoke computer systems and in the current climate where such a request would be seen as burdensome.

77.   One particular aspect of the proposed system (attribute tags) **could not be implemented** in the UK context as we generally don't hold centrally data on victim and perpetrator characteristics. Local police forces may well hold such data on local systems but there is currently no requirement for them to provide such data to the centre except for selected offences (e.g. homicide in England and Wales).

XIX.   Eurostat

78.   Eurostat has been closely involved in the development of this document, as is recorded in the Executive Summary. Several EU countries (Italy, Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom, Finland) were members of the UNODC/UNECE Task Force on crime classification which produced the document, and Eurostat co-ordinated the work at EU level. In March 2011 Eurostat circulated the draft crime classification to members of the Eurostat Working Group on Crime Statistics and co-ordinated the replies. We then provided further comments to the CES Plenary meeting on 6-8 June 2011.

79.   Eurostat fully supports the approach taken in the development of the framework for an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes and considers this to form a very promising springboard for further work in this field. In particular, we wish to draw attention to the proposal in the Executive Summary to pilot the prototype in EU Member States with financial support from the European Commission. We are available for any technical assistance required in implementing this initiative.

80.   Eurostat looks forward to the further progress of this work based on the results of these pilot exercises. In the longer term, the adoption of a single methodological tool will make it possible to integrate the existing data collections of Eurostat and UNODC into a single exercise, resulting in improved consistency from the user viewpoint as well as savings in resources at both national and international level.

81.   Assuming the successful completion of the project, a common data collection between the UNODC and Eurostat is planned for 2013.

XX. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

82.   The revised version of the report of the UNODC/UNECE Task Force on crime classification does not seem to show any major change relative to the draft that was circulated in October 2011 (attached). For this reason, the comments we provided on the first draft report still stand. We also have a number of additional comments on the revised draft. The two sets of comments follow.

83.   Earlier comments: The UNECE/UNDOC Task Force was established in October 2008 to develop principles for a classification of crime statistics, to improve consistency and international comparability. The TF has retained the principles of 'exhaustiveness', 'structure', 'mutual exclusiveness' and 'description' (divided into target, seriousness, intent, modus operandi, degree of completion, degree of co-responsibility, sex and age of the victim, and policy area) as appropriate basis for such classification. The classification is event-based – i.e. it classifies the actions or events that are commonly criminalised under national and international law – and is structured at different levels, with horizontal 'tags' across classification categories providing a more detailed description of crime events. The system could be adopted for both police statistics and victimisation surveys. Guidance is provided on the 'mapping of crimes registered by criminal justice institutions into the international system. To demonstrate the validity of the identified principles and framework approach, two case studies (classification of acts leading to death and classification of burglary) are presented in the report. Points that you may wish to mention:

84.   The OECD has been using statistical information on crimes (both police- and survey-based) in the context of its publications (*How's Life?, Society at a Glance*). We plan continuing doing so in the future, with possible extension to new areas (corruption, functioning of the justice system).

85.   We welcome the proposed framework for crime classification, in particular its event-based nature (rather than being built upon legal attributes) and the fact that level-one of the proposed structure consists of only ten categories, which would facilitate compliance by countries. We hope that the adoption of the international crime classification system will promote the collection of statistical data where these are missing or insufficient at the national level.

86.   We support the progressive implementation of the classification system, with a limited set of acts particularly relevant to crime prevention initiatives providing a starting point for future international developments.

87.   We agree that future international crime classification should be accompanied by guidance on its use with respect to national counting systems and recording practices.

88.   We encourage a revision of the horizontal descriptive 'tags' at a later stage, with the inclusion of information that may be relevant for crime prevention policies, such as the context in which a crime occur, the characteristics of victims and perpetrators as well as the relationship between them.

89.   We appreciate the report and recognise the relevant work done by the Task Force to develop a set of principles on international crime classification system for statistical use. This classification system will help improve consistency and international comparability of crime statistics, provided that such a framework is applied in a systematic manner in national contexts.

90.   In order to achieve a high level of cross-country comparability, more work needs to be done to compare specific crime rates based on victimisation surveys with those based on police records.

91.   Access to criminal statistics by NSOs needs to be improved, as at present only 30% of NSOs declare that they provide access to microdata on crime and criminal justice (while 70% of NSOs report having access to aggregate data only). Such access would improve the effectiveness of the international crime classification system.

92.   In the proposed framework, information on the gender of the victim and the perpetrator is available, while only limited information on age is provided (i.e. whether the victim and /or the perpetrator is a minor). The recording system should be refined to include additional age categories and information on the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator.

93.   For additional horizontal attribute 'tags' (e.g. age categories and relationship between the victim and the perpetrator) to be added, national crime classifications need to improve the available information on victims. This information is particularly relevant to understand the determinants of victimisation and to put in place preventive policies.

94.   The crime classification suggested by the Task Force seems to be focused on common and continental criminal laws (i.e. European countries, Russia, the United States and Australia). It would be interesting to test whether the proposed classification could be applied to Asian countries (e.g. Japan) and other major economies such as China, Brazil and India.

XXI.   Statistical Office of the Commonwealth of Independent States

95.   CIS-STAT supports the draft document "Principles and Framework for an International Classification of Crimes for Statistical Purposes", prepared by the joint UNODC/UNECE Task Force on Crime Classification.

96.   However, taking into account criminal legislation of different countries, we believe that it is advisable to introduce this classification gradually, starting with a limited set of crimes such as murder, rape, theft, robbery, crimes related to drugs and some other. Statistical data on these types of crimes in the CIS countries are the most comparable.

97.   For the implementation of the international classification of crimes in full it is necessary to harmonize criminal laws of all countries that goes beyond the competence of the national statistical services.

────────────