



**Study on the
development of an EU-
level offence
classification system and
an assessment of its
feasibility to supporting
the implementation of
the Action Plan to
develop an EU strategy
to measure crime and
criminal justice**

*The Crime Statistics
Project*



UNISYS



Institute for International Research on Criminal Policy
Ghent University

Study

on the development of an
EU-level offence classification system
and an assessment of its feasibility
to supporting the implementation of
the Action Plan to develop an
EU strategy to measure
crime and criminal justice

Crime Statistics Project

Final Report

Study Team

Ann MENNENS

Wilfried DE WEVER

Athina DALAMANGA

Asteria KALAMARA

Giedrė KAZLAUSKAITE

Professor Gert VERMEULEN

Wendy DE BONDT

Project Manager

UNISYS

IRCP

Proprietary Notice

This Unisys document was produced with the financial support of the the European Commission's ISEC programme (DG JLS).. Its content remains the responsibility of the principal authors and does not necessarily reflect the official views of the European Commission, nor are its conclusions binding on the European Commission.

Acknowledgment

We would like to express our gratitude to all those who contributed to the completion of this Project. We wish to thank members of the Advisory Group, all the stakeholders involved both from the Member States and the International Organisations, researchers and practitioners for their stimulating support and collaboration. Thanks to their input we have been able to achieve the results presented in this report. We would also like to give our special thanks to the European Commission, DG JLS, especially to its Policy Officer Mr Richard TROY for his encouragement and professional guidance throughout this Study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Proprietary Notice 3
- Acknowledgment 4
- Table of contents 5
- Used Acronyms 8
- Main Reference Instruments 10
- Executive Summary 12
- The making of EULOCS, the EU-level offence classification system..... 12
- 1 Introduction 14
 - 1.1 Background and scope 14
 - 1.2 Objectives of the Project Team..... 14
 - 1.2.1 High Level Objective: Ensuring and stimulating convergence 14
 - 1.2.2 Specific Objective: Contributing to Collection of Comparable Crime Statistics ... 15
 - 1.3 Methodology of the Project 15
 - 1.4 Vision of the Project Team: Choices made..... 16
 - 1.5 Reporting strategy 17
- 2 Study Findings..... 19
 - 2.1 High Level Overview Tables 19
 - 2.1.1 Member States’ classification systems overview table 19
 - 2.1.2 International Stakeholders’ data collection overview table..... 20
 - 2.2 Classification systems in use 22
 - 2.2.1 Fragmentation at national level 22
 - 2.2.2 Fragmentation at international level 23
 - 2.3 Communication and data exchange 24
 - 2.3.1 Cumbersome internal data flow..... 24
 - 2.3.2 Difficulties in external exchange of data 25
 - 2.3.2.1 Wide range of data sources 25
 - 2.3.2.2 Various types of IT systems 26
 - 2.3.2.3 Variety of complex questionnaires..... 26
 - 2.3.2.4 Varying quality and quantity of provided data..... 27
 - 2.3.2.5 Different MS practices reporting and recording data 27
 - 2.4 Comparison with cross-country exchanged data 28
 - 2.4.1 Difficulties in correctly handling foreign data..... 28
 - 2.4.2 Insufficient insight into crime phenomena 29
 - 2.5 Compatibility Assessment of EULOCS..... 30
 - 2.5.1 Compatibility of EULOCS with national classification systems..... 30
 - 2.5.1.1 Category compatibility: assessing data availability 30
 - 2.5.1.2 Definition compatibility: assessing the scope of available data..... 31
 - 2.5.1.3 General compatibility related findings..... 31
 - 2.5.2 Compatibility of EULOCS with international classification systems 32
 - 2.6 Conclusion: Clear Added Value of EULOCS in the field of Crime Statistics..... 32
- 3 Recommendations 34
 - 3.1 One single EULOCS, used beyond the field of crime statistics 34
 - 3.1.1 Introduction: justifying the integrated approach..... 34
 - 3.1.2 Specific recommendations..... 36
 - 3.1.2.1 Define EULOCS’ full potential 36
 - 3.1.2.2 Brand and version EULOCS 36
 - 3.1.2.3 License the use of EULOCS 37
 - 3.1.2.4 Make information on EULOCS easy accessible 37
 - 3.1.2.5 Translate EULOCS 38
 - 3.2 Application in the field of crime statistics 39
 - 3.2.1 Structural requirements for EULOCS 39

	3.2.1.1	Maintain strict offence based character.....	39
	3.2.1.2	Cluster jointly identified components of offences	40
	3.2.1.3	Complement EULOCS with statistical inclusion and exclusion criteria	40
	3.2.1.4	Complement EULOCS with offender, victim and event variables.....	40
	3.2.1.5	Complement EULOCS with contextual information	40
	3.2.2	Practical solutions for efficient and effective data collection at EU level.....	41
	3.2.2.1	EU coordination to streamline data requests.....	41
	3.2.2.2	Ensure the creation of a transparent and stable network of contact points (CPs) at national level	42
	3.2.2.3	Support IT applications for exchange of crime-related information.....	43
	3.2.2.4	Encourage usage of a common standard to exchange statistical information	45
	3.3	Supporting Crime Statistics at MS level.....	46
	3.3.1	Stimulate integration and coordination.....	46
	3.3.2	Encourage communication and transparency	46
	3.3.3	Support investment in manpower	47
4		Annexes.....	48
	4.1	Methodology and State of the Art.....	48
	4.1.1	General Project Guidance.....	48
	4.1.2	Desktop Research	48
	4.1.2.1	Attaining better understanding of Crime Statistics environment	48
	4.1.2.2	Ensuring compatibility with other related JHA activities	48
	4.1.3	Development and design of the initial EULOCS	48
	4.1.3.1	Using ECRIS as a basis.....	48
	4.1.3.2	Rebuilding ECRIS and designing an initial EULOCS.....	49
	4.1.4	Redesigning into proposed EULOCS.....	50
	4.1.4.1	Consulting rounds	50
	4.2	Detailed Analytic Tables	53
	4.2.1	Table on the Classification Systems in use	53
	4.2.2	Table on the Internal data flow.....	59
	4.2.3	Table on External Data Exchange	64
	4.2.4	Table on the Various types of IT systems	65
	4.2.5	Table on the Handling of foreign data.....	81
	4.2.6	Table on the wide range of priority offences.....	82
	4.2.7	Table on the Application in the field of crime statistics.....	83
	4.2.8	Table on the support of crime statistics at MS level.....	84
	4.3	List of offence categories with a high data availability ratio.....	84
	4.4	List of offence categories with a low data availability ratio	85
	4.5	List of offence categories with a high definition compatibility ratio.....	86
	4.6	List of offence categories with a low definition compatibility ratio.....	86
	4.7	Suggestion related to a Creative Common Licence “Share Alike”	87
	4.8	The proposed (complemented) EULOCS.....	88
	4.9	The package of Questionnaires.....	95
	4.9.1	Member State Questionnaires.....	95
	4.9.2	Policy Needs Questionnaire.....	95
	4.9.3	Classification Feedback Questionnaire	96
	4.10	Folders with final filled out Questionnaires.....	96
	4.10.1	Member State Questionnaires.....	96
	4.10.2	Policy Needs Questionnaire.....	96
	4.10.3	Classification Feedback Questionnaire	96
	4.11	Compatibility Overview	97
	4.12	Country Matrices	97
	4.13	Overview of System Variables used in Member States.....	97
	4.14	List of contributors to the study.....	98
5		Bibliography	102

5.1 Legal and Political Documents (in alphabetical order).....	102
5.2 Case Law	107
5.3 Literature.....	107
5.4 Electronic Sources of information	110

Used Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
ASOC	Australian System of Offence Classification
BIPAR	European Federation of Insurance Intermediaries
CDPC	Committee on Crime Problems – Council of Europe
CEA	European Insurance Committee
CEPEJ	European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice – Council of Europe
CJS	Criminal Justice System
CMS	Case Management System (Eurojust)
CoE	Council of Europe
Cor	Correctional
CP	Contact Point
CSP	Crime Statistics Project
CTS	United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems
DG	Directorate General
DG JLS	Directorate General Justice, Freedom and Security
EAW	European Arrest Warrant
EBF	European Banking Federation
EC	European Commission
ECRIS	European Criminal Record Information System
eDAMIS	Electronic Data Files Management and Information System
EMCDDA	European Monitoring Centre on Drugs and Drug Addiction
ESG	European Sourcebook Group
ESS	European Statistical System
EU	European Union
EUROJUST	European Union's Judicial Cooperation Unit
EUROPOL	European Police Office
EUROSTAT	Statistical Office of the European Communities
EULOCS	EU-Level Offence Classification System
FATF	Financial Action Task Force
FIS	Frontex Information System
FRA	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights
FRALEX	FRA's Legal Experts Group
FRONTEX	Frontières Extérieures: European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the MS of the EU
IDABC	Interoperable Delivery of European eGovernment Services to public Administrations, Businesses and Citizens
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IO	International Organisation
IRCP	Institute for International Research on Criminal Policy
IT	Information Technology
JHA	Justice and Home Affairs
MOI	Ministry of Interior
MOJ	Ministry of Justice
Moneyval	Committee of Experts on the Evaluation of Anti-Money Laundering Measures and the Financing of Terrorism (CoE)
MS	EU Member State(s)
NCP	National Contact Point
NFP	National Focal Point
OCR	Organised Crime Report
OCTA	Organised Crime Threat Assessment
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
Oth	Other
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe

Acronym	Meaning
OSOR	Open Source Observatory and Repository for European public administrations
PC-CP	Council for Penological Cooperation of the Council of Europe
POL	Police
PROS	Prosecution
QST	Questionnaire
RAXEN	European Racism and Xenophobia Information Network
SDDS	Special Data Dissemination Standard format
SPACE	Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics
SPOC	Single Point of Contact
TE-SAT	Terrorism Situation and Trend Report
SEMIC	Semantic Interoperability Centre Europe
STAT	Statistics
UNICEF	United National Children's Fund
UISCC	Unified Information System for Combating Crime
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Main Reference Instruments

n°	Name	Description	Issue Date
R01	Call for Tender No. JLS/D2/2007/03 on the development of an EU-level system for the classification of criminal offences & an assessment of its feasibility	Terms of Reference	March 2007
R02	Organisation and Methodology Section of the Unisys Proposal	Methodology Proposal	3 August 2007
R03	Service Contract JLS/D2/2007/03 (contract nr: ABAC N°30-CE-0162508/00-41	Service Contract	14 February 2008
R04	Project Inception Report v1.01	PIR	27 March 2008
R05	Council Regulation (EC) No 322/97 of 17 February 1997 on Community Statistics	Council Regulation on Community Statistics	17 February 1997
R06	European Statistics Code of Practice	Code of Practice	Adopted by the Statistical Programme Committee on 24 February 2005
R07	Developing a Comprehensive and Coherent EU Strategy To Measure Crime and Criminal Justice: An EU Action Plan 2006-2010	EU Action Plan 2006-2010	January 2008
R08	The European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – Third edition	European Sourcebook	2006
R09	Contents of Eurostat CIRCA forum on crime statistics: http://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/dsis/crimestat/home	Eurostat CIRCA	N/A
R10	Contents of DG JLS CIRCA forum: Expert group on the policy needs for data on crime and criminal justice https://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/jai/pndccj/home	DG JLS CIRCA	N/A
R11	VERMEULEN, G., BALCAEN, A., DI NICOLA, A., CAUDURO, A, 2006, MAKLU (2007) The SIAMSECT files: Standardised templates and blueprint for EU-wide collection of statistical information and analysis on missing and sexually exploited children and trafficking in human beings ()	The SIAMSECT files	2007
R12	European Sourcebook Group questionnaire covering 2003-2007	ESG QST	2008
R13	BARCLAY, G.C (2000) Comparability of data on Convictions and Sanctions: Are International comparisons possible? <i>European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, Volume 8, Number 1, March 2000, pp. 13-26(14)</i>	Comparability study	2000
R14	JEHLE, J.M. (2000) Prosecution in Europe: Varying Structures, Convergent Trends, <i>European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, Volume 8, Number 1, March 2000, pp. 27-42(16)</i>	Prosecution study,	2000
R15	Manual for the measurement of juvenile justice indicators of the UNODC	Juvenile Justice Manual	2006
R16	JOUTSEN, M. (2006) The European Union and Cooperation in Criminal Matters: the Search for Balance (HEUNI nr.25, 2006,)	The European Institute for crime prevention and Control affiliated with the United Nations	2006
R17	Questionnaire for the Tenth Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (2005-2006)	UNODC CTS QST	2006
R18	The questionnaire used by the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice of the Council of Europe	CEPEJ QST	2007

n°	Name	Description	Issue Date
R19	Feasibility Study on Crime Comparisons Between Canada and the United States	FS	2001
R20	Australian Standard Offence Classification of the Australian Bureau of Statistics	ASOC	1997
R21	About the Uniform Crime Reporting Program of the US Department of Justice	Uniform Crime Reporting Program	October 2006
R22	Irish Crime Classification System of the Central Statistics office	ICCS	April 2008
R23	Offence classification proposed by DG JLS in the framework of the European Criminal Record Information System (ECRIS (COM (2008)0332)	ECRIS Classification system	27 May 2008
R24	Project “EU Crime Statistics – Offence Classifications” (CSP) Interim Report	Interim Report	22 July 2008

Executive Summary

The making of EULOCS, the EU-level offence classification system

The Commission presented the Project Team, Unisys Belgium and the Institute for International Research on Criminal Policy (IRCP), with an ambitious challenge: *the development of an EU-level system for the classification of criminal offences and an assessment of its feasibility with a view to supporting the implementation of the Action Plan to develop an EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice*. A one year research project has resulted in a sourced and concerted EU level Offence Classification System (EULOCS). This should not only be a fundamental tool for the collection and production of crime statistics. It must also ensure convergence across different areas of Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) as a general EU-reference index complete with accompanying working definitions.

The application of EULOCS beyond the field of Crime Statistics, justifies an approach inspired by the JHA acquis. The European Criminal Record Information System (ECRIS) was the cornerstone on which a preliminary version of the EULOCS was built, supplemented with agreed upon definitions from the JHA acquis. In addition, a number of ongoing data collection projects at European and international level, each with their own objectives and mandate, were fully taken into account in the EULOCS development: European and international organisations have been consulted and their requirements and achievements incorporated. Before finalising the design of the EULOCS, the preliminary EULOCS was presented to the community of potential users to obtain feedback and assess its compatibility with existing classification systems.

During the extensive consultation process, practitioners and policy makers at Member State level, most international- and private sector organisations, European stakeholders and different academic and research institutes expressed a clear need for a uniform and transparent framework. On site focus group meetings confirmed that EULOCS can indeed serve as a comparative model across EU Member States supporting the stocktaking of data and indicators. Moreover, it could provide the necessary common basis for targeting further action and further specifying the policy needs related to crime statistics in the EU. Priorities can be set starting from the EU-level offence classification system, providing the backbone for enhanced comparability of data across EU Member States. In addition, EULOCS can serve the EU intermediary role of reducing Member States' administrative burdens in relation to the international and supranational reporting accountabilities in the field of crime related data.

Indeed, the hurdles the Project Team has been confronted with were manifold, demonstrating the need for rationalisation of information exchange both at national and international level. The diversity and complexity of the reality in the EU Member States is striking: diverse criminal justice systems largely based on differing national criminal codes; a variety of classification systems each with their own scope; dispersion of crime related data amongst authorities and throughout the justice chain; data comparability problems across countries and authorities due to the use of different definitions, languages and counting rules. All this impacts directly on the quality, completeness and timeliness of crime data currently available across countries.

EULOCS and accompanying definitions clarify the terminology and concepts and provide a common reference structure for the variety of data collected and organised in diverse classification systems. This version of EULOCS is a first step on a long journey towards stronger convergence, rationalisation and improved comparability. Depending on the nature of specific data exchange environments and challenges, different options can and will be taken. But as long as they are compliant with EULOCS they will at least evolve in the same direction. For statistical purposes,

EULOCS should be further developed and elaborated. Variables and context fields need to be studied in depth to safeguard the exclusiveness of data collected and to enhance the comparability of data across countries by increasing the importance of the phenomenological view on offences.

Member States, although at times reluctant and even sceptical, have taken the first important step by devoting time and effort to participate to the Study. They delivered crucial input on their views, needs and feedback regarding the preliminary EULOCS. Although resources dedicated to crime related data seem rather scarce, the Study has been able to involve about 160 persons, putting into the picture around 140 organisations, at national and international level combined, thus yielding an EU wide view on the crime statistics landscape in Europe. In some countries this represented the very first occasion for debate and exchange across authorities, in others existing cooperation mechanisms and structures were mobilised to produce the requested input. Common to all Member States is the limited involvement of private sector sources and the underestimation or ignorance of their potential as a contributor.

Apart from promoting the increased involvement of the private sector as a data provider, the Study recommends the (further) establishment of a network of contact points in the Member States, to enhance and rationalise information exchange both at national and international levels. The information flow can be facilitated and streamlined through the efficient use of tools and the reinforcement of the IT infrastructure and common data formats. Whatever systems will be developed, EULOCS can serve as the reference data model for the different fields established for the data exchange. By absence of a common language, a common frame of reference can also gradually stimulate a common phenomenological understanding on crimes committed in the EU.

EULOCS has been built in such a way to ensure its political acceptability. Fast agreement at EU-level on this global reference index of offences will provide the necessary basis for continuing the work on achieving a workable classification system for statistical purposes. As a follow up to this Study, further work on the categories is envisaged, to ensure their exclusiveness for use in statistical matters. A pilot implementation of a sub-set of the classification system should be organised to test bed certain categories in the Member States. Linking this up with the reporting accountabilities of Member States to international and European organisations, the pilot could be organised in the framework of the mandate of an International Organisation or European Agency in charge of data collection related to one of the sub-sets.

Providing for multiple applications, EULOCS has to be safeguarded and maintained on an ongoing basis. Political endorsement will kick start its promotion. Its multiplication in practical tools and data exchange projects will ensure the necessary convergence of offence classification systems throughout the EU. To ensure a wide application and use of EULOCS to its full potential, we recommend (i) maintaining a strict offence based character, (ii) the identification of all potential beneficiaries, (iii) branding and versioning EULOCS, (iv) licensing the use of EULOCS, (v) making information on EULOCS easily accessible and (vi) translating EULOCS.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND AND SCOPE

Information exchange lies at the heart of any meaningful cooperation. Information that is exchanged needs to be understood in the same way by all parties involved. One of the main deficiencies in the EU area of Justice, Freedom and Security, is the current lack of cross-country comparable crime statistics data. The importance of progress in this domain, especially in the context of the identification of best practices in the fight against crime, has been identified on several occasions.¹

Research related to the elaboration of comparable EU crime statistics, should be conducted on two levels. Firstly the terminology, the key concepts and the definitions used should be analysed and clarified. Indeed, national criminal codes differ and similar offences do not necessarily cover exactly the same behaviour. It is important to fully understand the differences in scope of offences and develop a common reference terminology. Secondly, in depth analysis needs to be carried out with regard to the theory and practice of crime statistics applied by the different stakeholders in the field. Current differences in recording policies, counting rules, data analysis and data production have a significant impact and bias on the final statistics, leaving us with virtually incomparable data. Additionally a case by case approach is necessary for each of the offence types to determine the variables needed to gain valuable insight in a certain phenomenon.

In March 2007, the European Commission, DG JLS, launched a call for tender for a “Study on the development of an EU-level offence classification system and an assessment of its feasibility to supporting the implementation of the Action Plan to develop an EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice” – The Crime Statistics Project (CSP). The main objective in the Study’s terms of reference is to create an EU-level offence classification system for the purpose of exchanging comparable statistical information on offences throughout the EU. The Study is a crucial component of what is described above as the first level of the research, namely developing and clarifying the terminology and concepts that can serve as a common reference framework. This classification system should serve as a first step towards the development of a more comprehensive and sophisticated EU-level offence classification system. Additionally, the Terms of Reference of the Study highlight – as a secondary consideration – that the creation of an EU-level offence classification system may offer indirect benefits as a reference index across different areas of related JHA activity.

Unisys Belgium, with the Institute for International Research on Criminal Policy (IRCP) as a subcontractor, was contracted to perform the work in a one year timeframe (February 2008-February 2009).

1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT TEAM

1.2.1 High Level Objective: Ensuring and stimulating convergence

Taking into account the secondary consideration included in the terms of reference, the Project Team aims at *developing and promoting one single EU-level offence classification system* (hereinafter EULOCS). The aim is not to create yet another new compelling system that requires Member States (hereafter MS) to adjust national data models, but to develop a reference index that could serve the different needs in the area of JHA related activities. Going forward, as stated in the Terms of Reference, a potentially beneficial application is as an aid to Member State transposition of EU JHA legislation in terms of (i) communicating a clear understanding of the associated statistical

¹ Amongst other occasions, this need was identified by the 2000 Millennium Strategy (Doc. 9423/99 CRIMORG 80, 21.06.1999), the 2003 Dublin Declaration (Doc. 16302/03 CRIMORG 96, 19.12.2003), the 2004 The Hague Programme (OJ C 53, 03.03.2005, p. 1) and the 2006 EC Communication (2006/581/EC, 07.08.2007).

requirements and (ii) providing an organising framework for legislation dealing with emergent or evolving forms of criminality.

The Project Team therefore engaged in an extensive consultation process thereby stimulating the dialogue between the wide range of actors in the field, including practitioners and policy makers at MS level, international, supranational and private sector organisations, European actors and policy makers, and different academic and research institutes.

1.2.2 Specific Objective: Contributing to Collection of Comparable Crime Statistics

Taken from the EU Action Plan to measure crime and criminal justice,² the collection of crime statistics is one of the specific purposes EULOCS could serve. Building on this specific purpose, the main objectives of the Project are:

- to develop an EU level offence classification system, taking into account:
 - o the policy needs of international, supranational organisations as well as MS' authorities involved in the exchange of crime statistics;
 - o existing classification systems used at national and EU/international levels;
 - o the implications of the development and use of a reference offence classification system at EU level.
- to identify obstacles to the collection of statistics and propose practical solutions to overcome them (e.g. elaborate workable inclusion and exclusion criteria for the offence types);
- to develop a strategy and practical solutions for the promotion of EULOCS in order to stimulate dialogue between stakeholders (public and private actors);
- to inform the European Commission in order to better target funding programmes aimed at further research in the area and suggestions for future system applications and development.

1.3 METHODOLOGY OF THE PROJECT

During the initial desktop research, the Project Team received guidance from DG JLS and an Advisory Group consisting of crime statistics experts from the European Sourcebook Group, EUROSTAT and the UNODC, to obtain their input on the methodology for this Study. The orientation phase was concluded with the consultation of selected international organisations, European bodies and institutions on their policy needs.³ The international stakeholder consultation approach was mainly centred on distance-administered questionnaire management and remote interaction. The selection of stakeholders was based on their involvement in the production and collection of statistical information on offences in the EU. The first phase of the project also entailed developing a preliminary EULOCS.

The main part of the Study consisted of the consultation with Member States to receive crucial input on their views, needs and feedback with regard to the preliminary EULOCS in terms of compatibility and feasibility.

² EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2006), *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the council and the European Economic and Social Committee: Developing a comprehensive and coherent EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice: An EU Action Plan 2006 – 2010*, (COM(2006) 437 final of 07.08.2006)

³ The European Insurance and Reinsurance Federation (CEA), the Council of Europe (COE)*, the European Banking Federation (EBF)*, the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA), the European Unions' Judicial Cooperation Unit (Eurojust), the European Police Office (Europol), the Statistical Office of the European Communities (Eurostat), the Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA)*, the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union (Frontex), International Labour Organisation (ILO)*, the United Nations Children's Fund (Unicef)*, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (Institutions marked with * have provided feedback on the priority offences).

At the beginning of September 2008, a package of Questionnaires was sent to all EU Member States via a network of Single Points of Contact (SPOCs). They were requested to:

- identify the persons responsible for the collection of crime statistics in the different national authorities producing and using crime statistics;
- forward the Questionnaires to these stakeholders and explain what they needed to do;
- consolidate the answers provided and return the Questionnaires to the Project Team within one month of receipt;
- organise the Focus Group meeting for a Project Team member with the involved parties upon completion of the Questionnaires by the different authorities;
- if required, update and finalise the contribution of the country in a consolidated reply to the Questionnaires.

The package of Questionnaires contained (see Annex 4.9)

- a general questionnaire aimed at getting a general overview of the national crime statistics environment, experiences with international exchange of data and overall suggestions related to the creation of a EULOCS;
- classification forms to obtain an overview chart for each of the classification systems in use encompassing information i.a. on the level of detail, the number of offence categories, IT aspects and languages;
- variables forms to be filled out for each of the classification systems in view of assessing the availability of variables;
- two compatibility files, allowing an assessment of the degree of compatibility of EULOCS with the national classification systems, in terms of (i) definition compatibility and (ii) category compatibility.

26 Member States have replied to the questionnaires sent out.⁴ Moreover, during subsequent Focus Group meetings in 24 Member States, the Project Team has personally consulted around 160 persons in more than 125 different authorities.

On the basis of the overall assessment and the findings of the consultations, the preliminary EULOCS has been adjusted and the recommended EULOCS finalised. To support further research in the area and suggestions for future system application and development a comprehensive and concise narrative of the Project methodology, focussing on the development and design of EULOCS, is provided in Annex 4.1.

1.4 VISION OF THE PROJECT TEAM: CHOICES MADE

Apart from the task to create an offence classification accompanied by working definitions, the Project Team received limited official requirements for the design of a single EU level offence classification system affording a lot of room to evaluate different options. Taking into account the nature of the area of freedom, justice and security, the Team opted for a high level of political acceptability complemented by practical and statistical acceptability.

In order to attain the first objective, and referring back to the secondary consideration in the Terms of Reference, the Project Team seeks to promote a single offence classification system, to be used in various EU JHA related areas. This is a strong argument in favour of using the classification of the European Criminal Records Information System as a basis for the study and further build upon that with the entire EU JHA Acquis in mind, including not only the instruments elaborated on a European Community/Union level, but also instruments from other actors such as the Council of Europe and the United Nations. In view of attaining statistical acceptability the Team pursued comprehensiveness and exclusiveness.

⁴ From 27 EU Member States, only Malta did not participate in the Study. No mission was organised to Spain and Slovenia upon request of the Single Point of Contact.

During the course of the Study, the Team became even more aware of the need to create a single reference index that could serve different purposes. This is one of the reasons a more strict application of the offence based character of the classification system was employed. Together with the feedback of the Member State meetings and the international and supranational stakeholders' consultation the initial EULOCS was redesigned into the current proposed EULOCS (see Annex 4.1 and 4.8).

- The strict “offence based character” is externalised through limiting the listed offences to their constituent elements. The level of detail included in the initial EULOCS did not always reflect different offence types, but also encompassed characteristics of either the offender, the victim or the event that had taken place. Those characteristics have now been shifted to the variables sheet, as they might interfere with the general application scope the Team envisages for EULOCS.
- Because of the call to focus more explicitly on the Subsidiarity principle, EU priority offence and the offences within the mandates of the international and supranational bodies and organisations, the choice was made to introduce a new cluster in the system. Jointly identified parts of offences are now regrouped as such, as the Team recognises a legitimate interest of data for that group. This could serve as a basis for evaluating related policy initiatives.
- Considering that in-depth insight into certain crime phenomena also requires the possibility to indicate in the context of which phenomena an offence was committed – e.g. falsification of identity documents committed in the context of trafficking in human beings – EULOCS was also complemented with a sheet on so-called context fields.
- During the overall redesign of EULOCS feedback related to enhancing user-friendliness was taken into account and resulted, amongst other things in the simplification and limitation of the number of words on the primary offence categories, through shifting descriptive aspects to the definition sheet.

1.5 REPORTING STRATEGY

During the course of this Study, a substantial amount of information was gathered from a wide variety of actors in the field of crime statistics. The data collected during the CSP has been consolidated in several detailed analytical tables containing qualitative and quantitative information presented in the Annexes. Primary information (i.a. filled out Questionnaires, detailed comparisons on the compatibility assessments) is uploaded – upon the consent of the MS – onto CIRCA.⁵

Due to the requirement in the terms of reference that the Study may not exceed 15.000 words, detailed overviews of the gathered information are not included directly in this report. Together with the Commission the decision was made to focus on the main Study Findings and the Recommendations and make detailed information available via CIRCA.

After the introduction, in the second section of this report, high level overview tables are presented to provide the reader with a first glimpse of the current EU Crime Statistics Environment. Several “bullet boxes” are introduced, indicating the main points the study revealed, to enhance the reader friendliness of the report. They can serve both as a reading guide and a summary of the following section. Topics elaborated upon are:

- the existing classification systems (section 2.2);
- the communication between authorities (both within one MS as between MS) and with international and supranational bodies and agencies (section 2.3);
- the comparison of data (section 2.4);
- the compatibility with the preliminary EULOCS (section 2.5).

⁵ CIRCA is a portal developed under the European Commission IDA programme. It enables collaboration between the European Institutions and the Public Administration. The Expert Group on policy needs for data on crime and criminal justice CIRCA site can be found at <https://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/jai/pndccj/home>.

The Team concludes from the analysis of gathered data that EULOCS would provide clear added value.

The third section – dealing with the Project Team’s recommendations – has a three-layered structure. Referring back to the secondary consideration in the terms of reference and the high level objective, the Team promotes the setting up and maintaining of one single EULOCS, used beyond the field of crime statistics (section 3.1). Subsequently, the Team explains its recommendation with regard to the application of EULOCS in the field of crime statistics (section 3.2), before making the final observations on the need to simultaneously intensify the efforts to support the further development of the crime statistics environment at MS level (section 3.3).

Through recalling the related obstacles in the bullet boxes, the Project Teams seeks to support the recommendations. Additionally the recommended actions are boxed, to serve both as a summary and a guide for the reader.

2 STUDY FINDINGS

2.1 HIGH LEVEL OVERVIEW TABLES

2.1.1 Member States' classification systems overview table

The table below presents a high level overview of the most important offence classification systems identified in this Study.⁶ This table also shows which authorities have ownership of the classification system and whether this is embedded in an IT system and available in English.⁷ Moreover it highlights the countries in which there is one single central authority at the national level responsible for coordinating the collection of crime statistics from the different authorities (Coordinating Authority). The last column shows which Member States have indicated that there is at least one authority producing data for each of the stages of the justice chain (arrest; prosecution/investigation; decision on cases; deprivation of liberty/ alternative sanctions). More details can be found in the Annexed tables (Annex 4.2.1 up to 4.2.6).

	Authority Owning Classification system								Coordinating Authority	Possibility to produce data covering all stages of the CJS
	STAT	POLICE	COURT	PROSECUTION	PRISON	MoJ	MoI	Other		
AT	X	X*					X			
BE		X ⁸		X				X ⁹		
BG						X				X
CY	X ^E	X*			X*	X*			X	X
CZ		X ^E				X ^E			X	X
DE	X*	X ^{E10}								
DK		X							X	X
EE						X ^E			X	X
EL	X* ^E	X*		X					X	X
ES	X*	X*								
FI	X ^E								X	X
FR						X ¹¹	X ^E			X
HU						X ¹²			X	X
IE	X								X	
IT	X ^E					X	X		X	X
LT			X		X* ^E		X ^E			X
LV								X ¹³		
NL	X* ^E	X*	X	X					X	
PL					X	X*			X	X
PT		X		X ¹⁴	X*				X	X

⁶ Their selection by the SPOC and the provision of further detail in a classification form on that particular classification system is a strong indication of their importance at MS level.

⁷ In the overview tables below, (*) indicates that the classification system is not embedded in an IT system. The symbol (E) indicates that the classification system is also available in English.

⁸ Federal Police (CGO).

⁹ Central criminal records office.

¹⁰ Federal Criminal Police.

¹¹ Criminal Affairs Direction in the French Ministry of Justice.

¹² Same classification system is used by Law enforcement authorities.

¹³ Parliament.

	Authority Owning Classification system							Coordinating Authority	Possibility to produce data covering all stages of the CJS
	STAT	POLICE	COURT	PROSECUTION	PRISON	MoJ	MoI		
RO		X			X	X ¹⁵		X ¹⁶	
SE								X ¹⁷	X
SI	X ^E								X
SK		X		X	X* ¹⁸	X			X
UK						X		X	N/A

Table 1– High level overview of Member State environment

2.1.2 International Stakeholders' data collection overview table

The table below firstly sets out the data sources used by the international and supranational organisations as indicated during the Policy Needs consultation. It also identifies those authorities that use an offence classification system indicating whether those classification systems are integrated into an IT system and whether they are available in English.¹⁹ The last column of the table shows the use of single points of contact in the Member States in the exchange of offence-related information per consulted organisation.

	Used Data Sources									Classification system	SPOC in Member States	
	POLICE	COURTS	PROSECUTION	PRISON	Other Gov. Auth	Victims	NGOs	Private Sector	Other IOs			Other
CEA							X	X				X
CoE	X	X	X	X	X							
EBF								X				X
EMCDDA	X		X ²⁰								X* ^E	X
ESG	X	X	X	X		X					X* ^E	X
Eurojust	X	X	X								X ^E	X
Europol	X ²¹	X		X	X							X
Eurostat										X ²²	X* ^E	X

¹⁴ The classification system used by Portugal's prosecution authorities is also used by the Courts.

¹⁵ Romania's Superior Council magistracy.

¹⁶ General Inspectorate of Romanian Border Police owns a classification system, which is not embedded in an IT system.

¹⁷ National Council of Crime Prevention.

¹⁸ Slovakia's General Directorate of the Corps of Prison and Court Guard own a classification system.

¹⁹ In the overview tables below, (*) indicates that the classification system is not embedded in an IT system. The symbol (e) indicates that the classification system is also available in English.

²⁰ EMCDDA collects information from prosecution on an ad-hoc basis upon the needs, if required, of the National Focal Points. For example in 2008, there was a publication of a selected issue on sentencing statistics on drug-related offences for which information collected by prosecution authorities was necessary.

²¹ Eurojust rarely collects information from the police.

	Used Data Sources										Classification system	SPOC in Member States
	POLICE	COURTS	PROSECUTION	PRISON	Other Gov. Auth	Victims	NGOs	Private Sector	Other IOs	Other		
FRA	X	X	X			X	X					X
Frontex					X				X			X
ILO					X							
UNODC	X	X	X	X	X	X					X ^E	

Table 2 – High level overview of International Stakeholder environment

²² National contact persons nominated by Directors of Social Statistics.

2.2 CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS IN USE

This section analyses the main findings regarding the classification systems in use by the Member States and international and EU stakeholders summarised in the two high level overview tables above. When introducing the Action Plan on Measuring Crime, the Commission presented its concerns regarding the wide fragmentation of crime statistics at the national level. It states that “national statistics differ on so many factors that comparisons between countries, even with extensive efforts to make them comparable, are almost impossible”.²³ This statement can be well illustrated by the Study findings. Throughout the European Union, at least 128 national authorities are involved in the collection and production of crime statistics.²⁴ 53 of those authorities indicated that they make use of an offence classification system. This does not necessarily imply that they all make use of different offence classification systems but at least 52 distinct offence classification systems have been identified at the national level in the MS.

More detailed information is available in Annexed tables 4.2.1 up to 4.2.3.

Analysis reveals:

- **Fragmentation at national level**
 - **Close link to national criminal code**
 - **Different MS offence definitions, classification systems, CJS**
 - **Different approach by different actors**
- **Fragmentation at international level**
 - **Limited use of offence classification systems at international level**
 - **Different policy needs for each stakeholder**
 - **No initiatives to allow for to conversion**

2.2.1 Fragmentation at national level

As all identified national classification systems refer back to national criminal codes, the systems each have their own distinct features resulting in a low inter-compatibility throughout the Union. Even referring back to one single national criminal code does not necessarily prevent the elaboration of up to 5 different classification systems within one MS.²⁵

The wide variety in the national classification systems’ level of detail, resulting mainly from the fact that they serve different purposes, adds to low inter-compatibility of datasets. The scope of offence categories in different authorities’ classification systems ranges from “property offences” over “theft” to descriptions as detailed as “theft of a caravan”. It is safe to say that in the majority of MS, police forces use the most detailed classification systems.²⁶

The interest in different information sets by different national authorities involved explains and even justifies a different approach. However, practices in some Member States show that different interests do not exclude the use of similar, at least compatible classification systems.

²³ EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2006), *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Economic and Social Committee: Developing a comprehensive and coherent EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice: An EU Action Plan 2006 – 2010*, (COM(2006) 437 final of 07.08.2006), p. 3

²⁴ 128 Member States provided an answer to the related question.

²⁵ 1 Member State has 5 classification systems, 2 have 4, 5 have 3 and 9 have 2 and 8 have 1.

²⁶ This finding is true for 9 out of 26 Member States.

In Member States where there is a high level of centralisation or a well-developed mapping or bridging system, it seems to be the case that the administrative burden can be significantly reduced, while the fluent production, comparability, integration and exchange of the different datasets can be increased within a country.

2.2.2 Fragmentation at international level

The fragmentation at national level is also identified at international level.

Starting with the Hague Programme,²⁷ a number of policy documents such as the Report on the Convergence principle by the “Future Group”²⁸ or the Council of the EU Draft Conclusions²⁹ stresses the importance of simplifying procedures for exchange and cooperation. Only four of the consulted organisations and the European Sourcebook Group (hereafter ESG) have reported making use of an offence classification system for data exchange.³⁰ The exchange of crime data at international level largely depends on organisations’ scope of work and their mandate regarding the use of this information. This different interest in crime data collection and offence categories has resulted in different offence classification systems or offence categories at international/ EU-level.

Currently there seems to be no coordinated effort to further develop the different classification systems in use in a common direction, even though there is a shared interest in some offence types, such as traditional offences and drug-related offences. This gives rise to a substantial risk of further, divergence increasing the burden on reporting authorities being repeatedly faced with similar but always slightly different requests for datasets.

Both at MS level and international level respondents have confirmed the need and added value of a common reference index for data collection at EU level.

²⁷ EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2005), *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: The Hague Programme: Ten priorities for the next five years - The Partnership for European renewal in the field of Freedom, Security and Justice*, (COM(2005) 184 final 13.05.2005), p. 20

²⁸ COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008) Report of the Informal High Level Advisory Group on the Future of European Home Affairs Policy („The Future Group“), June 2008 (DOC 11657/08)., p. 9

²⁹ COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008) Draft conclusions on the principle of convergence and the architecture for internal security (DOC 13459/08, JAI 576, CATS 70), p.4

³⁰ Eurojust, UNODC, Eurostat and EMCDDA indicated that they make use of a classification system.

2.3 COMMUNICATION AND DATA EXCHANGE

Apart from the use of different classification systems, the high level overview tables (section 2.1) also reveal the complexity of the exchange of offence-related information both at national and EU level. This section analyses the main findings and obstacles that have been identified by the consulted authorities and organisations related to the exchange of crime statistics.

Analysis reveals:

- **Cumbersome internal data flow**
 - **Added value of Single centralised authority**
 - **Difficulty in covering all stages of criminal justice chain**
 - **Significant time lapse before achieving integrated data set**
- **Difficulties in externally exchange of data**
 - **Wide range of data sources**
 - **Various types of IT-systems**
 - **Variety of complex questionnaires**
 - **Varying quality and quantity of provided data**
 - **Different MS practices for reporting and recording data**

2.3.1 Cumbersome internal data flow³¹

The sheer number of classification systems in use at national level, coupled with the wide variety of authorities involved in the production of statistical data on offences, contributes to the complexity of the exchange of crime statistics at the national level. Coordination at the national level seems difficult and there is a significant time lapse before achieving an integrated data set that covers all stages of the criminal justice chain.

In more than half of the MS, the complexity of the national statistical environment is partly resolved through the introduction of one authority responsible for coordination of the production of crime statistics at national level. The Project Team identified that in countries where a single centralised authority operates, the latter is not always privileged or mandated to have access to and work with data covering all the stages of the criminal justice chain. Some coordinating authorities that are in this position indicated however that the great time lapse before integrated data can be produced, is a significant obstacle for the operational use and value of the data.³²

There is increasing awareness of the added value of integrated crime statistics. Many Member States have pointed to the rapidly changing nature of the crime statistics field and the reforms to improve integration currently taking place or planned for a not too distant future.³³

³¹ A detailed overview table can be found in annex 4.2.2.

³² This obstacle was identified by 8 Member States.

³³ This was indicated during the Focus Group Meetings at 5 Member States.

2.3.2 Difficulties in external exchange of data³⁴

The complexity of the data flow at the national level is reflected in the communication between Member States as well as between Member States and EU and international stakeholders.

Data exchange with international stakeholders is more common than communication with other MS. Exchange of statistical data on offences is only explicitly mentioned in the mandate of FRA, EMCDDA, Eurostat and UNODC, but the majority of the consulted organisations deal with statistics on offences in the scope of their work.³⁵ Both periodic as well as ad-hoc reports are used for the presentation of crime statistics and most international organisations use questionnaires as a means of collecting information from MS.

During the Study, a number of obstacles, analysed below, have been identified that partly explain why exchange of data between Member States and the EU and international level is considered to be difficult as well as the difficulties faced in data comparability. Member States seem to be limiting external data exchange to the absolute minimum required.

2.3.2.1 Wide range of data sources

International stakeholders use a wide range of data sources to collect offence-related information from Member States (see Table 2 above). This is considered to be an obstacle to data exchange efficiency and to obtaining a complete data set per Member State at the international/EU level. Notwithstanding the use of wide range of different data sources, private sector organisations are often disregarded, when looking for possible data sources.³⁶ Data exchange on offences between the private sector (profit organisations) and international and supranational organisations does not seem to be a common practice. Only FRA and CEA (a private sector EU federation) have indicated that they collect data from non-profit private sector organisations (NGOs).

The complexity of international information exchange is well illustrated by the fact that, even when similar information is collected from the same type of data source, different contact persons are often used by the different International Stakeholders. There was a case reported where two different international organisations using different contact persons to obtain data from the same organisations, resulted in different data sets for a particular offence category.

On the other hand, the use of single points of contact for data collection by EU and international organisations seems to be a challenge. Consulted international stakeholders have pointed to the fact that single points of contact in the Member States are not always in the best position to provide statistical data on offences at the international level. This can be seen as a direct consequence of the complexity of the national environment (see section 2.3.1.)

Two main obstacles can be deduced from this practice. Firstly, International stakeholders are not always aware of which data sources/contact points should be consulted. In addition to this, the use of a wide variety of data sources often seems to cause delays and inconsistencies in the data provided.³⁷

³⁴ A detailed overview table can be found in annex 4.2.3.

³⁵ 8 of the 12 consulted International Stakeholders mentioned this.

³⁶ Only 3 international stakeholders indicated that they collect data from private sector organisations, including both profit and non-profit organisations.

³⁷ This obstacle was identified by 6 Member States.

2.3.2.2 Various types of IT systems

Not only are there different authorities involved, but also various types of IT-systems and applications. Within the framework of this study, 52 different IT-systems were utilised by crime statistics authorities from 24 MS illustrating an average of 2 IT-systems involved in the production of crime statistics data at national level. The maximum number of IT-systems reported in one MS was 5. For future reference, the details of the IT-related feedback can be found in Annexed Table 4.2.4. A brief overview of the data already demonstrates a large variety of different system architecture models, software applications and data formats.

2.3.2.3 Variety of complex questionnaires

A third set of obstacles is related to the nature of the international / EU data requests sent to MS.

There seems to be general agreement that the number of circulating questionnaires has passed the saturation point, in particular since the same or at least similar questions are repeated in different questionnaires. For instance similar but different requests for data on drug trafficking appear in data requests from EMCDDA, Eurostat, UNODC, ESG, Europol and Eurojust. Moreover, each of the requesting authorities makes use of a different information exchange network. Notwithstanding a common interest in some offence types, agencies that collect information do so separately from each other. The exchange of statistical data on offences between international and supranational organisations is not a common practice. Only Europol and Frontex indicated that they have data originating from supranational or international organisations.

Hence the need for rationalisation and for an integrated and more coordinated approach to information exchange at the EU level has surfaced.³⁸ In this context, UNODC highlighted the need to obtain a better understanding of similarities and differences of data collected at EU-level.³⁹ Related to the risk of duplication of work, by requesting Member States to respond to different questionnaires on similar issues, UNODC has stressed the need for a joint EU-UN approach to data collection. This is also the reason why the UNODC, Eurostat and ESG are working towards common definitions of a limited number of traditional offence types.

More than half of the consulted Member States have further indicated that – besides being confronted with similar requests – there is not always a common understanding on the scope of the requested data.⁴⁰ Data requests can be very detailed for certain offence types but at the same time, they seem sometimes not sufficiently detailed to allow for the production of meaningful comparable cross-country data to gain an insight in certain crime phenomena. The lack of contextual information is also identified as an obstacle to the efficiency of the current situation by the International Stakeholders.⁴¹ Links between data on offences, offender, victim, location and other variables should be taken into account in crime statistics analysis.⁴²

³⁸ This observation was identified by 10 Member States.

³⁹ A step towards this direction has been taken by Eurostat in the framework of the Criminal Justice Sub-Group on the 28th May 2008. A report was submitted to the Group highlighting the differences and similarities of the different requests made by UNODC, ESG, Eurostat, CoE to MS.

⁴⁰ This obstacle was identified by 15 Member States.

⁴¹ This finding was also confirmed by Eurostat during the Policy Needs sub-Group on the 5th February, where in relation to data exchange on money-laundering, MS seem to be unable to provide data to Eurostat on a number of variables.

⁴² The analysis of the Variables Forms endorsed the history of offender oriented criminal justice systems in Europe. A number of authorities have listed additional variables to the ones we had included in the form.

2.3.2.4 Varying quality and quantity of provided data

A third set of identified obstacles to external data exchange can be linked to the availability of the requested data at national level and the ability of the national data sources to provide a proper reply to international requests.

Some International Stakeholders point to their limited knowledge on what kind of data exists at national level, as an obstacle to the adaptation of their questionnaires.⁴³ The unavailability of data, such as for instance lack of victim data⁴⁴ and simply the lack of public information on offences for which data is requested, have been identified as problems by MS. In addition to this, three of the consulted International Stakeholders identified MS' resistance to share offence-related information as an obstacle in the current situation. The lack of available data at the national level can be linked to the apparently insufficient coordination between SPOCs and primary data providers; and to the complexity of the crime statistics environment at the national level (section 2.3.1).

Lack of requested data can also be seen as a result of a number of problems identified at the national level regarding data exchange: the limited use of automated work in the field of crime statistics and overall budgetary and staffing constraints.⁴⁵ International organisations have also identified current budgetary constraints as an obstacle to the efficiency and effectiveness in collecting data from Member States and in detecting crime.

2.3.2.5 Different MS practices reporting and recording data

The complexity of data exchange at the EU and international level is also linked to a number of issues concerning different Member State practices for reporting and recording data, which seem to hinder data exchange at the EU level.

Differences in the point in time at which offence data is recorded, or published seem to be an obstacle for the collection of comparable data at the EU level. In addition to this, international stakeholders also point to the different methods used by Member States to exchange data at the national level as well as the differences in reporting practices and procedures as factors hindering comparability of data at the EU level.

The obstacles described in the above sections, explain the difficulties Member States face in sharing information with other Member States and international stakeholders, the limited quantity and quality of the responses to the questionnaires⁴⁶ and hence their limited interest in crime statistics for comparisons.

The IT overview table in annex 4.2.4 shows that the exchange patterns differ greatly throughout the EU. Twenty one online collection and registration methods were identified in comparison with thirty two offline collection and registration methods. Often data registration and production seems to be a semi-automated process where technical users are involved in the consolidation and validation of data, the production of reports or the construction of queries. With respect to reported exchange networks, the intranet is used for the exchange of information in 29 cases, the internet in 16 cases. XML files, spreadsheets and text files are the most commonly used data formats.

⁴³ This obstacle was raised by Frontex in the Policy Needs Questionnaire.

⁴⁴ This obstacle was identified by 7 Member States. The analysis of the Variables Forms revealed that the single statistical authorities rarely have data on victims. None of the Prison Authorities that responded to the questionnaires have data on victims.

⁴⁵ This obstacle was identified by 10 Member States.

⁴⁶ This obstacle was identified by 3 International Organisations.

2.4 COMPARISON WITH CROSS-COUNTRY EXCHANGED DATA

Analysis reveals:

- **Difficulties in correctly handling foreign data**
 - **Close links to national criminal code**
 - **Limited statistical clarification**
- **Insufficient insight into crime phenomena**

The consulted international and supranational organisations indicated that enabling comparisons between countries is one of the three main purposes for exchanging statistical data on offences.⁴⁷ At MS-level however we see a different picture. Most Member State authorities involved in the collection and production of crime statistics have clearly indicated that comparison of their national crime statistics with those of other EU MS does not take place on a regular basis or as a continuous activity.⁴⁸ Member States report that comparative analysis is usually performed on an ad-hoc basis within the scope of scientific research or thematic analysis for Policy Needs, or requested on an ad-hoc basis in the framework of diplomatic relations or in the context of negotiation procedures with other countries.⁴⁹

An exception to that rule is that regular comparisons do take place in some countries within the framework of regional cooperation, such as between the Nordic countries, or in border regions, like data of interest to the Border Police.⁵⁰ Some of the identified comparisons are limited to a joint publication to support public access to data, rather than providing real cross-country comparisons.

The Project Team also identified two clusters of obstacles that seem to explain the limited use of cross-country exchanged data.

2.4.1 Difficulties in correctly handling foreign data

Firstly, various countries indicated having difficulties in correctly handling foreign data because of the close link to the national criminal codes. This is partly due to the fact that only few criminal codes are translated into English and there is a significant risk of consulting a translation that is not up-to-date⁵¹. Related to budgetary and staffing constraints, very few authorities in the Member States have experts with a particular responsibility for cross-country comparisons. Moreover, these experts have only limited tools available to assist them.

Furthermore, from a statistical point of view, the hesitation is reinforced by the limited availability of statistical inclusion and exclusion criteria to specify the exact scope of the individual offence data. Several MS and international organisations have identified as an obstacle in the current situation the fact that different Member States use different counting rules to measure crime, which can lead to situations of double counting.⁵²

⁴⁷ Additionally, deciding on priority offences and analysing crime trends were identified as purposes for the exchange of statistical data on offences.

⁴⁸ 3 out of 26 MS stated that periodicity of reporting data is low.

⁴⁹ 4 Member States mentioned this kind of cooperation initiatives.

⁵⁰ This form of cooperation takes place between 7 Member States, divided into 2 regional groups.

⁵¹ This obstacle was identified by 4 Member States.

⁵² Some Member States measure crime based on the offence, others based on the offender. Among those recording offences, some record all offences reported to them, others measure the most important offences, such as those with the highest sentences. Furthermore, among countries recording offenders, some record the number of individuals during a certain time while others record the number of *different* individuals reported during this

This is one reason why the EMCDDA has pointed to the importance of taking contextual information into account such as name, sex or age identifying the offender in order to obtain sufficient insight into the crime phenomena. In that sense some countries and international organisations confirmed the absence of a common nomenclature and up-to-date manuals of internal practices for the data to be sufficiently comparable.⁵³

2.4.2 Insufficient insight into crime phenomena

Secondly, Member States sometimes question the usefulness and the added value of the current scope of the available cross-country data. This finding is related to the need for contextual information to gain in-depth insight into crime.

MS indicate that the gathered data is only used within the scope of scientific research. For the elaboration of policy strategies, too little use is made of available data. Due to limited cross-country data exchanges, the Project Team received little guidance related to the priority offences for EU-wide data collection from the respondents. International stakeholders referred to their mandates, whereas Member States made suggestions in various directions: interest in traditional offences,⁵⁴ high volume offences,⁵⁵ cross-border offences⁵⁶ and EU-defined offences⁵⁷ were expressed, combined with suggestions to move ahead with high level aggregated data⁵⁸ as well as with very specific and detailed offences.⁵⁹

time. In the former case an individual reported twice will be counted twice, whereas in the latter case the person will only be counted once.

⁵³ This need was identified by 5 Member States.

⁵⁴ This suggestion was made by 2 Member States.

⁵⁵ This suggestion was made by 3 Member States.

⁵⁶ This suggestion was made by 1 Member State.

⁵⁷ This suggestion was made by 1 Member State.

⁵⁸ This suggestion was made by 8 Member States.

⁵⁹ This suggestion was made by 8 Member States.

2.5 COMPATIBILITY ASSESSMENT OF EULOCS

A preliminary version of EULOCS was prepared by the Project Team in the course of the Study. Assessing its applicability and compatibility in the national data collection environment constituted the main task of the consulted national authorities. Other consulted stakeholders were also asked for feedback on the proposed EULOCS.

2.5.1 Compatibility of EULOCS with national classification systems

Two “Degree of Compatibility” assessments were performed by the MS (see section 1.3). The completed country matrixes present the preliminary EULOCS and the results of the definition - and category compatibility assessment for future reference (see annex 4.11). In addition to the compatibility assessment on a per country basis, a general compatibility overview was prepared consolidating all compatibility scores collected.

2.5.1.1 Category compatibility: assessing data availability

The compatibility assessment was performed for 119 of the 446 offence categories. It is difficult to visualise the results of the analysis on the availability of data. Following table provides a high level overview and should be read as follows:

- 16.8 %: for 16.8 % of the offence categories examined, data is available in more than 66% of the classification systems that participated in the Study;
- 55.5 %: for 55.5 % of the offence categories examined, data is available in between 33 and 66% of the classification systems that participated in the Study;

	% of offence categories with A evaluation	% of offence categories with C evaluation	% of offence categories with N evaluation
High # of systems examined (x>66%)	16.8%	0%	3.4%
Medium # of systems examined (33%>x>66%)	55.5%	0%	45.4%
Low # of systems examined (x<33%)	27.7%	100%	51.3%

Table 3 – Data availability

In Annex 4.3 a list is provided representing the offence categories with a high data availability ratio. Annex 4.4 contains a list representing the offence categories with a low data availability ratio. Please bear in mind that this list represents the categories in the initial EULOCS, not necessarily appearing as such in the proposed EULOCS.

The Project Team concludes that there is a relatively high amount of offence categories with a high data availability ratio. Analysis has also shown that there is a substantial number of offence categories for which it would be impossible for many authorities to provide data. Prior to requesting new crime statistics data on offence categories it is therefore important to understand the feasibility and the impact of the request. One method would be to examine the results of the compatibility overview assessment. The overall diversity in category compatibility assessment scoring points to a high diversity in offence categories used in the production of crime statistics throughout the EU.

There is however a high consistency in the responses for the following offence categories:

- a large majority of MS authorities do produce crime statistics for the list of offence categories represented in Annex 4.3;
- only a small number of MS authorities produce crime statistics for the list of offence categories represented in Annex 4.4.

2.5.1.2 Definition compatibility: assessing the scope of available data

The compatibility assessment was performed for the same 119 of the 446 offence categories. Similar to the previous table, 7.6% should be read as: “7.6% of the offence categories examined, were deemed to be a perfect match by more than 66% for the classification systems that have participated in the Study”.

	% of offence categories with perfect match Evaluation	% of offence categories with minor incompatibility Evaluation	% of offence categories with major incompatibility evaluation	% of offence categories with no criminality evaluation
High # of countries examined (x>66%)	7.6%	0	0	0
Medium # of countries examined (33%>x>66%)	73.9%	25.2%	1.7%	4.2%
Low # of countries examined (x<33%)	18.5%	74.8%	14.3%	95.8

Table 4 – Definition compatibility

Annex 4.5 provides a list with offence categories having a high definition compatibility ratio. Similarly, Annex 4.6 provides a list with offence categories having a low definition compatibility ratio.

The Project Team concludes that there is a low number of offence categories for which there are major definition incompatibilities. This result demonstrates that the current working definitions are a solid basis for the future for the majority of offence categories.

Working definitions will however have to be evaluated and refined to ensure a sufficient consensus on their use as a common denominator.

2.5.1.3 General compatibility related findings

- The compatibility assessment is linked to national criminal codes and more specifically the articles of the criminal code – it was not always possible to provide detailed information for Member States if that information is covered by multiple paragraphs in the criminal code.
- It is not feasible to strive for a EULOCS with full compatibility with all national criminal codes.
- The compatibility outcome was not linked to the level of detail (main families are not more or less compatible than subfamilies). The elaboration of the level of detail in the Member States is strongly dependant on the political interest for data.
- The compatibility exercise did reveal some inconsistencies in the level of detail of the preliminary EULOCS. They were dealt with during revision of EULOCS.

2.5.2 Compatibility of EULOCS with international classification systems

The preliminary EULOCS has been developed on the basis of the ECRIS classification system. It was then sent to the international organisations consulted during the initial stakeholder consultation round. Their feedback was taken on board as much as possible. So we can safely say that the EULOCS as it is presented in this study is highly compatible with existing classification systems at the international or EU-level. Some offence category suggestions were considered too detailed at this stage.

The overview of the mapping of the EULOCS with important classification systems at international or EU-level can be found in the documentation uploaded to CIRCA (doc 4.8).

2.6 CONCLUSION: CLEAR ADDED VALUE OF EULOCS IN THE FIELD OF CRIME STATISTICS

Based on the analysis of the Study findings and the feedback received during the various consultation rounds, the Project Team contents there is a clear added value of creating and using EULOCS as a common reference index in the field of Crime Statistics. Bearing in mind the benefits of using a common reference index at the EU level as reported during the course of the project, positive feedback was also received when the proposed EULOCS was presented to the Expert Group on policy needs on the 5th February. Member States welcomed the proposal and one Member State stated that the quality of EULOCS is high enough to be used as an index for exchange of information and as a basis for crime analysis. The following table presents a high level overview of the potential of EULOCS in relation to the obstacles identified during the course of the Study.

Classification Systems in use	
Obstacle	Potential of EULOCS
Close link to national criminal codes	Common reference index towards which one could map the classification systems
No bridging systems in place	
Rapidly evolving environment	Take common reference index into account when further developing the environment; stimulate communication in case of common interest in view of heading towards conversion
Divergence in further development	
No coordination efforts	
Communication and data exchange	
Obstacle	Potential of EULOCS
Unclear what kind of data is requested	Clarify scope of the requested data via link to specific offence category
Inconsistencies between different data sets	
Low quality and quantity in data reply	Link offence categories with the possible data sources per offence type
Unclear which data sources are to be addressed	
Variety of complex questionnaires	Stimulate international organisations to indicate and communicate offences with the scope of their interest, so that patterns and common interest fields are visualised and could become subject of dialogue.
Overlapping or at least similar data requests	
Comparison with cross-country exchanged data	
Obstacle	Potential of EULOCS
Difficulties to handle data as scope is unclear	Possibility to provide link to national criminal code
Lack of accessibility to translations of national criminal codes	
	Mapping for each of the criminal codes, will stimulate cross-country comparison

Definitions used and scope of provided data unclear	Common reference index would help to interpret offence categories from other EU MS/ national level
Lack of detailed information to gain valuable insight in crime phenomenon	Elaborate the level of detail of specific offence types according to a specific need for more detailed information
Lack of contextual information	

Table 5 – Overview of EULOCS’ potential

In addition to addressing identified obstacles, the use of EULOCS has been identified as beneficial during CSP, in relation to:

- **Transcending the distinction between qualitative and quantitative data exchange**
As mentioned in Section 2.2, some of the consulted international stakeholders focus on the exchange of crime-related qualitative data.⁶⁰ This highlights the need for a unifying index that transcends the distinction between qualitative and quantitative crime-related data, particularly in terms of questionnaires as OCTA and TE-SAT. The use of EULOCS offers a means for more structured cooperation in the information exchange at the EU level and consistency between qualitative quantitative data.
- **Integration of traditional and non-traditional offences**
Divergence in the use of data sources (section 2.3.2.1) underlines the need for a reference index that integrates non-traditional crime data, also originating from non-state sources, such as NGOs, into wider crime and research reports.⁶¹ The importance of data originating from various non-traditional sources, is also highlighted at the national level by the fact that the Central Statistics Office of Ireland, which recently⁶² published a new Irish Crime Classification system (ICCS) (R017) reflecting the need a system that goes beyond offences recorded by An Garda Síochána.
- **Increased private sector involvement**
The limited involvement of the private sector in the exchange of crime statistics also underlines the added value of EULOCS as a basis for private sector crime reporting and future compatibility. EULOCS can be seen as a means of encouraging structured cooperation between international and EU organisations and private sector bodies.

⁶⁰ Eurojust and Europol, collect data through the OCTA and TE-SAT questionnaires.

⁶¹ FRA collect data officially published police and criminal justice data on offences of their interest, but also unofficial NGO reports and academic research reports.

⁶² 17 April 2008.

3 RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 ONE SINGLE EULOCS, USED BEYOND THE FIELD OF CRIME STATISTICS

Accommodating the following obstacles:

- **Different initiatives in the field of data exchange**
- **Variety of classification systems in use at international level (UNODC, Europol, Eurojust, ECRIS, ...)**
- **No coordinated effort to further develop the classification systems in use -> risk for further divergence**

3.1.1 Introduction: justifying the integrated approach

Data exchange in the European Union and beyond is very complex. Different initiatives taken to meet different needs have resulted in the elaboration of different classification systems. However, research has shown that different interests brought about by the different applications could accommodate the creation of a reference index. In recent years, rationalisation calls have intensified: we need a common approach for data exchange, we need initiatives for conversion. This observation is also taken into account in the Terms of Reference of the Study as it considers the ‘system to be created’ as having a beneficial influence as a reference index across different areas of related JHA activities. The Project Team regards this as strong argument supporting a very direct approach towards the creating of one single EU-level offence classification system, used beyond the field of crime statistics.

This approach is fully in line with the Convergence Principle, introduced by the Informal High Level Advisory Group on the Future of European Home Affairs Policy in June 2008.⁶³ The aim of this idea is to bring Member States closer together, not only by means of standardisation when necessary, but also by operational means. It would apply to all areas where closer relations between Member States are possible: agents, institutions, practices, equipment and legal frameworks.⁶⁴

In the Presidency Conclusions on that principle, the Council considered that it may constitute a guiding principle for the continued construction of a common European Area of Security, in addition to the mutual recognition and availability principles. Simultaneously, the Council invited MS to develop tools to facilitate operational cooperation among their law enforcement authorities, through – amongst others – the harmonisation of legal frameworks promoted by progressively simplifying procedures for exchange of information.⁶⁵

Apart from crime statistics – the core of this Study – the following initiatives were identified as indicative for possible beneficiaries to using EULOCS for their activities:

- **Complementing data exchange on criminal records**
Allowing prosecution and judicial authorities to take into account prior convictions obtained in another MS, criminal records information is exchanged between different MS.

⁶³ COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008) Report of the Informal High Level Advisory Group on the Future of European Home Affairs Policy („The Future Group“), June 2008 (DOC 11657/08), p. 9

⁶⁴ COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008) Report of the Informal High Level Advisory Group on the Future of European Home Affairs Policy („The Future Group“), June 2008 (DOC 11657/08), p. 11

⁶⁵ COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008) Draft conclusions on the principle of convergence and the architecture for internal security (DOC 13459/08, JAI 576, CATS 70), p.4

Currently, it is unclear to what extent prior convictions should be taken into account. In order to correctly interpret the information received, it is crucial to grasp the scope of the conviction. The added value of using a common reference index for the assessment of information received has already been identified, and led to the creation of the European Criminal Records Information System (ECRIS). Through inclusion in EULOCS of cross-references to other categorisations, different initiatives can further develop in the same direction, ultimately leading to convergence. In a first stage, a solid mapping or bridging tool will avoid further divergence.

- **Identifying the scope of an EU certificate of non prior conviction**
The practicing of a number of professional activities requires the possession of a certificate of non prior conviction in general, or non prior conviction for specific offence types in particular. The difference in scope of those offences in the different Member States possibly jeopardises fair competition between actors based in different MS. Using a common reference index to determine the scope of these so-called black listed offences, would increase mutual trust with regard to the supplied certificates, and will ensure fair competition throughout the Union.
- **Refining the mandate of EU bodies such as EUROJUST and EUROPOL**
At the time when the Europol and Eurojust mandates were elaborated, the concept of using harmonised definitions to determine the scope of offences was still gaining influence. Using a reference index to clarify and further elaborate the scope of the mandated offences, would likely be beneficial to the general functioning and the overall recognition of EU bodies and agencies.
- **Refining the scope of the European Arrest Warrant categories**
When elaborating a list of offences, for which no double criminality test is considered necessary, no definitions or clarifications were provided with regard to the scope of the offences and hence the scope of application of the European Arrest Warrant. Whereas some offences have an EU-level instrument (or international instrument incorporated into the Justice and Home Affairs acquis) that could give an indication of the scope of the listed offence (and the action radius of the EAW), other categories cannot fall back on such an instrument and remain vague. Hence the confusion and practical problems when executing a European Arrest Warrant.
- **Transposing EU JHA legislation**
Using a reference index for the clarification of the offence scope in each of the mutual legal assistance and mutual recognition instruments will stimulate dialogue, clarify the scope and benefit the perception of legislative initiatives in this field. Finally we refer back to the Terms of Reference of the Study, which already indicated that a potentially beneficial application of EULOCS would be as an aid to MS transposition of EU JHA legislation in terms of (i) communicating a clear understanding of the associated statistical requirements and (ii) provide an organising framework for legislation dealing with emergent or evolving forms of criminality.

3.1.2 Specific recommendations

The practical application of using a reference index requires promoting EULOCS and raising awareness of the added value of this approach at policy level.

Recommended actions:

- **Define EULOCS' full potential through identifying beneficiaries**
- **Brand and version EULOCS**
- **License the use of EULOCS**
- **Make information on EULOCS easy accessible**
- **Translate EULOCS**

3.1.2.1 Define EULOCS' full potential

An inventory should be drawn up of all data exchange initiatives that could benefit from this approach.

In the course of the project, most national stakeholders involved in crime statistics have been engaged during the MS missions. Likewise, a significant number of international and EU organisations involved in the exchange of crime-related data were consulted. The benefit of this approach is that all authorities involved in the field of crime statistics at national level and relevant international organisations are already aware of the effort to produce an EU-level offence classification system that can potentially facilitate and improve their work. Moreover, the Study was considered as an excellent opportunity for enhancing internal dialogue between different national stakeholders. Beneficiaries outside the scope of crime statistics should be involved in further elaboration and implementation as well, if EULOCS is to be accepted and used in a wide context. Therefore the Project Team stresses the importance of identifying all beneficiaries and potential users of EULOCS.

3.1.2.2 Brand and version EULOCS

EULOCS should be branded and versioned.

The brand could be complemented by the creation of a logo. Based on the logo, a “EULOCS certified” or “EULOCS compatible” label could be deposited as a trade mark (owned by the European Community) in order to benefit to all application that would decide to use the EULOCS.

Versioning is recommended to illustrate that EULOCS is subject to evolution (both to improve and adapt to changes in the rapidly evolving field of crime and criminal justice), and thus seen as a long term enterprise. One could start with “EULOCS v.1.0” or “EULOCS 2009”.

Further development and operationalisation of EULOCS should be undertaken in close contact with all identified beneficiaries. An initial assessment of the compatibility between the MS' and EULOCS' offence categories and definitions was performed in the framework of the CSP (section 2.5).

As a short-term recommendation, a more detailed mapping exercise could be performed and further integrated into an IT solution already enabling the exchange and comparability of cross-border statistical data (see section 3.2.2.3).⁶⁶ An online conference could be launched as an initial phase of the follow-up study, to engage all actors involved to assess operationalisation of data collection using EULOCS v1.0. At the online conference, the offence index as well as working definitions could be adjusted by a limited group of stakeholders and accepted as a working basis by the majority of crime statistics stakeholders in the EU. In this way, a combination of bottom-up, when engaging MS representatives, and top-down approaches would be achieved. Following the suggestions indicated in the Report of Convergence Principle, networks of experts could be created and developed.⁶⁷ The requirement of fitting within the context of existing initiatives (such as E-justice portal, for instance) is no less important.⁶⁸

Additionally, versioning should be regarded as a tool to recognise and accommodate the different needs of different actors. Version 1.0 A could stay basic (main categories), version 1.0 B (and C, D, E etc.) could be more detailed (with statistical inclusion and exclusion criteria, with offender and victims variables, etc).

Therefore, an application using EULOCS could announce “EULOCS v.1.0 A compatibility” or EUROSTAT collecting statistics could require “EULOCS v. 1.0 B compatibility” etc. “Compatible” means here that all original EULOCS categories are common, even if some users have added sub-categories, as the case may be.

After some months or years, an impact assessment of EULOCS (investigating its use and the versions modified by recipients) could produce the EULOCS v 2.0 (possibly in various level of complexity A,B, C, etc.).

3.1.2.3 License the use of EULOCS

It may look trivial, but one of the most basic conditions of EULOCS promotion is to authorise its usage. This must be done with a formal licence. Since EULOCS is a copyrighted work, its use is legally forbidden without such license. This license must authorise the widest possible use, including modifications, in order to comply with the specific needs of a great number of potential users. However, modifications must preserve the initial trunk (otherwise no interoperability will be possible).

As a practical solution, we recommend the distribution of a “EULOCS v.1.0” under a Creative Common Licence “Share alike” (CC). Annex 4.7 contains an illustration of how this could be modified.

3.1.2.4 Make information on EULOCS easy accessible

To make information of EULOCS as easily accessible as possible, the Project Team recommends leveraging with other initiatives. Even though one might consider the benefits of a possible www.eulocs.eu site, the most immediate and practical solution is to host the EULOCS initiative on an existing website, owned by the European Commission.

⁶⁶ The classification expert of the ILO stressed the importance of mapping the offences in each country to a preliminary EU-level offence classification system before it can be finalised so that detailed categories can be aggregated to a level that can be supported on the basis of legislation in each Member State.

⁶⁷ COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008) Draft conclusions on the principle of convergence and the architecture for internal security (DOC 13459/08, JAI 576, CATS 70), p.3

⁶⁸ COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008) Draft conclusions on the principle of convergence and the architecture for internal security (DOC 13459/08, JAI 576, CATS 70), p.9-10

In particular, www.OSOR.EU provides for the constitution of “communities” and “projects”. EULOCS could be one of those. Communities include user’s registration, an on-line discussion forum, blogs and communication platform. Projects include a repository for source code, version management, downloading and licensing. After December 2009, the e-Justice Portal is another alternative (however functionalities are still to be defined and developed, making the use for EULOCS possible only from the end of 2010, in all probability). As a practical solution, the migration of the various aspects of EULOCS on OSOR.eu could be analysed.

3.1.2.5 Translate EULOCS

Language barriers between Member States consist one of the main obstacles in the current situation. EULOCS should be translated in all EU official languages in order to stimulate its acceptance and allow for a better understanding of offence categories of the common reference system. Due to the fact that EULOCS categories and definitions are still to be refined, it is recommended that the translation takes place once agreement has been reached among the relevant authorities and stakeholders.

Regarding translation of EULOCS itself, the following considerations should be taken into account:

- when translating the group titles and the terminology of the EULOCS into a national language, it is important to remember that it is the concepts rather than the words themselves that are being translated;
- the translation requires a comparison between the different languages and this necessitates that both language and subject matter experts from the Member States are involved in the translation. This is important, in particular as it may require the creation of new terms in the national language, or the specification of more precise meanings for existing terms. Such innovations should always be as consistent as possible. This is why; it is strongly recommended that EULOCS’ official translation in national languages is performed under the responsibility of the Member States themselves.

3.2 APPLICATION IN THE FIELD OF CRIME STATISTICS

Accommodating the following obstacles:

- **Wide range of data sources and different contact networks**
- **Inconsistencies between different data sets**
- **Difficulties in obtaining complete data set per MS**
- **Too many (overlapping) questionnaires**
- **Variety of classification systems in use at international level**
- **Difficulties in interpreting the data**
 - **Different definitions put burden on comparability of data**
 - **Limited availability of translated national codes**
 - **Unclear what is provided => more need to have statistical comments**
- **Lack of contextual information**
- **Limited communication between different stakeholders regardless of similarities in the scope of interesting offences**

3.2.1 Structural requirements for EULOCS

Even though EULOCS is to be used for different data exchange initiatives, the exchange of statistical data is probably the most demanding in terms of the structuring of EULOCS. Elaborating a clear scope for each of the categories and the exclusion of overlapping categories are only two out of a series of valid concerns. This section aims to describe how to take those requirements into account, balancing them with the requirements for a general applicability in the field of EU JHA. Annex 4.2.7 provides a more detailed overview of the suggestions put forward by the MS and the International Organisations.

Recommended actions:

- **Maintain strict offence based character**
- **Cluster jointly identified components of offences**
- **Complement EULOCS with statistical inclusion and exclusion criteria**
- **Complement EULOCS with offender, victim and event variables**
- **Complement EULOCS with contextual information sheet**

3.2.1.1 Maintain strict offence based character

Taking into account the observations during the course of the Study and the analysis of the feedback received, the Project Team strongly recommends maintaining the approach to limit the level of detail of the offences to their constituent elements. The level of detail included in the initial EULOCS did not always reflect different offence types, but also brought in characteristics of either the offender, the victim or the event that had taken place. Those characteristics have now been shifted to the variables sheet, as they might interfere with the general application scope the Team envisages for EULOCS. This approach also accommodates the comment on the unbalanced level of detail.

As a consequence of this approach, not all categories that appear in currently used classification systems by International stakeholders or at EU level, are included in the basic version of EULOCS. This effect is obviated through complementing EULOCS with a number of additional sheets (infra).

3.2.1.2 Cluster jointly identified components of offences

Following the call to focus more explicit on the Subsidiary principle, EU priority offence and the offences within the mandates of the international and supranational bodies and organisations, the choice was made to introduce a new cluster in the system. Jointly identified parts of offences are now regrouped as such, as the Team recognises a legitimate interest of data for that group. It could also serve as a basis for evaluating related policy initiatives.

3.2.1.3 Complement EULOCS with statistical inclusion and exclusion criteria

The fact that most national classification systems and hence the available data, are closely linked to the national criminal codes, may not be denied. From a statistical point of view however, becoming cross-country comparable data requires taking a step back and break down the definitions into the smallest behavioural components. The right balance should be struck between the use of legal definitions and the creation of statistical definitions (i.e. descriptions clearly indicating inclusion and exclusion criteria for each of the categories to ensure comparability). The Project Team complemented EULOCS with a definition sheet. Based upon specific policy needs and/or the identification of offence categories of particular interest, these definitions should be refined and further developed into strictly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria.

3.2.1.4 Complement EULOCS with offender, victim and event variables

Enabling the production of meaningful data sets, a series of variables related to the offender, the victim and the events should complement EULOCS. Via this approach categories that appear in other classification systems (not strictly limited to the offence) can be recreated. Whereas car theft no longer features as an offence category in EULOCS itself, the combination of offence category “theft”, with “car” as object of the offence, allows the reproduction of this ECRIS category. Likewise the relationship between perpetrator and victim will allow analysis to take place which focuses on domestic violence. Similarly, “shop” as the location of the facts, can be interpreted together with theft, to run an analysis on shoplifting. Amongst others, the following criteria could be introduced as complementing variables: age, sex, social status, relationship between offender and victim, location of the event, modus operandi.

Additionally, external variables such as population shifts, organisation of society, culture and cultural changes, technology, ... could be used to refine the insight into a phenomenon. Based on previous research and the results from the analysis of received Variables Forms, the Project Team took a first step in this direction by complementing the proposed EULOCS with offender, victim and event variables.

3.2.1.5 Complement EULOCS with contextual information

To gain a truly detailed insight into specific crime phenomena, it is not enough to have information on the offences themselves. One will also need information on the context in which those offences were committed. Theft, extortion, causing bodily injury, dangerous driving can all be related to drug addiction and drug consumption. Similarly, falsification of administrative documents could be committed in the context of trafficking in human beings. It is specifically that context researchers need to provide policy makers with an accurate evidence base for policy initiatives outlining prevention strategies. Based on this consideration, the Project Team included an illustration of context fields in the proposed EULOCS file.

3.2.2 Practical solutions for efficient and effective data collection at EU level

Recommended actions:

- **EU coordination to streamline data requests**
- **Ensure stable and transparent network of contact points**
- **Support IT applications**
- **Encourage use of common standards**

3.2.2.1 EU coordination to streamline data requests

The kind of data that is exchanged is strongly dependent on the purpose of the exchange. Data is being exchanged for different purposes, amongst which statistics is only one. However, even the exchange of statistics happens for a wide range of purposes, affecting the level of detail of the exchanged data. A general trend assessment could be carried out, based on high level data, whereas an in-depth analysis of a specific phenomenon requires very detailed and complemented data. Data providers have indicated that they are confronted with similar data requests from different stakeholders. It is often unclear what data is requested and similarly, it is often unclear what data is presented in the end due to different data sets collected and published by different EU and international organisations. Using EULOCS as a reference index to clarify the scope of data requests could significantly improve common understanding of the exchanged data.

Additionally, indicating offences of interest to each of the stakeholders will reveal common interests among and stimulate dialogue between different international stakeholders in view of rationalisation of the requests.

The Project Team recommends rationalising the data request according to the purpose of the data collection. High level data collected in view of a general overview or trend assessment can be collected by a generalist body, whereas detailed information in view of tackling a specific crime phenomenon should be collected by a specialist body. The latter objective requires experience and knowledge related to the characteristics of crime phenomena. In order to develop EU policies capable of tackling the phenomenon of missing and sexually exploited children and trafficking in human beings, reliable information is needed on the present developments, the threats, the recent methods, the modus operandi, the number of persons and the amount of money involved in trafficking in human beings, sexually exploited children and missing children. Years of study and in-depth analysis is required to gain enough insight to be able to develop an appropriate data collection tool.⁶⁹

⁶⁹ With the 2004 Siamsect project, IRCP started the development of standardised templates for EU-wide collection and analysis of statistical information. The Project Team started off with the results of both the Childscope Study and the Study on European Data Collection on Sexual Offences Against Minors, and conducted a desk top research of literature and legislation gave a first insight on the variables used in the different Member States. Thereupon, a large number of international organisations gathering data on the phenomenon, and two existing EU monitoring centres (EUMC and EMCDDA), were visited. Additionally, cooperation was received from national experts in all the EU Member States, to review the draft template. During the course of the project, a steering group composed of representatives from various international organisations, met several times to evaluate the progress. The template now forms the basis of a follow up project called MONTRASEC, aimed at developing a ready-to-use and statistical responsible IT-platform bringing together the different data of the relevant partners in an integrated data collection mechanism. The time lapse between the identification of the need for detailed and cross-country comparable data on trafficking in human beings and sexual exploitation of children, and the start of the current MONTRASEC-project can serve as

Moreover, a solution to the complexity faced at the EU/international level could be for Eurostat to perform a coordinating role in identifying reporting parameters as part of a wider quality assurance role in crime statistics at EU level. Eurostat could be tasked with consolidating the various data from different organisations and agencies as a way of streamlining and coordinating different datasets available at EU level.

3.2.2.2 Ensure the creation of a transparent and stable network of contact points (CPs) at national level

A variety of classification systems in use	
Obstacle	Potential of proposed “EULOCS committee”
Close link to national criminal codes	Promotion of EULOCS to all potential beneficiaries at national and international/ EU level and coordinate the further operationalisation of the common reference index
No bridging systems in place	
Rapidly evolving environment	
Divergence in further development	
No coordination efforts	
Difficult communication complicates data exchange	
Obstacle	Potential of proposed transparent and stable network of Contact Points
Wide range of data sources at national level	National CP network closely integrated with data sources and liaising with national data providers. National CP network responsible for validating data before provided to international/EU level
Lack of coordination at MS level	
SPOCs not sufficiently integrated with primary data sources	
Inconsistencies between different data sets provided	
Unclear which data sources at MS level are to be addressed	
Limited quality and quantity in data replies	CP network streamlining overlapping data requests
Variety of complex and partially overlapping questionnaires	
Lack of IT and manpower	
Requested data is unclear or unavailable	CP network to drive a process of identification of complete set of data sources per offence type at MS level
Lack of victim data	

Table 6 – Overview of proposed SPOC potential

Once an EU-level offence classification system is developed, it would be very interesting to examine the types of information sources per offence category in further detail (inclusion of victim surveys, NGOs, private sector organisations).⁷⁰ Already in the Dublin Declaration it was mentioned that the private sector should be encouraged to participate in data exchange and reporting process.⁷¹ Such an exercise will result in a list of all relevant crime statistics stakeholders used for the collection of crime statistics information.

a striking example, or even as best practice, of the time and effort needed to identify all the required variables before starting a data collection that will be able to provide a valuable insight in the phenomenon.

⁷⁰ For some offence categories NGOs or victim organisations can be a better source of information while, for other offence categories insurance companies or credit card companies are in a better position to deliver the appropriate data.

⁷¹ *Declaration of the Dublin Conference on Organised Crime* (Doc. 16302/03 CRIMORG 96 of 19 December 2003), p.6-7

Through mapping of such a network and publishing network details, the process of data exchange could be significantly rationalised. Each chain in the network will have access to information regarding national counterparts or counterparts in other MS. Getting to know other actors in the field would improve the communication not least through exchange of best practices and raise the level of transparency.

A coordinating committee at national level can also be set up to:

- coordinate the gathering of all available statistical data from selected governmental and non-governmental organisations;
- have in-house capacity to analyse the data;
- validate crime statistics for particular offence categories;
- improve and ensure quality of the data provided at the international/EU level.

In this respect, Eurostat could be tasked with to preparing quality assurance guidelines for Member State provision of data at the international/EU level, such as:

- encouraging the publication of crime data in the public domain;⁷²
- close monitoring of new procedures, legislation and systems' implementation to avoid misinterpretation when processing data at the national level;
- identification of standard units of analysis for different offences.

These functions can ideally be performed by national authorities responsible for national crime statistics coordination. However, for the above functions to be conducted effectively, national coordinating authorities need to be well integrated with various data sources. Improved coordination with the private sector, for certain offence categories, will also improve the current situation.

In addition to improving coordination at the national level, one of the organisations consulted referred to the Regulation on migration statistics requesting MS to supply migration statistics annually to Eurostat.⁷³ An EU Regulation obliging MS to report statistics on a regular basis could improve the exchange of crime-related data that does not fall under the third pillar.

3.2.2.3 Support IT applications for exchange of crime-related information⁷⁴

A number of organisations already make use of web-based data exchange tools or shared databases (see section 2.3.2.2). EULOCs could provide further impetus to streamline the communication with and between the EU MS allowing the Member States and international organisations to adjust their information systems in the future to match the classification, making it easier to share the information.⁷⁵ In the long term, centrally developed applications or a web portal could:

- facilitate the exchange and publication of crime statistics information at MS and international levels;

⁷² Two organisations in England & Wales have the current best practice of making data available in the public domain on publicly reported and criminal justice recorded crimes as well as police statistics and victim survey data.

⁷³ This Regulation was adopted in June 2007.

⁷⁴ Use of centralised information systems and databases is a suggestion reported by four MS and two international stakeholders. Two of the consulted international stakeholders identified the use of IT systems at the EU level for exchange of information as a best practice.

⁷⁵ This suggestion was mentioned by Frontex.

- speed up and ensure the accuracy of information exchanged between Member States and the EU level;⁷⁶
- enable end-users to choose the level of detail in order to meet the different policy needs of different EU/international stakeholders and different national authorities;⁷⁷
- provide automatic translation functionalities facilitating cross-border information exchange and data comparisons.

Integrating EULOCS into an IT application is a long term recommendation that can be foreseen once it has been refined and accepted by EU and national stakeholders. The development of an IT application should go hand in hand with stronger coordination amongst relevant international, EU and national stakeholders.

The IT application integrating EULOCS should address the policy needs of the different users. As well as being reliable, it should be simple and user-friendly so that users are encouraged to use it on a daily basis.

The eDamis system currently used by Eurostat should be considered as a best practice in this direction, particularly in terms of developing a middleware/platform with MS reporting systems. Moreover, related to the advantage of using IT as a means to reduce the possibility of errors in provided data, the “web form” of the latest eDamis release already allows users in the MS to prepare and check a dataset in the screen before submitting it to Eurostat.

It is strongly recommended that a *consultation process* on the development of the IT application involving MS and international/ EU stakeholders is foreseen, with a particular focus on the potential end-users of the application. In addition to representatives from the authorities producing crime-related data, the following stakeholders shall be consulted:

- courts representatives - if information such as court calendars, offender identification, and dispositions can be accommodated electronically between systems, clerical workload will decrease and data accuracy will improve.
- crime analysts need access to fresh, thorough information on crime in geographic areas. Also, they may need computer support in their analyses.
- technical staff to address questions such as communications, security, files conversion, interactions with other systems, site preparation, etc.

Main points to be addressed during the consultation process:

- definition and decision on the application’s scope and objectives;⁷⁸
- identification of needs and requirements;
- translation of needs and requirements into system functionalities by a coordinating party;
- review of functionalities by stakeholders;
- test of software’s ability to meet requirements prior to acceptance.

Following this consultation period, an IT application shall be developed meeting the requirements set by the relevant international and Member State stakeholders.

⁷⁶ This is in contrast to the current situation where the use of paper questionnaires increases the possibility of errors in the information provided by MS (see section 2.3.2.3).

⁷⁷ Eurojust identified the suggestion for integrating EULOCS into a web-based form enabling end-users to choose the desired level of detail. The need for addressing different needs from the different national authorities involved in the exchange of crime statistics was confirmed by the Expert Group on policy needs on the 5th February.

⁷⁸ For instance use of the system for the exchange of statistics and/or qualitative information

3.2.2.4 Encourage usage of a common standard to exchange statistical information

Most of the organisations use their own customised data model to store their data. But 14 data exchange systems already make use of the XML format or the Statistical Data and Metadata eXchange format (SDMX).

Strength/Opportunities of the SDMX format in particular:

- the value, the quality and the comparability of the statistical information will increase the effectiveness of the political actions of the MS, agencies and the EC when they are dealing with the fight against national and transnational crimes;
- the SDMX group provides “...*Content-Oriented Guidelines* ... [*recommending*] *practices for creating interoperable data and metadata sets using the SDMX technical standards...*”;⁷⁹
- the SDMX group can facilitate the work to make the criminal statistics systems interoperable;
- each organisation can implement the standard according to its own needs; this has no impact on the development of the other administrations timetable.

Weakness/Threats:

- the costs of the activities (the training, the management, the acquisition or development of new software ...) needed to implement the standard are significant;
- not all organisations will implement the standard reducing the value, the quality and the comparability of the data.

Recommendation:

The European Commission in general but more precisely DG JLS could

- fund projects aimed to implement the usage of the SDMX format within the public administrations;
- act as facilitator for the exchange of information between the DG EUROSTAT, the IDABC programme, the DG DIGIT and the SDMX group;
- use the IDABC/DG DIGIT initiatives like the Open Source Observatory and Repository and the Semantic Interoperability Centre Europe dealing with similar subjects on other topics.

⁷⁹ “SDMX CONTENT-ORIENTED GUIDELINES”, SDMX DRAFT - February 2008, BIS - ECB - EUROSTAT - IMF - OECD - UN - World Bank, http://sdmx.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/02/sdmx_content-oriented_guidelines_draft_february_2008.pdf

3.3 SUPPORTING CRIME STATISTICS AT MS LEVEL

Accommodating the following obstacles:

- **Low inter-compatibility of classification systems**
- **Poor integrated data – accessibility of data for all suppliers of answers**
- **Overall budgetary and staffing constraints**

Recommended actions (see also annex 4.2.8):

- **Stimulate integration and coordination**
- **Encourage communication and transparency**
- **Support investment in man power**

3.3.1 Stimulate integration and coordination

In view of solving obstacles related to the fragmentation at national level and the sometimes difficult communication between authorities, the Project Team highly recommends stimulating the evolution towards the establishment of fully integrated data systems covering all stages of the criminal justice chain. This could also encompass noncommittal recommendations to consider the establishment of single centralised authorities.

Additionally, this would also entail supporting investment in the extension of IT applications. In this respect Member States are encouraged – as was explicitly done at the Expert Group on policy needs on the 5th February – to explore 2009 EU funding opportunities (ISEC programme – framework partners) to use the project findings in order to promote the capacity-building of domestic IT systems. In the Draft conclusions on convergence principle, it was stressed that it is essential to create manuals and guides to best practices for the MS. Moreover, shared platforms and databases should be developed.⁸⁰ The Report on Home Affairs Policy talks about efforts (..) to standardise databases and new technologies⁸¹ in order to obtain better interoperability.⁸²

3.3.2 Encourage communication and transparency

In some MS, communication and hence cooperation between different authorities involved in the field of crime and crime statistics, is not self evident. In order to attain the previous objective (integration and coordination), an underlying requirement is improved communication. Increased transparency of the functioning of the authorities involved will constitute an important first step. The Project Team stresses the added value codified guidelines on the national recording and reporting practices will bring on the ability to interpret and analyse foreign (i.e. from other authority within MS or from other MS) data.

⁸⁰ COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008) Draft conclusions on the principle of convergence and the architecture for internal security (DOC 13459/08, JAI 576, CATS 70), p.3

⁸¹ COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008) Report of the Informal High Level Advisory Group on the Future of European Home Affairs Policy („The Future Group“), June 2008 (DOC 11657/08), p. 18

⁸² COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008) Report of the Informal High Level Advisory Group on the Future of European Home Affairs Policy („The Future Group“), June 2008 (DOC 11657/08), p.4

Moreover, the Project Team recommends the stimulation of both the internal and external exchange of meta models on core variables. With the objective of convergence and based on the results of the initial assessment of variables used by Member States in the framework of the CSP, a research opportunity on identifying similarities and differences in the counting rules used by the Member States is envisaged. ESG is considered as the most competent body to undertake such research.

3.3.3 Support investment in manpower

During MS consultations, the acute shortage of manpower to process the data requests was highlighted. Even though increased integration of data together with the rationalisation of data requests will significantly reduce the burden on Member States, considerable investment in manpower is needed to manage the current situation.

4 ANNEXES

4.1 METHODOLOGY AND STATE OF THE ART

This annex aims to provide a rough overview of the results of the literature review and how the state of the art was taken into account during the development of the proposed EU-Level Offence Classification System (EULOCS).

4.1.1 General Project Guidance

The Project team received general project guidance from DG JLS and the Advisory Group set up for this project consisting of crime statistics experts from the European Sourcebook Group, EUROSTAT and the UNODC. They have been invited to provide feedback in meetings on the Policy Needs Questionnaire and on the suggested approach towards the MS.

4.1.2 Desktop Research

Consisting of the study of relevant documentation and internet research, the desktop research aimed at obtaining a more complete understanding of EU Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) activities in the domain of offence classifications and crime statistics and beyond.

4.1.2.1 Attaining better understanding of Crime Statistics environment

Literature on crime statistics and existing classification systems (together with their best practices) have been analysed to determine the requirements of a classification system to meet the purposes for which crime statistics are used.

Both the Australian Standard Offence Classification and the Irish Crime Classification System served as main best practices. Besides those, we also studied the methodology, the encountered obstacles and best practices of the US Classification System, the European Source Book and the European Criminal Records Information System (ECRIS). Additionally, the Europol Information System and the Eurojust Case Management System as well as the quasi-offence classification in the European Arrest Warrant were studied to take them into account and ensure full compatibility with the proposed EULOCS.

4.1.2.2 Ensuring compatibility with other related JHA activities

Furthermore a general analysis has taken place of the entire JHA acquis, in view of taking into account the consideration in the Terms of Reference that the reference index may offer an indirect benefit to related JHA areas.

4.1.3 Development and design of the initial EULOCS

4.1.3.1 Using ECRIS as a basis

Taking into account the secondary consideration included in the Terms of Reference, the Project Team aims at developing and promoting one single EU-level offence classification system (hereinafter EULOCS). The aim is not to create yet another new compelling system that requires Member States to adjust national data models, but rather to develop a reference index that could serve the different needs in the area of JHA related activities. As currently the European Criminal Records Information System is being developed, the Project Team was asked to further built upon this classification. The team strongly believes that – in the long run – it is vital to work towards the development of *one* single EU-

level offence classification system that can be used for different purposes, amongst which are the criminal records exchange and the generation of EU crime statistics.

4.1.3.2 Rebuilding ECRIS and designing an initial EULOCS

Apart from the task to create an offence classification accompanied by working definitions, the Project Team received limited official requirements for the design of a single EU level offence classification system leaving a lot of room to evaluate different options. Taking into account the nature of the area of freedom, justice and security, the Team opted for a high level of political acceptability complemented by practical and statistical acceptability.

Political acceptability: substantive criminal law acquis as foundation

In order to attain the first objective, and referring back to the secondary consideration in the Terms of Reference, the Project Team seeks to promote a single offence classification system, to be used in various EU JHA related areas. This is a strong argument in favour of using the classification of the European Criminal Records Information System as a basis for the study and further build upon that with the entire EU JHA Acquis in mind.

Based on knowledge from previous research projects (Study on the Common Format for the Exchange of Criminal Records, Childscope, The SIAMSECT files, ...), the Team set up an e-library with all international documents containing offence definitions, originating from:

- The United Nations;
- The Council of Europe;
- The European Community;
- The European Union.

Indeed, to understand the current scope of substantive European criminal law and where the building blocks of harmonised minimum definitions are to be found, one will need to find a way through the labyrinth of instruments and initiatives, as cooperation is initiated at various levels: bilaterally, multilaterally (e.g. Benelux), regionally (e.g. Council of Europe, European Union) and internationally (e.g. UN). As most of the relevant non-EU instruments are clustered in the Justice and Home Affairs acquis (JHA acquis), this has served as the roadmap for further analysis. Even though the Union as such is not a party to these instruments, it considers the provisions in these instruments to be applicable throughout the entire Union, even when some states have not ratified them.⁸³

Statistical Acceptability: comprehensiveness and exclusiveness

In view of attaining statistical acceptability the Project Team identified the requirements of statistical classification systems. The requirements are closely linked to the purpose(s) for which it will be used. Broadly, 2003 UN Manual for the Development of a system of Criminal Justice Statistics (hereinafter “UN Manual”), identifies and explains three interdependent areas in which the use of criminal justice statistics can be divided: administration, planning, and policy research and analysis. The different purposes and priorities do not necessarily mean that separate data collection mechanisms should be elaborated. As the kind of information needed for operational, reporting and policy development needs are moving closer together, it is advised to elaborate a system that can provide all users with the information they need.

⁸³ W. DE BONDT en G. VERMEULEN, “Esperanto for EU Crime Statistics. Towards Common EU offences in an EU level offence classification system”, in M. COOLS et al, Readings On Criminal Justice, Criminal Law & Policing, Maklu, Antwerpen-Apeldoorn, 2009, 87-124;

4.1.4 Redesigning into proposed EULOCS

4.1.4.1 Consulting rounds

Input Advisory Group and Peer Review

The Team sought additional input from the Advisory Group and Peers at international criminology conferences to guard the practical implementation possibilities of the preliminary EULOCS, and its compatibility with existing classification systems.

In addition to the initial desktop research, the team analysed statistical classification systems other than crime statistics classifications (e.g. the International Standard Classification of Occupations). Subsequently, small changes were made with regard to the definitions and terminology (e.g. child/minor, drugs/precursors), and the user friendliness of the proposed EULOCS.

First Consultation Round: International Stakeholders

The first consultation round aimed at collecting information concerning the policy needs of EU JHA Bodies and Agencies, International Organisations and Private Sector Representative Bodies.

The international stakeholder consultation approach during consultation round was centred on distance-administered questionnaire management and remote interaction. The selection of stakeholders was based on their involvement in the prevention or monitoring of crime in the EU and their involvement in the production and collection of statistical information on offences in the EU.

The first consultation round resulted in a better insight of the policy needs of international actors related to the development of an EU-level offence classification system. Taking into account the input from these stakeholder groups, the Project Team has:

- increased the level of detail;
- included all European Arrest Warrant Categories;
- changed the terminology.

Feedback from peers: Stockholm Criminology Symposium and Edinburgh Criminology Conference

The Proposed EU-level Offence Classification System was presented on 17 June 2008 during a panel session organised by the Project Team during the annual Stockholm Criminology Symposium. Small changes were made with regard to the definitions and the user friendliness of the proposed EU-level offence classification system. On 4 September another panel session was organised at the Criminology Conference of the European Society for Criminology organised in Edinburgh.

Second Consultation Round: Member State Missions

The main objectives of the second consultation round were to study the crime statistics environment of the MS, their policy needs and requirements regarding the EULOCS as well as

to assess the compatibility between national offence classification systems in use and the preliminary EULOCS.

At the beginning of September, the Questionnaire was sent out to all EU MS and Focus Group meetings have been organised in the 27 MS. SPOCs in all Member States were requested to:

- identify the persons responsible for the collection of crime statistics in the different national authorities producing and using crime statistics;
- forward the Questionnaire to the stakeholders and explain what they need to do;
- organise the Focus Group meeting with the involved parties upon completion of the Questionnaire by the different authorities;
- consolidate the answers provided and return the Questionnaire to the Project Team within one month upon the receipt of it.

After the reception of the completed Questionnaire, a consultant of the Project Team travelled to the EU MS for a Focus Group Meeting.

Further consultation international stakeholders on EULOCS

In parallel to the meetings in the MS, the preliminary EULOCS was sent to the international and EU stakeholders, for their feedback.

Main criteria of redesign

On the basis of the overall assessment and the findings gathered during the consultation rounds, the preliminary EULOCS was adjusted and the recommended EULOCS was finalised. During the course of the Study, the Team became even more aware of the need to create a single reference index that could serve different purposes. This is one of the reasons a more strict application of the offence based character of the classification system was implemented. Together with the feedback of the MS meetings and the international and supranational stakeholders consultation the initial EULOCS was redesigned into the current proposed EULOCS.

- Maintain strict offence based character

Taking into account the observations during the course of the Study and the analysis of the feedback received, the Project Team strongly recommends maintaining the approach to limit the “level of detail” in the reference index to the constituent elements of offences. The level of detail included in the initial EULOCS did not always correspond with different offence types, but in fact brought in characteristics of either the offender, the victim or the event that had taken place. Those characteristics have now been shifted to the variables sheet, as they might interfere with the general application scope the Team envisages for EULOCS. This approach also accommodates the comment on the unbalanced level of detail, as indicated by the Member States.

The consequence of this approach is that not all categories that appear in currently used classification systems by International stakeholders or at EU level, are included in the basic version of EULOCS. This effect is obviated through complementing EULOCS with a number of additional sheets (infra).

- Cluster jointly identified components of offences

Following the call to focus more explicit on the Subsidiary principle, EU priority offence and the offences within the mandates of the international and supranational bodies and

organisations, the choice was made to introduce a new cluster in the system. Jointly identified parts of offences are now regrouped as such, as the Team recognises a legitimate interest for data on that group. The clusters could also serve as a basis for evaluating related policy initiatives.

- Complement EULOCS with statistical inclusion and exclusion criteria

The fact that most national classification systems – and hence the available data – are closely linked to the national criminal codes, may not be denied. From a statistical point of view however, becoming cross-country comparable data requires taking a step back and break down the definitions into the smallest behavioural components. The right balance should be struck between the use of legal definitions and the creation of statistical definitions (i.e. descriptions clearly indicating inclusion and exclusion criteria for each of the categories to ensure comparability). The Project Team complemented EULOCS with a definition sheet. Based upon specific policy needs and/or the identification of offence categories of particular interest, these definitions should be refined and further developed into strictly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria.

- Complement EULOCS with offender, victim and event variables

Enabling the production of meaningful data sets, a series of variables related to the offender, the victim and the events should complement EULOCS. Via this approach categories that appear in other classification systems (not strictly limited to the offence) can be recreated. Whereas car theft no longer features as an offence category in EULOCS itself, the combination of offence category “theft”, with “car” as object of the offence, allows the reproduction of this ECRIS category. Likewise the relationship between perpetrator and victim will allow analysis to take place which focuses on domestic violence. Similarly, “shop” as the location of the facts, can be interpreted together with theft, to run an analysis on shoplifting.

Amongst others, the following criteria could be introduced as complementing variables: age, sex, social status, relationship between offender and victim, location of the event, *modus operandi*.

Additionally, external variables such as population shifts, organisation of society, culture and cultural changes, technology, ... could be used to refine the insight into a phenomenon. Based on previous research and the results from the analysis of received Variables Forms, the Project Team took a first step in this direction by complementing the proposed EULOCS with offender, victim and event variables.

- Complement EULOCS with contextual information

To gain a truly detailed insight into specific crime phenomena, it is not enough to have information on the offences themselves. One will also need information on the context in which those offences were committed. Theft, extortion, causing bodily injury, dangerous driving can all be related to drug addiction and drug consumption. Similarly, falsification of administrative documents could be committed in the context of trafficking in human beings. It is specifically that context researchers need to provide policy makers with an accurate evidence base for policy initiatives outlining prevention strategies. Based on this consideration, the Project Team included an illustration of context fields in the proposed EULOCS file.

4.2 DETAILED ANALYTIC TABLES

4.2.1 Table on the Classification Systems in use

Classification Systems in use									
M S	General comment on classification systems in use	Authorities using a classification system	Classification systems	Features of the classification systems					
				IT system	Since	# Main Offences	# All Offences	English version	
A T	A few systems based on articles and subsections of the Criminal Code.	Stat Austria	Judicial criminal statistics based on the criminal records file maintained by the Federal MOI (classification of the convictions having legal effect that is handed down by courts in accordance with the Criminal Code+other laws).	Y	1947 (revised 1975)	2	Approx 400	N	
		Federal Criminal Police Office - MOI	Kriminal Stat Online	N	2000	7	470	N	
B E	Asystem based on the Criminal Code has been developed by the Police (tuning with the judicial authorities has taken place) giving an input to the nomenclature used by the Prosecution Service.	Central criminal records office	No info provided	Y	1994	2	1889	N	
		CGO, Federal Police	“PV Register aka Gerechtelijke nomenclatuur aka inputnomenclatuur”	Y	1994	37	Approx 1000	N	
		Prosecution authorities	Prosecution Offence Codes List	Y	2005	4	484	N	
B⁸⁴ G	A coded electronic table classification system was developed in the framework of the Unified Information System for Counteracting Crime” (UISCC) project - this classification system will be used by all authorities in the future. The table is not in use yet; at the moment all authorities refer to the article in the Penal Code, using a unique number for each registered case	MOJ	Classifiers and standards of Unified Information System to Combat Crime (UISCC)	Y	2007	14	1439	N	
C Y	Different systems used by different authorities. Their difference lies in their level of detail and the purpose for which they are used.	Stat Service	Classification System of Offences	Y	1976	11	250	Y	
		MOJ and Public Order	Annual Criminal Statistics	N	1960	5	79	N	
		Police	List of Serious and Minor Offences	N	No exact number	18	1881	N	
		Department of Prisons	List of offences for which convicted persons are admitted	N	1960	11	33	N	
C Z	MoI has developed its own coded electronic table classification system in addition to the classification in the Criminal Code,	MOJ	Central data storage - CSLAV-DW	Y	2008	12	Approx 200	Y	
		Police Presidium	Tactical statistical classification of crimes	Y	1993	9	188	Y	

⁸⁴ Countries having one single classification system (or those currently implementing changes to have such a system within maximum5 years) are put in bold.

Classification Systems in use

M S	General comment on classification systems in use	Authorities using a classification system	Classification systems	Features of the classification systems				
				IT system	Since	# Main Offences	# All Offences	English version
	whereas the MoJ only uses a reference to the Criminal Code. Both classification systems can be linked with each other according to subsections and definitions of the Criminal Code.							
D E	Federal Criminal Pol Office has developed a system in co-operation with the Federal Stat Office. Collection of statistics is based on a catalogue of criminal offenses compiled under both penal and criminological aspects	Federal Stat Office	“Straftatenkatalog der Strafrechtspflegestatistiken”	N	1974	9	500	N
		Federal Criminal Police Office	Police Crime Statistics (PCS)	Y	1953	9	Approx 1400	Y
D K	A system referring to subsections of the Criminal Code and special legislation.	National Commissioner of the Police	Journalplan	Y	1978	3	900	N
E E	A system referring to articles and subsections of the Criminal Code. Input in the system is done via a reference table linking with the articles in the Criminal Code. Offences that are described in other legal acts or are described in penal code but do not match the punishment criteria are misdemeanors and are not part of the crime statistics.	MOJ	Classification system based on Criminal Code	Y	2002	17	357	Y
E L	Different systems based on articles and subsections of the Criminal Code and special criminal laws (e.g. laws referring to drug offences). Difference lies mainly on level of detail.	National Stat Service	Statistics of offences and juridical statistics	N	1971(offences) 1958(sentenced persons)	27	Approx 120	Y
		Informatics Department	Classification integrated into the Central System (Database) of Police	N	Approx 1988	348+ 42	No info provided	N
		Courts (First Instance)	Classification of crimes based on the Criminal Code	Y	2004	8	27	N
E S	Systems based on articles, subsections and sections of the Criminal Code.	National Stat Institute	Offence classification based on Criminal Code	N	1998	25	107	N
		Police-MOI	Statistical system of Criminality	N	1997	4	178	N
FI	Central coded electronic table classification system referring to articles and subsections of the Criminal Code + other legislation is maintained by Stat Finland in collaboration with the police and judicial administration. This nomenclature contains a separate heading for each legal provision on an offence. Attempted offences are nearly	Stat Finland	Classification system based on Criminal Code + other legislation	Y	1977	87	Approx 900	Y

Classification Systems in use

MS	General comment on classification systems in use	Authorities using a classification system	Classification systems	Features of the classification systems				
				IT system	Since	# Main Offences	# All Offences	English version
	always under their own heading. By contrast, abetting in the commitment of an offence and instigation to committing an offence do not have separate headings but are provided for under the relevant offence.							
FR	A legal classification of crimes (NATINF) is used by the MoJ, while police, gendarmerie use a different classification system (État 4001). NATINF is supposed to be used by all authorities in their dealings with courts and some authorities (gendarmerie, Public Treasury) are abandoning their offence classification systems, while others, such as police, are maintaining their proper classification systems. By 2010, NATINF shall facilitate the exchange and comparability of statistics between the IT systems of the Police, gendarmerie, MoJ and Public Treasury.	Criminal Affairs Direction-MOJ	Legal classification of crimes (NATINF)	Y	1984	340 (NATAF) 250 (DIFINF)	11.000	N
		MOI	Etat 4001	Y	1972	5	103	Y
HU	A system based on criminal code and procedural rules.	MOJ/Law Enforcement	Criminal Code?	Y	1963	11	229	
IE	A system developed by the Central Statistics that is planned to be extended to the other statistical sources (Courts, Prisons and Probation). There is a separate program for integration between police and court – integrate manually the convictions – not entered on the police side – linkage between data systems on the court outcome data	Central Stat Office	Irish Crime Classification System	Y	2008	16	153	Not applicable
IT	Classification system (ISTAT) and lists of crimes (MoJ and MoI) based on criminal laws and the Criminal Code.	National Institute Stat	ISTAT statistical classification	Y	1880	6 + miscellaneous	Approx 520	Y
		MOI	MOI list of crimes	Y	No info provided	No info provided	No info provided	N
		MOJ	List of crimes of the General Register Database	Y	No info provided	No info provided	No info provided	N

Classification Systems in use

MS	General comment on classification systems in use	Authorities using a classification system	Classification systems	Features of the classification systems				
				IT system	Since	# Main Offences	# All Offences	English version
L T	Different authorities use classification systems based on articles and subsections of the Criminal Code.	Information Technology & Communication Department – MOI	The Departmental Register of Criminal Offences	Y	2003 (1990 according to old Criminal Code)	32	225	Y
		National Courts Administration	Classification of categories of criminal cases	Y	2005	32	306	N
		Prisons Department - MOJ	Common statistical reports of the Criminal Enforcement System	N	1993	32	No info provided	Y
L U	Different Systems used for different purposes; however, they follow the structure of the Criminal Code.	Centre of Information	Centre de documentation et de recherche Judiciaire (Information Policière)	Y	1996	3	700	N
		General Prosecution Office, Courts, Prisons	Classification system based on Criminal code, road traffic code and other special legislation	Planned for 2011	Since the existence of the Criminal Code	150	3800 ⁸⁵	Partially
L V	Two systems due to the changes of legislation in the criminal law: the Latvian Criminal Code (system for offences committed until the 1 st of April, 1999)+the Latvian Criminal Law (system for offences committed after this date). The systems have different section erringring, differences in section determination for the offences on its merits as well as some different and some additional sections due to changes of legislation.	Parliament	Latvian Criminal Code	No info provided	1961	No info provided	No info provided	N
		Parliament	Latvian Criminal Law	No info provided	1991	No info provided	No info provided	N
P L	Two systems due to the changes of legislation in the criminal law: the Latvian Criminal Code (system for offences committed until the 1 st of April, 1999)+the Latvian Criminal Law (system for offences committed after this date). The systems have different section erringring, differences in section determination for the offences on its merits as well as some different and some additional sections due to changes of legislation.	MOJ	Classification system based on criminal law provisions	N	1919	Does not exist	2500	N
		Prisons	Classification system is based on criminal law provisions	Y	1994	No info provided	250	N

⁸⁵ Criminal register used the same classification system as Prosecution, Courts and Prisons until participation of Luxembourg to the NRJ project. Since last year, the classification system used by the criminal register is much more detailed.

Classification Systems in use

MS	General comment on classification systems in use	Authorities using a classification system	Classification systems	Features of the classification systems				
				IT system	Since	# Main Offences	# All Offences	English version
PT	Different systems used by the Courts, Prosecution, Pol, DGPJ and Prisons referring to articles and subsections of the Criminal Code. Their difference lies in their level of detail.	Police, DGPJ	Table of crimes registered by police based on the Criminal Code	Y	1983	9	199	N
		Courts, Prosecution	Criminal Code+ other legislation	Y	1983	8	174	N
		Prisons	Most relevant categories of the Criminal Code used for stat purposes	N	1942	5	14	N
RO	Different systems theoretically based on the Criminal Code and the special laws on registering and evidencing dossiers, deeds, investigated persons and victims	Police	Classification of the offences as they are grouped in the Criminal Code and special laws.	Y	1990	9	282	N
		General Inspectorate of Romanian Border Police	The performance statistics indicators for the assessment of criminal environment concerning combating cross-border crime	N	2005	22	66	N
		National Administration of Prisons	System used by National Administration of Prisons	Y	2004	No info provided	No info provided	No info provided
		Superior Council of Magistracy	System based on Criminal Code special laws (drug trafficking, trafficking in human beings, etc)	Y	2005	12	177	N
SE	The classification of crimes is made by electronic crime codes built on the current legislation. In some cases they can give more specific information (object of the crime, age, etc.). The conviction Stat as well as Prison and Probation Stat follow the exact legal classification with the reference to the bridged legislation with specification	The National Council for Crime Prevention	Classification system based on the Criminal Code and other statues (eg. the Swedish Environmental Code)	Y/N	1965	Does not exist	420	Partially
SI	A system of Classification of Criminal Offences for internal use (SORS) developed by the Stat Office	Stat Office	Classification of Criminal Offences for internal use (SORS) based on The Criminal Code	Y	1995	21	270	Y
SK	A system based on subsections of the Criminal Code	Stat Department - MOJ	Statistics of Criminal Agency	Y	1998	12	290	N
		Presidium of Police Corps	Criminal Code No. 300/2005 Coll; Code of Criminal Procedure No. 301/2005 Coll.	Y	2005	12	290	N
		General Prosecutor's Office	"Is Register (Patricia)"	Y	2000	12	290	N
		General Directorate of the Corps of Prison and Court Guard	Monthly report on the number of pre-trial detainees and sentenced prisoners placed in remand prisons and prisons; Yearbook of the Corps of Prison and Court Guard	N	No info provided	12	290	N
UK	Different classification systems used by Police, Home Office, Prosecution,	Home Office	Crim Sect 3	Y	No info provided	9	Approx 110	Not applicable

Classification Systems in use

MS	General comment on classification systems in use	Authorities using a classification system	Classification systems	Features of the classification systems				
				IT system	Since	# Main Offences	# All Offences	English version
	MOJ, Courts, Prison and Probation services as well as a number of other bodies (boards agencies, associations,) with no linking of the different classification system and following the cases. Electronic coding. Use of digit codes by <u>OCJR</u>							le
		Office for Criminal Justice Reform within the MOJ (OCJR)	Home office offence coding (OCJR codes as as of May 2007 went from HO to MOJ)	Y	No info provided	12	20.000	Not applicable

4.2.2 Table on the Internal data flow

Internal data flow								
MS	Authority	Centralised	Classification system	Web based system	Info/Phases			
					Arrest	Investigation/Prosecution	Decision	Deprivation of Liberty
A T	Statistics Austria	Y	Y	Y			X	X
	MOI, Federal Criminal Police Office	Y	Y	Y	X			
	MOJ	Y	Y	Y		X	X	X
B E	Federal Police – Direction of Operational Police Information (CGO)				X			
	Federal Justice Department	Y	Y	Y (except for prisons stat)		X	X	X
B G	National Statistical Institute, Statistics of Convicted Crime Unit	Y	Y	Y			X	
	MOI	Y	Y	Y	X	X		
	Ministry of Defence, Service for Military Police	N	Y	Y	X	X		
	Prosecutor's Office	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X
	National Investigation Service	Y	Y	Y		X		
	MOJ (responsible for the UISCC)	Y	Y	Y	X	X		X
	MOJ, DJ Enforcement of penalties	Y	Y	N				X
C Y	Statistical Office of Cyprus	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X
	Cyprus Police	Y	Y	Y	X	X		
	Supreme Court	Y	Y	N			X	
	Prisons Department	Y	Y	N				X
C Z	Czech Statistical Office ⁸⁶	Y	Y	Y				
	Police Presidium	Y	Y	Y	X	X		
	MOJ	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X
D E	Prison Administration	Y	N	Y				X
	Federal Criminal Police Office	Y ⁸⁷	Y	Y ⁸⁸	X			
	15 Stat Offices of the Länder	Y	Y	Y	X			
	Local Criminal Police Offices	Y	Y	Y	X			
	Other (Customs, Federal Police [former Border Police])	Y	Y	Y	X			
	Federal Statistical Office	Y	Y	Y		X	X	X
	14 Stat Offices of the Länder	Y	Y	Y		X	X	X
	Law Enforcement Agencies	Y	Y	Y		X		
Criminal Courts	Y	Y	Y			X		

⁸⁶ Only for data collection following specific ad-hoc requests.

⁸⁷ Due to a federal organisation within the country, both Federal and Laender authorities produce data that form part of the centralised crime statistics data.

Internal data flow								
MS	Authority	Centralised	Classification system	Web based system	Info/Phases			
					Arrest	Investigation/Prosecution	Decision	Deprivation of Liberty
	Prisons	Y	Y	Y				X
	Probation Services	Y	Y	Y				X
DK	Statistics Denmark	Y	Y	Y	X	X (number of charges)	X	X
	Danish National Police	Y	Y	Y	X	X (number of charges)	X	X
	MOJ	Y	Y	Y	Only minor statistics on specific subjects, new kinds of offences, solitary confinement, ...			
	Danish Prison and Probation Service	Y	Y	Y	X (pre-trial detention)			X
EE	MOJ				X	X	X	X
	MOJ, Criminal Policy Department	Y	Y	N	X	X	X	
	MOJ, Judicial Administration Policy Department	Y	Y	N			X	X
	MOJ, Prisons Department	Y	Y	N				X
	The Police Board	Y	Y	N	X			
EL	National Statistical Service	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X
	Police	Y	Y	Under construction	X	X		
	Athens Court of First Instance	N	Y	N		X		
ES	“Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE)”	Y	Y	Y			X	
	Police - “Seguridad del Estado”	Y	Y	Y	X			
	General Prosecutor	Y	Y	Y		X		
	Judicial Council (CGPJ)	Y	Y	Y			X	
	MOJ	Y	Y	N			X	
	Prisons - “Instituciones Penitenciarias”	Y	Y	Y				X
FI	Statistics Finland	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X
	MOI	N	Y	Y	X	X		
	MOJ	Y	Y	Y		X	X	X
	The Criminal Sanctions Agency	Y	Y	Y				X
FR	National Observatory of Delinquency⁸⁹	Y	Y	Y	X			
	Police and national gendarmerie	Y	Y	N	X	X		
	Justice	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X
HU	Justice/Penal Administration	Y	Y	Y				X
	Ministry of Justice and Law Enforcement	Y	Y	N	X	X		
	Police	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X

⁸⁹ Apart from court statistics, OND has a coordinating role on crime statistics in France.

Internal data flow

MS	Authority	Centralised	Classification system	Web based system	Info/Phases			
					Arrest	Investigation/Prosecution	Decision	Deprivation of Liberty
	Prosecutor	Y	Y	Y		X	X	X
	Court	Y	Y	Y		X	X	X
	Penal Institution	Y	Y	N				X
	Customs and Finance Guard	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X
IE	Central Statistics Office	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	
	Police				incident based data			
	Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions	Y	N	N		X		
	Courts Services	Y	N	N			X	
	Prisons Service	Y	N	N				X
	Probation Service	Y	N	N	No information provided			
IT	Italian National Statistical Institute (Istat) ⁹⁰	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X (final sentences)	X
	MOI, “Direzione Centrale Polizia Criminale – Servizio Analisi Criminale”	Y	Y	Y	X			
	MOI, “Direzione Investigativa Antimafia”	Y	Y	Y	X	X		
	MOI, “Direzione di Statistica”	Y	Y	Y	X			
	MOJ, Direzione Generale di Statistica	Y	Y	Y	No information provided			
	MOJ, “Dipartimento dell’Amministrazione Penitenziaria”	Y	Y	Y				X
	MOJ, “Dipartimento Giustizia Minorile - Servizio Statistico”	Y	Y	Y	No information provided			
LT	Statistics Lithuania	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X
	MOI, Information Technology and Communications Dep	Y	Y	Y	X	X		
	National Courts Administration	Y	Y	Y			X	X
	MOJ, Prisons Department	Y	Y	N				X
LU	MOJ ⁹¹							
	Police Grand-Ducale	Y	N	Y	X	X		
	Prosecution	N	Y	N		X		
	Courts	N	Y	N			X	
	Criminal Register (part of the General Prosecution service)	Y	Y	N				
Probation/ prisons	Y	Y	N				X	
LV	The State Police	Y	N	Y	X	X		
	MOI, The Information Centre	Y	Y	Y	X	X		
	Courts	Y	Y	Y			X	
NL	The Courts Administration	Y	Y	Y			X	
	Statistics Netherlands ⁹²	Y	Y	Y	No information provided			
	Police	Y	Y	Y	No information provided			
	Prosecutor	Y	N	Y	No information provided			
PL	Courts	Y	N	Y	No information provided			
	Police	Y	Y	N	X	X		
	MOJ	Y	Y	N			X	
PT	Central Board of Prison Service	Y	Y	Y				X
	Directorate General of Justice Policy (DGPJ)	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X

⁹⁰ Only for data production. Collection of data is exercised by different authorities.

⁹¹ Only for collection and publication of data.

⁹² Only for data production and dissemination.

Internal data flow

MS	Authority	Centralised	Classification system	Web based system	Info/Phases			
					Arrest	Investigation/Prosecution	Decision	Deprivation of Liberty
	Public Security Police (PSP)	N	Y	Y	X			
	National Republican Guard (GNR)	N	Y	Y	X			
	Criminal Police (PJ)	Y	Y	Y	X	X		
	Tribunals (Courts)	Y	Y	Y			X	
	Directorate General of Prison Services (DGSP)	Y	Y	N				X
	Probation Service (DGRS)	Y	Y	N				X
RO	The National Institute of Statistics ⁹³							
	The General Inspectorate of Romanian Police	Y	Y	N	X	X	X	X
	The General Inspectorate of Romanian Border Police	Y	Y	N	X	X	X	X
	The Superior Council of Magistracy	Y	Y	Y, in 2009	X	X	X	X
	The National Administration of Prisons	Y	Y	Y, in 2009				X
	The National Anti-drug Agency ⁹⁴							
SE	The National Council for Crime Prevention	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X
	Police Service	N	Y	N	X		X	
	Prosecution Authority	Y	Y	Partially ⁹⁵	X	X	X	
	Courts	Y	N	Partially			X	
	Prison and Probation Service	Y	N	Y	X			X
	Customs	Y	Y	Partially		X	X	
SI	Statistical Office	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X
SK	Statistical Office ⁹⁶	Y	Y	Y				
	MOJ	Y	Y	Y			X	X
	General Directorate of the Corps of Prison and Court Guard	Y	Y	Y				X
	Presidium of Police Corps	Y	Y	Y	X			
	The General Prosecution's Office	Y	Y	Y		X		
UK	Police (43 police forces, British Transport Police, Ministry of Defence, UK Atomic Energy Authority)	Y	Y	Y	No info provided			
	Home Office/MOJ ⁹⁷	Y	Y	Y	idem			
	Crown Prosecution Service	Y	Y	Y	idem			
	Her Majesty's Court Service	Y	Y	Y (to a large extent)	idem			
	HM Prison Service	Y	Y	Y	idem			
	Youth Justice Board	Y	Y	Y	idem			
	National Probation Service	Y	Y	Y	idem			
	National Police Improvements Agency	Y	Y	Y	idem			
	HM Customs & Excise	Y	Y	Y	idem			
	Serious & Organised Crime Agency	Y	Y	Y	idem			
APACS (trade association for payments providing the forum regarding the payments)	Y	Y	Y	idem				

⁹³ Only for publication of data.

⁹⁴ Only for analysis of data.

⁹⁵ Not all the data embedded on the website.

⁹⁶ Only for data collection following specific requests.

⁹⁷ Home Office performs the role of a centralised authority together with the Department of Justice.

Internal data flow

MS	Authority	Centralised	Classification system	Web based system	Info/Phases			
					Arrest	Investigation/Prosecution	Decision	Deprivation of Liberty
	industry).							
	Criminal Injuries Compensation Board	Y	Y	Y	Idem			

4.2.3 Table on External Data Exchange

External Data Exchange				
Study Finding	Main Obstacle	Specific Obstacles	N° of MS	N° of IO
Wide range of data sources	Lack of coordination at national level between different authorities involved	Authority responsible for providing data is not available or insufficiently integrated with data providers	8	2
		Lack of coordinated work organisation	6	2
		Different authorities providing responses to information requests	5	3
Variety of complex questionnaires	Lack of requested data and MS difficulties to provide requested data	Requested data is either unclear or not available at the national level	15	
		Data on victims is not sufficient	7	3
		Low periodicity of reporting data	3	2
		Too detailed or numerous QST	2	2
		Lack of public information	1	2
		Lack of contextual information	1	1
Varying quality and quantity of provided data	Unreliable quality and quantity of provided data	Low quality of responses to QST	1	2
		Low and/or late response rates to QST		1
Wide variety of MS practices reporting and recording data	Different MS practices for reporting and recording data	Different counting rules in classifications used	6	
		Different production/collection methods used by different authorities	4	
		Differences in reporting practices and procedures	4	3
		Different procedures of recording crime	5	3
		Different time of recording crime/publishing statistics	2	2
		Lack of up-to-date manual with counting rules	1	

4.2.4 Table on the Various types of IT systems

C O	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Stan- dard	Collec- tion format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
A U	Strafregisterfile (Statisticus Austria)		Data are sent from the “Strafregisteramt” (Register for persons convicted, which is situated at the Ministry for Internal Affairs) on (flat text with separating characters) file to Statistics Austria.	A technical user aggregates the data by special programs developed by Statistics Austria (PL/1)	Results are published in a publication (Gerichtliche Kriminalstatistik), in the Statistical Yearbook for Austria, on the Internet 98 and in the database ISIS, where end users are able to download data in EXCEL format. End user could also ask for data files in ASCII format	Y	N	N	N		N	ASCII
	X- Krimstat Online MOI: Bundesministerium für Inneres – Bundeskriminalamt)	A Statistical Data Collecting System			SPSS	Reports as doc / xls / pdf Smart Viewer Web Serve SPSS	N	Y	N	N		N
B E	REA / TPI – SAS (criminal offences committed by adult authors)		Extraction of operational REA/TPI (Sybase)	Technical users aggregate data, carry out a data cleansing and produce statistical database tables.	SAS	N	N	N	N		N	Text files

⁹⁸ http://www.statistik.at/web_en/statistics/social_statistics/criminality/index.html

C O	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Standard	Collection format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
	Authorities		into txt files. Conversion of txt files into SAS files	reports using SAS								
	MACH-SAS (traffic rules and other light offences) Prosecution authorities (in development)		Extraction of operational MACH database tables into txt files. Conversion of txt files into SAS files	Technical users aggregate de data, carry out a data cleansing and produce statistical reports using SAS	SAS	N	N	N	N		N	
	PJP-DUMBO (endangered children and offences committed by children): Prosecution authorities (in development)		Extraction of operational PJP-DUMBO database tables into txt files. Conversion of txt files into SAS files	Technical users aggregate de data, carry out a data cleansing and produce statistical reports using SAS	SAS	N	N	N	N		N	
	Central Criminal Records office (no name)	-	-	Back-end application : SAS9 ETL + Data integration	Web interface – SAS9	Y	Y				-	Text file, Spreadsheet, Direct access to database
	ISLP (Local Police) FEEDIS (Federal Police)	upload base materials via the web		Input in SAS	User based query tool			Y			-	Text file
B	Integrated Regional		sources of data	database	data text file that imports	N	Y	N	N	N	-	XML;

C O	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Stan- dard	Collec- tion format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
G	Police System (IRPS)		for the system are made of secondary documents (forms). These fields are coded and stored in the database	application	into Microsoft Excel.							administr ative formats
	AIS "Central Police Statistics"	system load and automatically updated with data from IRPS		statistical application	data text file that imports into Microsoft Excel.	N	Y	N	N	N	-	
	Centralised information system for the Investigation Service (TSISSS);Automate d Information System Military police record - AIS "VPR"	web-based statistical content management system	presence of a small number of off-line applications are necessary because of the lack of stable communication links	back-end application process; MS SQL through web-based application.	online reporting system: different formats possible: doc, xls and pdf format. Statistical reports are made by Micro strategy Warehouse Base.	N	Y	N	N	EI S P P	EISPP	XML

C O	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Stan- dard	Collec- tion format	
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other			
C Y	Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus		<p>From the Police: paper questionnaires are collected which are then codified and inputted electronically.</p> <p>From the Courts: data is obtained in paper form, inputted in Excel spreadsheets and statistical tables are prepared.</p> <p>From the Prisons: data is obtained in paper form, inputted in Excel spreadsheets and statistical tables are prepared.</p>	The data from the Police is processed and all the tables are prepared using the programming language SAS, version 9.1. The data from the Courts and Prison are processed in Excel.	An annual publication called “Criminal Statistics” is prepared both in paper and electronic format. The publication is bilingual (in Greek and English) and the Classification System of Offences of CYSTAT appears as an annex to the publication.	Y (dissem.)	Y (process.)					N	Paper qst
	Police “crime analysis”	Just recently police records		A technical user aggregates the data	Statistical data is mainly	Y						-	Text file; Spreadsh

C O	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Standard	Collection format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
		are being recorded electronically but still the system is unable to provide statistical data.		manually	reported by preparing tables using Microsoft Excel. There some cases were ACCESS is used to export some reports.							heet
C Z	ESKK (POL)	data input in ESKK directly		specialy developed statistical application (DOS)	MS EXCEL	N	Y	N	N	N	-	XML; Spreadsheet
	CSLAV-DW (MoJ)	Collection of data via data mining in various IT-systems		Central data warehouse	Standard application producing standard outcomes. There is a business intelligence application capable of producing an ad-hoc survey. Excel and Pdf-files	N	Y	N	N	N	-	XML; Spreadsheet
D E	INPOL-A PKS (POL)		At least once a month the State Criminal Police Offices send their data to a central server within the Bundeskriminalamt. Format is XML.	Oracle PL/SQL-applications are being used for the aggregation of the statistical data.	For drafting reports or analysis Oracle Discoverer is used and MS EXCEL					Y Corporate Network Police	National PKS-EDS-XML-Standard	XML
	System of Federal			Back-end	Macros executed through	N	N	N	N	N	SDMX	XML

C O	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Stand- ard	Collec- tion format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
	Statistical Office Germany			application processes	spreadsheet application						-XML	
D K	Journalplan		Non- preformatted document – text file	SAS products	Web interface (www.statbank.dk)	Y					-	Non- preforma tted doc
E E	Information system for proceedings: E- file	online central database		data can be processed from the data warehouse either by SQL or by Business Objects queries	Macro-spreadsheets; business objects	Y	N	N	N	N	-	XML; text; HTML; spreadsh eet; Pdf
E L	Statistics of offences and juridical statistics system		statistical tables transmitted during the first quarter of each year to the National Statistical Service from the statistics department of Ministry of Public Order		Publication of statistical data (annual surveys) in the web site of National Statistical Service							
	Subsystem of central database of police	The sub- system provides data to the data warehouse of the Statistical Yearbook.		web application that processes the offence data from the Database and presents them to the relevant users.	The Statistical Yearbook is an online web- interface system that can report data on pdf form	N	Y	N	N	N	-	Database format
	Athens Court of First Instance	Case management		Oracle database. Requests for data	Data from SQL is manually entered into a		Y				-	-

CO	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Standard	Collection format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
	Oracle database	system (intranet)		are done with SQL. Data is extracted but tables are created manually in a word document.	table in Word documents.							
ES	Statistical System of Criminality (MOI)		Input data in preformatted doc	Executing macros through spreadsheet application	Yearbook of MOI	N	Y	N	N		SDMX-XML	XML, Spreadsheet, Pdf
	INE system (MOJ)		Utilisation of Penal Registers of MOJ	INE receives data file from penal Register of Ministry of Justice and process data using SPSS product		Y					N	Text file; Spreadsheet
FI		chargeable statistics databases using PX-Web technology. Processing of the data in different forms, for example as Excel files,	Yearbook of Justice Statistics	SAS products	Macro-spreadsheets	Y	N	N	N	N	XML	Police: Oracle; Courts: IDMS
FR	NATINF	Definitive conviction data from national criminal register		Oracle database: accessible via SAS or BO application	Tables in PDF format - Justice observatory (Anaconda) with BO support (intranet)	Y (partly)	Y				-	Text file (part of the info: paper)
	STIC-FCE (Police nationale)		Offline input in MS EXCEL or MS ACCESS	A user executes the macros (eg. MS EXCEL)	Macros per table (excel) and Pdf	N	N	N	N			Text file, Odysée format
	Base nationale de		BB2000: data	A back end	An online reporting	N	Y	N	N		-	XML,

C O	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Standard	Collection format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
	statistiques sur la délinquance. (Gendarmerie nationale)		input in offline form	application (ETL software) processes and aggregates the data in “Base nationale de statistiques sur la délinquance”.	system “Infocentre” is able to export reports as Excel or PDF by using a web interface.							Text file
H U	Hungarian Unified Investigating Authorities and Prosecution Criminal Statistics	Under development	Data recording program	Statistical program	Web interface – own development - MS EXCEL, MS WORD	Y	Y	N	N		-	Spreadsh eet, DBF, (XML under develop ment)
IE	SAS database system		Administrative data sent by an Garda Siochana (Irish Police) from their PULSE database system, in form of CSV files representing	Statistician uses SAS scripts for generating the statistics	Paper and online (pdf). Data available to public in Web-interface using PC-axis technology. Users can make custom queries of their own	Y	Y	N	N		Pdf file with outputs	.csv (comma delimited spreadsh eet)
IT	ISTAT		MoJ provides to ISTAT on a periodic basis. PROSECUTIO N offices extract	ISTAT has a program that extracts processes and aggregates the statistical data.	SAS application generates reports	Y						Spreadsh eet

data from the
RE.GE. and
send data to
ISTAT in a DB
form (zipped

C O	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Standard	Collection format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
			files: table for offenders/ victims / offences/ general info on the proceedings) – DBF file. Data is inserted in an offline application: Oracle Database – data warehouse									
	SDI (POL)		Data comes from SDI: used for administrative, operational and investigative purposes. It can also be used to extract statistics on offences registered by police authorities. Data is inserted in an offline application: Oracle Database – data warehouse	Information is processed for statistical purposes on the SDD using 6 different statistical query forms.	SSD extracts statistical information which is collected on Excel files that are sent to ISTAT		Y				-	Spreadsheet

CO	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Standard	Collection format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
	General Register Database (MOJ)											
LT	Departmental Register of Criminal Offences	on-line entry of data by web Oracle forms.		Data is aggregated by Oracle SQL Plus	web interface	N	Y	N	N	N	-	Oracle forms
	Lithuanian Court Information System "Liteko"	web application		a back-end application processes and aggregates the data inputted by the end users	web interface	N	Y	N	N	N	-	XML; HTML; spreadsheet
LU	JUCHA (Justice case management system)	Rich client/server application The data contained in the relational data base can be used for the generation of statistics		To be defined in 2009	EXCEL, WORD	N	Y	Racine	Y		-	Text file; Spreadsheet
	IP (police crime stats tool)	Statistical snapshot from operational business applications and databases. ETL transformations of operational system data		Data is aggregated with database scripts during ETL transformations. Taking out info that is needed based on search	Online: via web portal + e-mail. Offline report generation (paper copy). Annual report used only for internal use, or reports sent to other bodies and NGOs (de-personalised data).	N	Y	N	N		N	Text file; Spreadsheet

CO	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Standard	Collection format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
		with data mart injection										
L V	NO IT System reported	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N L				Databases (registers) are sent to Stat Netherlands in ASCI. Stat Netherlands manipulates the data and make tables that may be downloaded in different formats from its website.	Figures are published on Statistic Netherlands website. It also publishes a book "Criminality and Law enforcement" in collaboration with the minstry of Justice						N	ASCII
P L	Courts reporting system (MOJ)		Files are submitted via e-mails in .dbf format	Customized statistical application (based on Fox Pro). It takes .dbf files sent by regional courts and aggregates them into one database.	Fox Pro application generates reports	N	Y	N	N	N	N	.dbf
	Centralna Baza Danych o Osobach Pozbawionych Wolności (Prisons)	Operators input data in online forms		Oracle database application	Statistical application CRISTAL RAPORT	Y	N	N	N		N	XML
P T	Hermes – The system used by DGPI to collect, treat and disclosure the statistical data	Depending on source: Web, application	Depending on source: Paper questionnaire,	Data warehouse system (SAS 8.2)	web statistical application, which offers an interface to visualise the information, MS EXCEL; Pdf	Y		Justice Dedicated Network		paper	Country specific	XML

C O	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Stand- ard	Collec- tion format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
	from the police forces (including the criminal police), the courts (including the prosecution) and the prisons.		direct transfer of files									
	Criminal Police System (source of info for DGPJ (see above))											
	Habilus/CITIUS – IT System used by the courts to support their business activities		Direct transfer of files from Courts									
R O	“P30” (POL)		Fox for DOS	primary data is aggregated manually from paper and registered in excel table or Oracle Database and exported in excel.	Extractions of data is made with short programs in FOX for DOS, MS EXCEL	N	Y		N		N	Spreadsh eet
	STATIS (Superior Council of Magistracy)		Fox for DOS	A clerk of the court registers the data after a previous hand collection. Excel is used for some operations, then data are registered in the system	An offline statistical application	N	Y	N	N		N	Dbf

C O	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Standard	Collection format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
	ANP (National Administration of Prisons)	to upload base materials to be processed afterwards by providing a XML file, a preformatted spreadsheet, or another kind of file		a technical user aggregates the data manually and he executes macros through a spreadsheet application	Web Interface, Macros executed through a web-application	N	Y	Telecom special service			N	Text file, Spreadsheet, Pdf, doc
S E	SOR (National Council for Crime Prevention)		Data comes directly from the administrative (case-management) systems of the police, the prosecution service, the courts and other agencies of the justice system. Data is transferred with help of SHS and stored in an SQL-Oracle database	Data is aggregated/processed with the help of SQL/PL procedures and stored as file of choice (depends on user) for example SPSS-, EXCEL- or text file	Data is available Online as Excel files on the Council web homepage as well as a web interface (however only for reported offences) + each year a written publication	Y	N	N	N	Server used by Council	N	XML; Text file; Spreadsheet
SI	Joined electronic database		Data sent via mail (txt format) and for other data via paper	For denounced adults and juveniles: reported of data by mail (text format)	For the dissemination of data we use Px Edit and Pc Axis environment. Statistical yearbook	Y	Y	N	N		N	Text file and paper

C O	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Stan- dard	Collec- tion format	
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other			
				<p>For accused and convicted adults and juvenile paper qsts are sent to courts. After collection entered into electronic database (Blaise)</p> <p>We join electronic database from Source 1 and Source 2 and make some logical controls</p> <p>we produce tables with TPL (table programming language)</p>	<p>SI-STAT database</p> <p>Reporting to international agencies in excel files</p>								
S K			Investigator completes statistical form send to specialised workstation	FOXPRO	Framework statistical data are available by a web interference, detailed data are available in form of text files within the intranet of ministry, specific statistics are available in format requested by user.		Y				N	Text file	
	IS REGISTER	Distributed		Import DB data	MS EXCEL		Y				N	Spreadsh	

CO	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Standard	Collection format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
	(PATRICIA) (Prosecutors)	client/server application on DB platform FoxPro/SYBASE										heet; Pdf
	Statistics of Criminal Agency (MOJ)		Offline users input the statistical data in to the small applications (run on MS Access97-2003). Then they send .mdb files trough intranet email to database admin who imports this .mdb files into main database (run on MS Access 2003)	Technical user aggregates the data manually by joining tables to main tables of system DB. Then queries are executed	MS EXCEL, doc, PDF, but main reports are in YearBook (printed coloured or white/black edition) YearBook is on website in downloadable format in (xls, pdf)	N	N	N	N		MS ACCE SS 2003	Spreadsh heet; .mdb
UK	Home Office: CruxMatrix For the future: data hub with individual forces submitting individual records data to the NMIS		Police send data file via email afterwards validation by CruxMatrix	Mainly Business Object application	Business object application translates data into excel files On Home Office Website main document and excel file	N	N	N	N	E m a i l t o e x c h a n	Excel	

C O	Name of IT-system	Collecting and Registering		Aggregating / Processing data	Reporting	Network					Stan- dard	Collec- tion format
		Web	Offline			Internet	Intranet	National Admin. Network	Testa	Other		
	(national managed info system)										ge in fo	
	CDAB (Court Appearance database) (MOJ)		Extracted text files comes back to Office Criminal Justice Reform for analysis	SAS application	Customers can extract data in packages such as access. Regular: monthly extract to create monthly survey	N	Y	N	N			
U N O D C	CTS system (crime trend survey)		The front end (MS Access) imports XML created files from Adobe Acrobat forms which reflect the survey instrument 1:1	Data warehouse component (MS SQL server)	Pdf forms and results on the web	N	N	N	N	N	-	XML, Pdf

4.2.5 Table on the Handling of foreign data

Correctly handling foreign data				
Study Finding	Main Obstacle	Specific Obstacles	N° of MS	N° of IO
Close link to national criminal code	Different MS offence definitions, classification systems, CJS	Different definitions/categories/level of detail between MS and requested data by international level	13	
		Different offence definitions per MS	12	9
		Different classification systems in use in the MS	8	2
		Different legal/criminal justice systems	5	7
		Lack of common understanding on requested data	5	3
		Lack of national Criminal Code translation into English	4	
Wide variety of MS practices reporting and recording data	Different approach by different actors	Different counting rules in classifications used	6	
		Different production/collection methods used by different authorities	4	
		Differences in reporting practices and procedures	4	3
		Different procedures of recording crime	5	3
		Different time of recording crime/publishing statistics	2	2
		Lack of up-to-date manual with counting rules	1	
Limited national resources	Budgetary and staffing constraints for information exchange	Lack of manpower	10	
		Budgetary constraints in data collection and detection of crime	4	2
		Lack of use of crime statistics for comparisons – only within the scope of scientific research of thematic analysis for Policy Needs	3	

4.2.6 Table on the wide range of priority offences

Wide range of priority offences			
	Offence Categories / Types	MS ⁹⁹	International Stakeholders ¹⁰⁰
General offence categories / types	EAW	x	4 (Eurojust, EUROPOL, FRONTEX, CoE)
	Crimes against Persons/Children		1 (UNICEF)
	Crimes within Eurojust Mandate	x	1 (Eurojust)
	Crimes within the EUROPOL mandate	x	1 (EUROPOL)
	Cross-border offences	x	4 (Eurojust, UNODC, FRONTEX, CoE)
	Organised crime	x	4 (Eurojust, UNODC, FRONTEX, CoE)
	CTS and CVS indicators		1 (UNODC)
	Traditional offences	x	
	High volume offences	x	
	EU-defined offences	x	
	High level aggregated data	x	
Specific Offence Categories / Types	Assault and battery		1 (CoE)
	Intentional homicide	x	2 (UNODC, CoE)
	Rape	x	1 (CoE)
	Theft	x	1 (CoE)
	Motor vehicle theft		1 (UNODC)
	Robbery		1 (CoE)
	Racist violence and related racist crimes, including xenophobia, anti-semitic and islamophobic crimes		1 (FRA)
	Offences against labour law		1 (ILO)
	Trafficking in Human Beings	x	5 (UNODC, UNICEF, FRA, Eurojust, EUROPOL)
	Smuggling of Migrants		3 (UNODC, Eurojust, EUROPOL)
	Drug law offences	x	2 (EMCDDA, CoE)
	Terrorism		4 (FRONTEX, CoE, Eurojust, EUROPOL)
	Financing of terrorism		1 (CoE)
	Fraud and Money Laundering		5 (CEA, CoE, Eurojust, EUROPOL)
	Fraud to insurance and the various categories of fraud (false declaration, false accidents overestimation of losses)		1 (CEA)
	Cross border fraud offences, especially when use is made of the lack of information exchange between the MS		1 (CEA)

⁹⁹ “x” indicates that this was part of a suggestion during Member State Missions

¹⁰⁰ Feedback from Policy Needs Consultation Round

4.2.7 Table on the Application in the field of crime statistics

EULOCS Application in the field of crime statistics				
	Main Recommendation	Specific Suggestion	MS	IO
Structural Requirements	Offence based character	The level of detail of the offences should be either low or high	7	2
		Balance the lowest level of detail for the different offence categories	1	1
		Set clear criteria for the offences in the list of offences	1	1
	Cluster “Jointly identified as”	Distinction between minor and serious offences should be made	2	3
	Inclusion and exclusion criteria / definitions	Use of clear definitions	15	2
		Create conversion tables of offences in the MS to better interpret the data	14	
		Distinguish between legal crime descriptions and statistical definitions (the latter compliment the first)	2	2
	Complementing Variables	Exchange meta models on core variables	15	
		Better use of specifiers containing details of crime	2	
		Include information to link between offence, offender, location, damages, sentences, ...	3	
	Complementing Contextual information	Contextual information should also be taken into account		
		Better use of specifiers containing details of crime	2	
Practical Solutions	Coordinate and Streamline data requests	Improve Questionnaires	4	3
		Improve data collection system	3	
		Balance the level of detail of the request	1	
		Some categories should be added / separated to gain useful information	3	
		Focus on volume crime should be stressed	12	
		Victim survey data should be used to complement other statistical data	4	2
	Set up network of contact points	SPOCs should be responsible for collection information nationally and providing an coordinated reply at international level	4	3
		Work with private sector organisations operating in MS to collect statistical information		1
		Improve data collection system	3	
	Support IT applications	Support technical integration of EU offence classification	2	

4.2.8 Table on the support of crime statistics at MS level

Supporting Crime Statistics at MS level			
Main Recommendation	Specific Suggestion	MS	IO
Integration and Coordination	Need for integrated data sources in the MS with working relationships with data providers responsible for collecting information nationally and providing a coordinated reply at international level	10	5
	Use of centralised information system and data bases	1	2
	Use of Single classification system at national level	2	
Communication and transparency	Exchange meta models on core variables	15	
	Need for information on counting units	2	
	Elaborate user friendly guide to clarify the different legal systems	3	
Investment in manpower	Investment in manpower	7	

4.3 LIST OF OFFENCE CATEGORIES WITH A HIGH DATA AVAILABILITY RATIO

Preliminary EULOCS code	Offence category
1002 00	Killing / causing death, <i>other than torture</i>
0501 01	Rape
0901 00	Theft
0601 00	Offences related to drugs
1003 00	Causing bodily injury, <i>other than torture</i>
0600 00 open category	OFFENCES RELATED TO DRUGS OR PRECURSORS
1003 01	Grievous bodily injury
1007 00	Kidnapping, illegal restraint and hostage-taking
0905 04 00	Forgery (i.e. Counterfeiting) of money and means of payment
1004 00	Threatening behaviour (including threat to kill), <i>other than torture</i>
0700 00 open category	FIREARMS, THEIR PARTS AND COMPONENTS, AMMUNITION AND EXPLOSIVES, <i>not committed or likely to be committed in the course of terrorist activities</i>
0904 00	Criminal damage
0601 01	Offences related to illicit trafficking in or sale of narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances and precursors
1002 01	Intentional killing
0905 03	Forgery (i.e. Counterfeiting) of administrative documents and trafficking therein
1002 02	Unintentional killing (manslaughter)
0905 01	Corruption
1600 00 open category	OFFENCES AGAINST MILITARY OBLIGATIONS
1400 00 open category	OFFENCES AGAINST MIGRATION LAW
1003 02	Minor bodily injury

4.4 LIST OF OFFENCE CATEGORIES WITH A LOW DATA AVAILABILITY RATIO

Preliminary EULOCS code	Offence category
1002 01 01 03	Causing death at the request of a victim (i.e. euthanasia)
1203 00	Offences relating to working conditions, health and safety at work
0901 01 01	Unorganised theft without violence or intimidation
0901 02 02	Organised theft with violence or intimidation(i.e. robbery)
0401 02	Trafficking of an adult for the purposes of the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation
1306 00	Other offences related to vehicles and road traffic regulations, other than stealing of vehicles and trafficking in stolen vehicles
0701 00	Illicit manufacturing
1202 00	Offences relating to remuneration including social security contributions
0901 02	Organised theft
1205 00	Offences relating to working hours and rest time, other than those in road traffic regulations
1201 00	Unlawful employment
0501 01 02 01	Rape of a child, <i>above the age of sexual consent</i>
0905 02 01	Fraud affecting the financial interests of the European Communities
1305 00	Offences related to road transport, including breaches of regulations pertaining to driving hours and rest periods and regulations on hazardous goods
0901 02 01	Organised theft without violence or intimidation
0504 01	Soliciting by a prostitute
0402 02	Trafficking of a child for the purposes of the exploitation of the prostitution of children or other forms of their sexual exploitation
0501 01 01 02	Rape of an adult, <i>between partners/within the marriage</i>
0402 00	Trafficking of a child
1204 00	Offences relating to access to or exercise of a professional activity
0402 01	Trafficking of a child for the purposes of labour or services exploitation of a child
0402 05	Trafficking of a child for the purpose of illegal adoption
0401 01	Trafficking of an adult for the purposes of labour or services exploitation
0401 03	Trafficking of an adult for the purposes of organ or human tissue removal
0401 00	Trafficking of an adult
0903 02	Trafficking in stolen vehicles
0402 03	Trafficking of a child for the purposes of organ or human tissue removal of a child
1206 00	Other offences against rights of the employees, including the right to form and join trade unions
0402 06	Trafficking of a child other or unknown purposes
0702 00	Falsifying or illicitly obliterating, removing or altering the marking(s) on firearms
1304 00	Avoiding a road check
0401 04	Trafficking of an adult for other or unknown purposes
0402 04	Trafficking of a child for the purpose of recruiting child soldiers

4.5 LIST OF OFFENCE CATEGORIES WITH A HIGH DEFINITION COMPATIBILITY RATIO

Preliminary EULOCs code	Offence category
1002 02	Unintentional killing (manslaughter)
0501 01	Rape
1002 00	Killing / causing death, other than torture
0401 02	Trafficking of an adult for the purposes of the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation
0905 01 02	Corruption in the public sector
0503 02 01	Sexual Exploitation of a child
1003 00	Causing bodily injury, other than torture
0905 08 01	Offence related to bankruptcy regulation
1002 01	Intentional killing

4.6 LIST OF OFFENCE CATEGORIES WITH A LOW DEFINITION COMPATIBILITY RATIO

Preliminary EULOCs code	Offence category
0702 00	Falsifying or illicitly obliterating, removing or altering the marking(s) on firearms
0402 06	Trafficking of a child for other or unknown purposes
1301 00	Dangerous driving
1306 00	Other offences related to vehicles and road traffic regulations, other than stealing of vehicles and trafficking in stolen vehicles
0501 02	Sexual Harassment
0901 02	Organised theft
0905 04 02	Forgery (i.e. Counterfeiting) of non-cash means of payment
1205 00	Offences relating to working hours and rest time, other than those in road traffic regulations
1204 00	Offences relating to access to or exercise of a professional activity
0501 01 01 02	Rape of an adult, <i>between partners/within the marriage</i>
1100 00 open category	OFFENCES AGAINST THE STATE, PUBLIC ORDER, COURSE OF JUSTICE OR PUBLIC OFFICIALS
0402 04	Trafficking of a child for the purpose of recruiting child soldiers
1206 00	Other offences against rights of the employees, including the right to form and join trade unions
1304 00	Avoiding a road check
1305 00	Offences related to road transport, including breaches of regulations pertaining to driving hours and rest periods and regulations on hazardous goods
1201 00	Unlawful employment
0501 04	Engaging in any other unwanted sexual activity
0903 01	Illicit trafficking in cultural goods including antiques and works of art
0504 02	Procuring for prostitution or sexual act
0903 02	Trafficking in stolen vehicles
0504 01	Soliciting by a prostitute
1202 00	Offences relating to remuneration including social security contributions

4.7 SUGGESTION RELATED TO A CREATIVE COMMON LICENCE “SHARE ALIKE”

It may look trivial, but one of the most basic conditions of EULOCS promotion is to authorise its usage. This must be done with a formal licence. Since EULOCS is a copyrighted work, its use is legally forbidden without such license. This license must authorise the widest possible use, including modifications, in order to comply with the specific needs of a great number of potential users. However, modifications must preserve the initial trunk (otherwise no interoperability will be possible). As a practical solution, we recommend to distribute “EULOCS v.1.0” under a Creative Common Licence “Share alike” (CC), modified as follows:

“You (the recipient or the user of EULOCS) are free:

- to copy, distribute, display, and use this EULOCS version for any purpose (public, private, commercial).
- to make derivative works (*provide you do not modify existing categories: you can create categories and sub-categories corresponding to your specific needs, without changing the existing categories*).

Under the following conditions:

- **Attribution.** You must give the original author credit: © the European Community.
- **Share Alike.** If you build upon the EULOCS work, you may distribute the resulting work only under a licence identical to this one.
- For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the licence terms of this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder. Point of contact will be found on www.eulocs.eu¹⁰¹

Nothing in this license impairs or restricts the author's moral rights.

An additional condition should be:

For any reuse or distribution of a modified version of EULOCS, you will register on www.eulocs.eu, briefly describe and link to your project, explain the purpose of your modifications and attach your modified EULOCS version. Such information will be accessible (read mode) to all www.eulocs.eu visitors.

The proposed modifications to the standard CC are in *italic*. An un-modified CC would allow the recipient to alter and transform the EULOCS (and not only to build on it or extend it in more details). This is not appropriate (without the agreement of the author) because it would damage EULOCS interoperability. Therefore the above modified CC (*the italic text part*) allows recipients to build upon EULOCS (= create new categories and sub-categories) without modifying the original ones. This means that several EULOCS flavours, modified for specific purposes, will stay 100% compatible at upper level. The additional condition allows the Commission (and more generally the whole EULOCS user's community) to have access to modifications and to monitor usage by the EULOCS beneficiaries, facilitating the later evolution of EULOCS, if decided by a limited editorial group of stakeholders.

¹⁰¹ We assume here that a www.eulocs.eu site will exist with such functionalities. As long it is not the case, these functionalities are offered for free by other standardisation projects owned by the European Community: www.OSOR.eu (where a EULOCS community could be created) or www.SEMIC.eu. In the future the e-Justice Portal could present an additional alternative, especially if it includes ECRIS functionalities, as the case may be.

4.8 THE PROPOSED (COMPLEMENTED) EULOCS

Content – The proposed EULOCS, together with all suggested complementary sheets is created in an excel sheet and uploaded onto CIRCA. A “read me first”-sheet contains information on the included sheets. Besides EULOCS itself, a definitions and sources sheet, a variables sheet, a context field sheet and a compatibility sheet can be found. The latter provides a high level overview of the compatibility of the proposed EULOCS with offence types for which international organisations have been mandated, also indicating the results of the compatibility exercises at MS level (both category and definition compatibility), and the data collection efforts currently taking place.

Reference – Document JLS-CSP-FR-EULOCS.xls, available on CIRCA for download and consultation

(https://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/jai/pndccj/library?l=/unisys_classification/final_report/final_eulo_cs&vm=detailed&sb=Title)

0100 00 Open Category	CRIMES WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT
0101 00	GENOCIDE
0102 00	CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY
0103 00	WAR CRIMES
0104 00	CRIMES OF AGGRESSION
0200 00 Open Category	PARTICIPATION IN A CRIMINAL ORGANISATION
0201 00	OFFENCES JOINTLY IDENTIFIED AS PARTICIPATION IN A CRIMINAL ORGANISATION
0201 01	Directing a criminal organisation
0201 02	Knowingly participating in the criminal activities, <i>without being a director</i>
0201 03	Knowingly taking part in the non- criminal activities of a criminal organisation, <i>without being a director</i>
0202 00	OTHER FORMS OF PARTICIPATION IN A CRIMINAL ORGANISATION
0300 00 Open Category	OFFENCES LINKED TO TERRORISM
0301 00	PARTICIPATION IN A TERRORIST GROUP
0301 01	Offences jointly identified as participation in a terrorist group
0301 01 01	Directing a terrorist group
0301 01 02	Knowingly participating in the activities of a terrorist group, without being a director
0301 02	Other forms of participation in a terrorist group
0302 00	OFFENCES LINKED TO TERRORIST ACTIVITIES
0302 01	Offences jointly identified as linked to terrorist activities
0302 01 01	Public provocation to commit a terrorist offence
0302 01 02	Recruitment for terrorism
0302 01 03	Training for terrorism
0302 01 04	Aggravated theft with the view of committing a terrorist offence
0302 01 05	Extortion with the view of committing a terrorist offence
0302 01 06	Drawing up false administrative documents with the view of committing a terrorist offence
0302 01 07	Financing of terrorism
0302 02	Other offences linked to terrorist activities

0303 00	TERRORIST OFFENCES
0303 00	Offences jointly identified as terrorist offences
0303 01	Terrorist attacks upon a person's life
0303 02	Terrorist attacks upon a person's physical integrity
0303 03	Terrorist kidnapping or hostage taking
0303 04	Causing extensive terrorist destruction
0303 05	Terrorist seizure of transport
0303 06	Terrorist activities related to weapons
0303 07	Terrorist release of dangerous substances, or causing fires, floods or explosions
0303 08	Terrorist interfering with or disrupting the supply of a fundamental natural resource
0303 09	Threatening to commit any of the terrorist acts listed
0304 10	Other terrorist offences
0400 00 Open Category	TRAFFICKING IN HUMAN BEINGS
0401 00	TRAFFICKING OF AN ADULT
0401 01	Offences jointly identified as trafficking of an adult
0401 01 01	For the purposes of labour or services exploitation
0401 01 02	For the purposes of sexual exploitation
0401 01 03	For the purposes of organ or human tissue removal
0401 04	Other forms of trafficking of an adult
0402 00	TRAFFICKING OF A CHILD
0402 01	Offences jointly identified as trafficking of a child
0402 01 01	For the purposes of labour or services exploitation of a child
0402 01 02	For the purposes of sexual exploitation
0402 01 03	For the purposes of organ or human tissue removal of a child
0402 02	Other forms of trafficking of a child
0402 02 01	For the purpose of recruiting child soldiers
0402 02 02	For the purpose of illegal adoption
0402 02 03	For other or unknown purposes
0500 00 Open Category	SEXUAL OFFENCES
0501 00	SEXUAL ASSAULT
0501 01	Rape
0501 01 01	of an adult
0501 01 02	of a child
0501 02	Sexual Harassment
0501 02 01	of an adult
0501 02 02	of a child
0501 03	Indecent Exposure
0501 04	Other forms of sexual assault

0502 00	SEXUAL EXPLOITATION, PROSTITUTION AND PORNOGRAPHY
0502 01	Sexual exploitation
0502 01 01	Offences jointly identified as sexual exploitation of an adult
0502 01 02	Offences jointly identified as sexual exploitation of a child
0502 01 03	Other forms of sexual exploitation
0502 02	Soliciting by a prostitute
0502 03	Procuring for prostitution or sexual act
0502 04	Child Pornography
0502 04 01	Offences jointly identified as Child Pornography
0502 04 01 01	Possessing child pornography
0502 04 01 02	Producing child pornography
0502 04 01 03	Offering or making available of child pornography
0502 04 01 04	Distributing or transmitting child pornography
0502 04 01 05	Procuring child pornography for oneself or for another person
0502 04 02	Other offences related to child pornography
0600 00 Open Category	OFFENCES RELATED TO DRUGS OR PRECURSORS
0600 01	OFFENCES RELATED TO DRUGS
0600 01 01	Cultivation
0600 01 02	Manufacturing
0600 01 03	Trafficking
0600 01 04	Dealing
0600 01 05	Acquisition and Possession
0600 01 06	Consumption
0600 01 07	Other offences related to drugs
0600 01 07 01	promoting the consumption of drugs
0600 01 07 02	knowingly letting or renting a building or other place where public have access for the purpose of illegal consumption of drugs
0600 01 07 03	other
0600 02	OFFENCES RELATED TO PRECURSORS AND OTHER ESSENTIAL CHEMICALS
0600 02 01	Cultivation
0600 02 02	Manufacturing
0600 02 03	Trafficking
0600 02 04	Dealing
0600 02 05	Acquisition and Possession
0600 02 06	Other offences related to precursors
0700 00 Open Category	FIREARMS, THEIR PARTS AND COMPONENTS, AMMUNITION AND EXPLOSIVES, <i>not committed or likely to be committed in the course of terrorist activities</i>
0701 00	ILLICIT MANUFACTURING FIREARMS
0702 00	FALSIFYING OR ILLICITLY ALTERING THE MARKING(S) ON FIREARMS
0703 00	ILLICIT TRAFFICKING FIREARMS
0704 00	UNAUTHORISED ACQUISITION
0705 00	UNAUTHORISED POSSESSION OR USE

0706 00	OTHER
0800 00 Open Category	HARMING THE ENVIRONMENT AND/OR PUBLIC HEALTH <i>not committed or likely to be committed in the course of terrorist activities</i>
0801 00	OFFENCES JOINTLY IDENTIFIED AS ENVIRONMENTAL OFFENCES
0801 01	Offences related to a quantity of materials or ionizing radiation
0801 02	Offences related to waste
0801 03	Offences related to a plant in which a dangerous activity is carried out
0801 04	Offences related to nuclear materials or other hazardous radioactive substances
0801 05	Offences related to protected fauna and flora species
0801 06	Offences related to habitats
0801 07	Offences related to ozone-depleting substances
0801 08	Offences related to illicit trafficking in hormonal substances and other growth promoters
0802 00	OTHER OFFENCES AGAINST THE ENVIRONMENT OR HARMING PUBLIC HEALTH (NOT-DRUG RELATED)
0802 01	Offences related to consumer protection
0802 02	Other offences
0900 00 Open Category	OFFENCES AGAINST PROPERTY
0901 00	THEFT
0901 01	Theft with violence or intimidation
0901 02	Theft without violence or intimidation
0902 00	UNLAWFUL APPROPRIATION
0902 01	Racketeering and extortion
0902 02	Knowingly concealing or retaining property resulting from an offence
0902 03	Embezzlement, concealment of assets or unlawful increase in a company's liabilities
0902 04	Unlawful dispossession
0902 05	Other forms of unlawful appropriation
0903 00	ILLICIT DEALING IN OR CONCEALING GOODS
0903 01	Illicit trafficking in cultural goods
0903 02	Dealing in stolen goods
0903 03	Other forms of illicit dealing in or concealing goods
0904 00	CRIMINAL DAMAGE
0904 01	Destruction
0904 02	Sabotage
0904 03	Smearing
0904 04	Other forms of criminal damage
0905 00	CORRUPTION
0905 01	Offences jointly defined as corruption
0905 01 01	Active corruption in the public sector involving a EU public official
0905 01 02	Passive corruption in the public sector involving a EU public official
0905 02	Other forms of corruption

0906 00	MONEY LAUNDERING
0906 01	Offences jointly identified as Money Laundering
0906 01 01	The conversion or transfer of property
0906 01 02	The illicit concealment or disguise of property related information
0906 01 03	The illicit acquisition, possession or use of laundered property
0906 02	Other forms of Money Laundering
0907 00	VIOLATION OF COMPETITION RULES
0908 00	FRAUD AND SWINDLING
0908 01	Offences jointly identified as fraud and swindling
0908 01 01	Counterfeiting and piracy products
0908 01 02	Forgery (i.e. Counterfeiting) and trafficking of administrative documents
0908 01 03	Forgery (i.e. Counterfeiting) of means of payment
0908 01 03 01	Forgery (i.e. Counterfeiting) of cash means of payment
0908 01 03 02	Forgery (i.e. Counterfeiting) of non-cash means of payment
0908 01 04	Fraud affecting the financial interests of the European Communities
0908 02	Other forms of fraud and swindling
0908 02 01	Tax offences
0908 02 02	Social Security or Family Benefit Fraud
0908 02 03	Custom offences
0908 02 04	Fraudulent insolvency
0908 02 05	Other
0909 00	OFFENCES AGAINST INFORMATION SYSTEMS
0909 01	Offences jointly identified as offences against information systems
0909 01 01	Offences against the confidentiality, integrity and availability of computer data and systems
0909 01 02	Computer-related offences
0909 01 03	Offences related to infringements of copyright and related rights
0909 01 04	Production, possession or trafficking in computer devices or data enabling commitment of computer related offences
0909 02	Other forms of offences against information systems
0910 00	OTHER OFFENCES AGAINST PROPERTY
1000 00 Open Category	OFFENCES AGAINST LIFE, LIMB AND PERSONAL FREEDOM, <i>not committed or likely to be committed in the course of terrorist activities and other than offences against the state, nation, state symbol or public authority</i>
1001 00	CAUSING DEATH
1001 01	Intentional
1001 01 01	not further specified
1001 01 02	causing death at the request of the victim
1001 01 03	causing death of the own child during or immediately after birth
1001 01 04	offences related to suicide
1001 01 05	illegal abortion
1001 02	Unintentional

1002 00	CAUSING PSYCHOLOGICAL AND/OR BODILY INJURY
1002 01	Torture
1002 02	Causing psychological and bodily injury, <i>other than torture</i>
1002 02 01	Causing grievous bodily injury
1002 02 02	Causing minor bodily injury
1002 02 03	Threatening behaviour
1002 02 04	Other
1003 00	FAILURE TO OFFER AID
1004 00	EXPOSING TO DANGER OF LOSS OF LIFE OR GRIEVOUS BODILY INJURY
1005 00	KIDNAPPING, ILLEGAL RESTRAINT AND HOSTAGE-TAKING
1006 00	INSULT, SLANDER AND DEFAMATION
1007 00	BREACH OF PRIVACY, <i>other than through cybercrime</i>
1100 00 Open Category	OFFENCES AGAINST THE STATE, PUBLIC ORDER, COURSE OF JUSTICE OR PUBLIC OFFICIALS
1101 00	OFFENCES AGAINST THE STATE AND/OR PUBLIC AUTHORITIES
1101 01	Attempt against life or health of the head of State
1101 02	Insult of the State, nation or State symbols
1101 03	Insult or resistance to a representative of public authority
1101 04	Assault on a representative of public authority
1101 05	Unlawful impersonation of a person or an authority
1101 06	Espionage
1101 07	High treason
1101 08	Offences related to elections and referendum
1101 09	Obstructing of public tender procedures
1101 10	Obstructing or perverting the course of justice, making false allegations, perjury
1101 11	Abuse of function
1101 12	Other offences against the state and/or public authorities
1102 00	OFFENCES AGAINST PUBLIC PEACE/PUBLIC ORDER
1102 01	Violence during sports events
1102 02	Violence during international conferences
1102 03	Public abuse of alcohol or drugs, other than related to road traffic regulations
1102 04	Offences related to illegal gambling
1102 05	Disturbing public order through racism and xenophobia
1102 05 01	Publicly inciting to racist or xenophobic violence or hatred
1102 05 02	Denial, gross minimisation, approval or justification of genocide or crimes against humanity
1102 05 03	Other offences disturbing public order through racism and xenophobia
1200 00 Open Category	OFFENCES AGAINST LABOUR LAW
1201 00	UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT
1201 01	Unlawful employment <i>of an EU national</i>
1201 02	Unlawful employment <i>of a third country national</i>
1202 00	OFFENCES RELATING TO REMUNERATION INCLUDING SOCIAL SECURITY CONTRIBUTIONS

1203 00	OFFENCES RELATING TO WORKING CONDITIONS, HEALTH AND SAFETY AT WORK
1204 00	OFFENCES RELATING TO ACCESS TO OR EXERCISE OF A PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY
1205 00	OFFENCES RELATING TO WORKING HOURS AND REST TIME, <i>other than road traffic offences</i>
1206 00	OTHER OFFENCES AGAINST RIGHTS OF THE EMPLOYEES
1300 00 Open Category	MOTOR VEHICLE CRIME AND OFFENCES AGAINST TRAFFIC REGULATIONS, <i>other than theft, misappropriation and trafficking in stolen vehicles</i>
1301 00	DANGEROUS DRIVING
1302 00	DRIVING WITHOUT A LICENCE OR WHILE DISQUALIFIED
1303 00	FAILURE TO STOP AFTER A ROAD ACCIDENT
1304 00	AVOIDING A ROAD CHECK
1305 00	OFFENCES RELATED TO ROAD TRANSPORT
1306 00	OTHER OFFENCES RELATED TO VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATIONS
1400 00 Open Category	OFFENCES AGAINST MIGRATION LAW
1401 00	OFFENCES JOINTLY IDENTIFIED AS OFFENCES AGAINST MIGRATION LAW
1401 01	Unauthorised entry, transit and/or residence
1401 02	Facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residence
1404 00	OTHER OFFENCES RELATED TO IMMIGRATION/ALIEN LAWS
1500 00 Open Category	OFFENCES RELATED TO FAMILY LAW
1501 00	OFFENCES RELATED TO FAMILY LAW, <i>not further specified</i>
1502 00	BIGAMY
1503 00	FAMILY ABANDONMENT BY EVADING THE ALIMONY OR MAINTENANCE OBLIGATION
1504 00	REMOVAL OF A CHILD OR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH AN ORDER TO PRODUCE A CHILD
1600 00 Open Category	OFFENCES AGAINST MILITARY OBLIGATIONS

4.9 THE PACKAGE OF QUESTIONNAIRES

4.9.1 Member State Questionnaires

Content – The main part of the Study consisted of the consultation with MS to receive crucial input on their views, needs and feedback with regard to the preliminary EULOCS in terms of compatibility and feasibility. At the beginning of September 2008, a package of Questionnaires was sent to all EU MS via a network of Single Points of Contact (SPOCs). They were requested to:

- identify the persons responsible for the collection of crime statistics in the different national authorities producing and using crime statistics;
- forward the Questionnaires to these stakeholders and explain what they needed to do;
- consolidate the answers provided and return the Questionnaires to the Project Team within one month of receipt;
- organise the Focus Group meeting for a Project Team member with the involved parties upon completion of the Questionnaires by the different authorities;
- if required, update and finalise the contribution of the country in a consolidated reply to the Questionnaires

The package of Questionnaires contained:

- a general questionnaire aimed at getting a general overview of the national crime statistics environment, experiences with international exchange of data and overall suggestions related to the creation of a EULOCS (JLS-CSP-QST-Member States-MS-v2.0.doc)
- classification forms to obtain an overview chart for each of the classification systems in use encompassing information i.a. on the level of detail, the number of offence categories, IT aspects and languages (JLS-CSP-QST-Classification_Form-MS-Auth-2.0.doc);
- variables forms to be filled out for each of the classification systems in view of assessing the availability of variables (JLS-CSP-QST-System Variables-MS-Auth-v2.0.doc);
- two compatibility files, allowing an assessment of the degree of compatibility of EULOCS with the national classification systems, in terms of (i) definition compatibility (JLS_CSP-QST-Definition Compatibility-MS-v2.0.xls) and (ii) category compatibility (JLS_CSP-QST-Category Compatibility-MS-v2.0.xls).

Reference – See referred documents (above), available on CIRCA for download and consultation (https://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/jai/pndccj/library?l=/unisys_classification/questionnaire_ms&vm=detailed&sb=Title)

4.9.2 Policy Needs Questionnaire

Content - In the first part of the study, International, European and Private organisations representatives have been consulted to get a view on the policy needs regarding crime related data collection.

Reference – Policy Needs Questionnaire (JLS-CSP-QST-Policy Needs-v2.0.doc) and accompanying excel sheet (JLS-CSP-Excel QST-Policy Needs-final.xls), are available on CIRCA for download and consultation (https://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/jai/pndccj/library?l=/unisys_classification/policy_questionnaire_1&vm=detailed&sb=Title)

4.9.3 Classification Feedback Questionnaire

Content – In the second part of the study, International, European and Private organisations representatives have been consulted to get a view on the proposed EULOCS.

Reference – The Classification Feedback Questionnaire (JLS-CSP-QST-Classification_Feedback-v2.0.doc) is available on CIRCA for download and consultation (https://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/jai/pndccj/library?l=/unisys_classification/classification_feedback&vm=detailed&sb=Title)

4.10 FOLDERS WITH FINAL FILLED OUT QUESTIONNAIRES

4.10.1 Member State Questionnaires

Content – In order to encourage information sharing and knowledge transfer the Project Team proposed to make the contents of the completed Questionnaires available to other MS via the secure CIRCA website of DG JLS related to the Policy Needs for data on Crime and Criminal Justice. For the countries that indicated to agree that the Questionnaire they have completed is shared with the other MS, the replies have been uploaded onto CIRCA.

Reference – Different files received from 17 MS (https://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/jai/pndccj/library?l=/unisys_classification/answers_questionnaire&vm=detailed&sb=Title)

4.10.2 Policy Needs Questionnaire

Content - In order to encourage information sharing and knowledge transfer the Project Team proposed to make the contents of the completed Policy Needs Questionnaires available to the MS and other stakeholders via the secure CIRCA website of DG JLS related to the Policy Needs for data on Crime and Criminal Justice. For the organisations that indicated to agree that the Questionnaire they have completed is shared, the replies have been uploaded onto CIRCA

Reference – Different files received from 7 organisations (https://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/jai/pndccj/library?l=/unisys_classification/policy_questionnaire&vm=detailed&sb=Title)

4.10.3 Classification Feedback Questionnaire

Content – In the second part of the study, International, European and Private organisations representatives have been consulted to get a view on the proposed EULOCS.

Reference – The filled out Classification Feedback Questionnaire of those organisations that indicated that their reply could be made public (JLS-CSP-QST-Classification Feedback Questionnaire-v2.0.doc) is available on CIRCA for download and consultation (https://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/jai/pndccj/library?l=/unisys_classification/classification_feedback&vm=detailed&sb=Title)

4.11 COMPATIBILITY OVERVIEW

Content – In order to conduct an analysis of the nationally performed compatibility exercises, all results were clustered in an excel file. The first sheet provides a general overview of the results of the Category Compatibility exercises. “A” indicates data for the offence type is available, “C” indicates data could be made available through small changes to the data system , whereas “N” indicates data cannot be made available. In the second sheet “CategoryOrder” some functions were added to the results to allow the user to order the categories based on the attributed lettering. The third sheet is similar to the first in the sense that it also provides a general overview of the definition compatibility this time, whereas the fourth sheet also includes ordering functions.

Reference – Document JLS-CSP-FR-Annex-CompatibilityOverview.xls, annex delivered as a separate document

4.12 COUNTRY MATRICES

Content – For each of the MS that participated in the Study, a Country Matrix is created with the results from the compatibility exercises. The overview clusters the coding and comments for both the definition and the category compatibility. Additionally it also shows a more detailed mapping for those countries which went beyond the minimum of the yellow cells.

Reference – Document JLS-CSP-FR-Annex-CountryMatrixOverview.xls, annex delivered as a separate document. For the 17 countries that mentioned that their reply to the questionnaire can be made available to the other MS, the country matrix is published on CIRCA (https://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/jai/pndccj/library?l=/unisys_classification/final_report/country_matrices&vm=detailed&sb=Title)

4.13 OVERVIEW OF SYSTEM VARIABLES USED IN MEMBER STATES

Content – In order to analyse the results from the obtained Variables forms, an excel file was created clustering the collected information. The first sheet provides a general overview of the current situation. The subsequent sheets are dedicated to specific variables types (offender, victim, event, ...).

Reference – Document JLS-CSP-FR-Annex-VariablesOverview.xls, annex delivered as a separate document

4.14 LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO THE STUDY

In this section, authorities which contributed to the study have been listed. The overview lists the authorities in the MS which participated in the focus group meetings in the countries. The second table lists institutions and authorities consulted in the course of the Study.

Although the overview does not claim to be exhaustive, it provides an idea of the number of authorities and institutions that contributed to the Study.

CO	Organisation
AT	Directorate Population Stat
	Criminal Record Department
	Institut fuer Strafecht und Kriminologie
	MOI
	MOJ
BE	Institut National de Criminologie et de Criminologie
	Police
BG	National Statistics Institute
	Institute of Crime and Criminology
	MOI
	Ministry of Defence , Service for Military Police
	National Investigation Service
	State Agency “National Security”
	Supreme Cassation Prosecutors Office of the Republic Bulgaria
MOJ, DJ Enforcement of penalties -	
CY	Statistical Service of Cyprus
	Law Office of Cyprus
	Police
	Supreme Court
	Prisons
CZ	Czech Statistical Office
	Statistical Office
	Police Presidium
	MOJ
DE	Federal Office of Justice, Division of Criminology, Prevention and Justice Statistics
	Federal Statistical Office
	Federal Police Office
	Federal MOJ
DK	Danmarks Statistik
	Wellfare Division
	Public prosecution
	Statistics prison and probation service
	Research unit of MOJ
EE	MOJ
EL	National Statistical Service of Greece
	Police
	Athens court of First Instance
ES	Instituto Nacional de Estadística

CO	Organisation
FI	Statistics Finland
FR	Office national de la Délinquance, INHES
	Direction de la statistique et des études au Secrétariat Général - Ministère de la justice;
	Direction de l'administration pénitentiaire
	Observatoire national de la délinquance
	Direction des Affaires Criminelles et des Grâces Ministère de la Justice
	National Police HQ
	Prosecutor
	Prison Administration
	National HQ of the Customs and Excise Guard
	Office of the National Council of Justice of Hungary
	MOJ and Law Enforcement of the Republic of Hungary
	IE
Police	
Probation	
IT	DCIS Direzione centrale per le statistiche e le indagini sulle istituzioni sociali GIU/A U.O. Penale e penitenziaria
	Istat
	MOI
	CISIS, Bologna
	University "La Sapienza", Rome
LT	Stat Lithuania
	MOI, IT and Communications Department
	Nat Courts Admin
	Centre for Crime Prevention in Lithuania
	MOJ
	MOJ, Prisons Department
LU	Police
	MOI
	Parquet Général
	Parquet General, IT Sector
	Parquet Général,, Council WG for ECRIS
LV	State Police
	MOI, European Affairs Division
	Information Centre
NL	Department justice and public safety statistics
	Police
	WODC
	Institute of Justice
	National Criminal Register
	Police HQ
	Central Board of Prison Service
	MOJ
PT	Justice Statistics Division
	Justice Statistics and Computer Service Department

CO	Organisation
	Direction-General of Justice Policy, Criminal Justice Unit
	Direction-General of Justice Policy (responsible for the statistic area)
RO	Criminal Statistics and Special Records Department
	National Institute for Stat, Stat and Social Services Directorate,
	National Institute for Stat
	General Inspectorate of Police
	Stat Analysis and Evaluation Department Gen Inspectorate of Border Police
	Superior Council of Magistracy
	National Admin of Penitentiary, Detainees and Transfer Department,
	National Anti-Drug Agency
SE	MOJ, National Council for Crime Prevention, Stat Division
	Statistical department – convictions
	MOJ, Division for penal law (sanctions)
SI	MOJ
SK	MOJ
	Presidium of Police Corps
	The General Prosecution's Office
	General Directorate of the Corps of Prison and Court Guard
UK	Home Office
	Crown Prosecution Service
	OCJR, MOJ

Name (function / contact details)	Date	Medium	Purpose and Outcome
European Commission, D3	April	Various	was contacted to obtain more information on the European Criminal Records Information System (ECRIS).
Ghent University	April	Face to Face	was contacted to provide us with feedback on the methodology building the initial EULOCS, more specifically on the statistical requirements.
National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Finland	17 June	Face to Face	We invited the Institute of Legal Policy to provide feedback on our initial Classification during a panel session on our project organised at the Stockholm Criminology Symposium.
Northern Ireland Office	4 Sept	Face to Face	was informed about the project at the Edinburgh Criminology Symposium.
Analytical Service Division for the Justice Department of the Scottish Executive	4 Sept	Face to Face	was informed about the project at the Edinburgh Criminology Symposium. There was a small meeting with Gordon Barclay, Richard Erskine, and him during lunch.
Sheffield University	4 Sept 20 Oct	Face to Face Mail	was informed about the project at the Edinburgh Criminology Symposium. More information was requested via email.
WODC, Dutch Ministry of Justice	5 Sept 1 Oct	Face to Face Mail	is preparing a research proposal to gather comparable statistical data on European Reconviction Rates.
WODC, Dutch Ministry of Justice	5 Sept 4 Nov	Face to Face Mail	conducts the researcher on the Study on the Reconviction Rates. We have provided them with our classification and the definition compatibility sheet.
Belgian Criminal Records	3 Nov	Phone	Update us on status Classification System Pilot Project and ECRIS
Statistics and Survey Section, UNODC	2 Dec	Face to Face	Discussion on EULOCS
Crime statistics, UNODC	2 Dec	Face to Face	Discussion on EULOCS
Drug statistics, UNODC	2 Dec	Face to Face	Discussion on EULOCS
Information Systems	2 Dec	Face to Face	Discussion on EULOCS
EUROSTAT	2 Dec	Face to Face	Discussion on EULOCS

5 BIBLIOGRAPHY

5.1 LEGAL AND POLITICAL DOCUMENTS (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

- *Convention drawn up on the basis of Article K.3 (2) (c) of the Treaty on European Union on the fight against corruption involving officials of the European Communities or officials of Member States of the European Union* (OJ C 195 of 25.06.1997)
- *Convention drawn up on the basis of Article K.3 of the Treaty on European Union, on the protection of the European Communities' financial interests* (OJ C 316 of 27.11.1995)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2005), *Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism*, (CETS no. 196, Warsaw, 16.05.2005)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (1949), *Statute of the Council of Europe*, (CETS no. 001, London, 5.05.1949)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (1964), *European Convention on the Punishment of Road Traffic Offences*, (CETS no. 052, Strasbourg, 30.11.1964)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (1970), *European Convention on the International Validity of Criminal Judgements*, (CETS no. 070, Strasbourg, 28.05.1970)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (1977), *European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism*, (CETS no. 090, Strasbourg, 27.01.1977)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (1985), *European Convention on Offences relating to Cultural Property*, (CETS no. 119, Delphi, 23.06.1985)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (1990), *Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of Proceeds from Crime*, (CETS no. 141, Strasbourg, 8.11.1990)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (1998), *Convention on the Protection of Environment through Criminal Law*, (CETS no. 172, Strasbourg, 4.11.1998)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (1999), *Criminal Law Convention on Corruption*, (CETS no. 173, Strasbourg, 27.01.1999)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2001), *Convention on Cybercrime*, (CETS no. 185, Budapest, 23.11.2001)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2003), *Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime, concerning the criminalization of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems*, (CETS no. 189, Strasbourg, 28.01.2003)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2003), *Additional Protocol to the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption*, (CETS no. 191, Strasbourg, 15.05.2003)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2003), *Protocol amending the European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism*, (CETS no. 190, Strasbourg, 15.05.2003)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2005), *Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings*, (CETS no. 197, Warsaw, 16.05.2005)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2005), *Council of Europe Convention on the Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of proceeds of Crime and on the Financing of Terrorism*, (CETS no. 198, Warsaw, 16.05.2005)
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2007), *Council of Europe Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse*, (CETS no. 201, Lanzarote, 25.10.2007)

- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (1995), *Convention of 26 July 1995 on the protection of the European Communities financial interests*, (OJ C 316 of 27.11.1995 P.0049-0057)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (1996), *Council Resolution of 30 November 1994 relating to the limitations on the admission of third-country nationals to the territory of the Member States for the purpose of pursuing activities as self-employed persons*, (OJ C 274 of 19.09.1996 P.007-009)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (1997), *Convention of 26 May 1997 on the fight against corruption involving officials of Member States of the European Union*, (OJ C 195 of 25.06.1997 P.002-0011)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2000), *The prevention and control of organised crime: a European Union strategy for the beginning of the new millennium*, (OJ C 124/1 of 3.05.2000)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2000), *Council Framework Decision 2000/383/JHA on increasing protection by criminal penalties and other sanctions against counterfeiting in connection with the introduction of the euro*, (OJ L 140 of 14.06.2000, p. 1)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2001), *Council Framework Decision of 28 May 2001 combating fraud and counterfeiting of non-cash means of payment*, (OJ L 149 of 2.06.2001, p. 1)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2001), *Council Framework Decision of 26 June 2001 on money laundering, the identification, tracing, freezing, seizing and confiscation of instrumentalities and the proceeds of crime*, (OJ L 182 of 5.07.2001, p. 1)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2002), *Council Decision 2002/348/JHA of 25 April 2002 concerning security in connection with football matches with an international dimension*, (OC L 121/1 of 08.05.2002)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2002), *Council Directive 2002/90/EC of 28 November 2002 defining the facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residence*, (OJ L 328 of 5.12.2002, p. 4)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2002), *Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism* (OJ L 164 of 22.06.2002, p. 3)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2002), *Council Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States*, (OJ L 190 of 18.07.2002)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2002), *Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA of 19 July 2002 on combating trafficking in human beings*, (OJ L 203 of 1.08.2002, p. 1).
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2002), *Council Framework Decision 2002/946/JHA of 28 November 2002 on the strengthening of the legal framework to prevent the facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residence*, (OJ L 328 of 5.12.2002).
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2003), *Council Decision amending the provisions of Article 40(1) and (7) of the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 on the gradual abolition of checks at common borders*, (2003/725/JHA OJ L 260 of 11.10.2003)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2003), *Council Directive 2003/6/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2003, on insider dealing and market manipulation (market abuse)*, (OJ L 96 of 12.4.2003, p.16)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2003), *Council Framework Decision 2003/80/JHA on the protection of the environment through criminal law*, (OJ L 29 of 5.02.2003, p. 55, annulled).

- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2003), *Council Framework Decision 2003/568/JHA of 22 July 2003 on combating corruption in the private sector*, (OJ L 192 of 31.07.2003, p. 54).
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2003), *Declaration of the Dublin Conference on Organised Crime*, (Doc 16302/03, CRIMORG 96, 19.12.2003).
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2003), *Report on the measures and steps taken with regard to the implementation of the recommendations of the European Union Strategy for the Beginning of the New Millennium on Prevention and Control of Organised Crime*, (Doc. 10925/03 CRIMORG 49 of 30.06.2003).
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2004), *Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA of 22 December 2003 on combating the sexual exploitation of children and child pornography*, (OJ L 13 of 20.01.2004, p. 44).
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2004), *Council Framework Decision 2004/757/JHA of 25 October 2004 laying down minimum provisions on the constituent elements of criminal acts and penalties in the field of illicit drug trafficking*, (OJ L 335 of 11.11.2004, p. 8).
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2004), *Council Decision on tackling vehicle crime with cross-border implications*, (OJ L 389/28 of 30.12.2004)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2005), *Council Framework Decision 2005/667/JHA to strengthen the criminal-law framework for the enforcement of the law against ship-source pollution*, (OJ L 255 of 30.09.2005, p. 164, annulled).
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2005), *Council Framework Decision 2005/222/JHA on attacks against information system, adopted on 21 February 2005*, (OJ L 69 of 16.03.2005, p.67).
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2006), *Council Decision 2006/216/EC of 24 July 2006 on the conclusion, on behalf of the European Community, of the Protocol Against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organised Crime concerning the provisions of the Protocol, in so far as the provisions of this Protocol fall within the scope of Articles 179 and 181a of the Treaty establishing the European Community*, (OJ L 262 of 22.06.2006)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2006), *Council Decision 2006/617/EC of 24 July 2006 on the conclusion, on behalf of the European Community, of the Protocol Against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organised Crime concerning the provisions of the Protocol, in so far as the provisions of the Protocol fall within the scope of Part III, Title IV of the Treaty establishing the European Community*, (OJ L 262 of 22.06.2006)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2006), *Council Decision 2006/618/EC of 24 July 2006 on the conclusion, on behalf of the European Community, of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women And Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organised Crime concerning the provisions of the Protocol, in so far as the provisions of this Protocol fall within the scope of Articles 179 and 181a of the Treaty establishing the European Community*, (OJ L 262 of 22.06.2006)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2006), *Council Decision 2006/619/EC of 24 July 2006 on the conclusion, on behalf of the European Community, of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women And Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organised Crime concerning the provisions of the Protocol, in so far as the provisions of the Protocol fall within the scope of Part III, Title IV of the Treaty establishing the European Community*, (OJ L 262 of 22.06.2006)

- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2007), *Council Framework Decision of 18 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law*, (OJ L 328 of 6.12.2008).
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2007), *Regulation No 862/2007 of the European Parliament and the Council of 11 July 2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 311/76 on the compilation of statistics of foreign workers*, (OJ L 199/23 of 31.07.2007)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008), *Council Framework Decision of 28 November 2008 amending Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA on combating terrorism*, (OJ L 330 of 9.12.2008).
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008) Report of the Informal High Level Advisory Group on the Future of European Home Affairs Policy („The Future Group“), June 2008 (DOC 11657/08)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008) Draft conclusions on the principle of convergence and the architecture for internal security (DOC 13459/08, JAI 576, CATS 70)
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008), *Council Directive 2008/ 26/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2008, amending Directive 2003/6/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2003, on insider dealing and market manipulation (market abuse)*, (OJ L 81 of 20.3.2008, p.42).
- COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2008), *Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of the environment through Criminal Law- Outcome of the European Parliament’s first reading*, (COD 2007/022)
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2006), *Commission Communication to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Economic and Social Committee: Developing a comprehensive and coherent EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice: An EU action Plan 2006-2010*, (COM(2006) 437 final of 07.08.2006).
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2007), *Call for Tender - Study: the development of an EU-level system for the classification of criminal offences and an assessment of its feasibility with a view to supporting the implementation of the action plan to develop an EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice*, (2007/S 120/2007)
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2007), *Report from the commission on the implementation since 2005 of the Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States*, (COM(2007) 407 final of 11.07.2007)
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2008), *Award Contract Notice - Study: the development of an EU-level system for the classification of criminal offences and an assessment of its feasibility with a view to supporting the implementation of the action plan to develop an EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice*, (2008/S 011-011678).
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2008), *Proposal for a Council Decision on the establishment of the European Criminal Records Information System (ECRIS) in application of Article 11 of Framework Decision 2008/XX/JHA*, (Doc. 10122/08, COPEN 110, 30.05.2008)
- EUROPEAN COUNCIL (1992), *Edinburgh Presidency Conclusions*, (SN 456/92).
- EUROPEAN COUNCIL (1999), *Tampere Presidency Conclusions*, (SN 200/1/99 REV 1).
- EUROPEAN COUNCIL (2004), *The Hague Programme: strengthening freedom, security and justice in the European Union*, (OJ C 53/11 of 03.03.2005).
- INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT (2008), *Discussion paper on the crime of aggression proposed by the Chairman (revision 2008)*, (ICC-ASP/6/SWGCA/2 of 14 May 2008).
- *Single European Act*, (OJ L 169 of 29.06.1987).

- *Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe*, (OJ C 310 of 16.12.2004).
- *Treaty of Amsterdam* (OJ C 340 of 10.11.1997).
- *Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007*, (OJ C 306 of 17.12.2007).
- *Treaty on European Union* (Maastricht treaty), (OJ C 191 of 29.07.1992).
- UNITED NATIONS (1950), *Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others*, (UNTS no. 1342, Lake Success, 21.03.1950)
- UNITED NATIONS (1956), *Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery*, (UNTS no. 3822, Geneva, 07.09.1956)
- UNITED NATIONS (1971), *Convention on psychotropic substances* (UNTS no. 14956, Vienna, 21.02.1971)
- UNITED NATIONS (1975), *Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs*, (UNTS no. 14152, New York, 08.08.1975)
- UNITED NATIONS (1988), *Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances*, (UNTS no. 27627, Vienna, 20.12.1988)
- UNITED NATIONS (1998) *Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court*, (Rome, 17.07.1998)
- UNITED NATIONS (1999), *Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism* (UNTS no. 38349, New York, 9.12.1999)
- UNITED NATIONS (1999), *Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism* (UNTS no. 39464, Algiers, 14.07.1999)
- UNITED NATIONS (1999), *Criminal Law Convention on Corruption* (UNTS no. 39391, Strasbourg, 27.01.1999)
- UNITED NATIONS (2000), *Convention against Transnational Organized Crime* (UNTS no. 39574, New York, 15.11.2000)
- UNITED NATIONS (2000), *Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography*, (UNTS no. 27531, New York, 25.05.2000)
- UNITED NATIONS (2000), *Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime* (UNTS no. 39574, New York, 31.05.2001)
- UNITED NATIONS (2000), *Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Air and Sea, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime* (UNTS no. 39574, New York, 15.11.2000)
- UNITED NATIONS (2000), *Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime* (UNTS no. 39574, New York, 15.11.2000)
- UNITED NATIONS (2003), *Manual for the Development of A System of Criminal Justice Statistics*, (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.F/89)
- UNITED NATIONS (2003), *Convention against corruption* (Resolution 55/61 of 4 December 2000)

5.2 CASE LAW

- EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE (Case 68/88), Commission v. Greece (Greek-Maze case), Judgment of 21.09.1989, *Rec. 1989*, p. 2965
- EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE (Case 105/03), Pupino, Judgement of 16.06.2005, *Rec. 2005*, p. I-5285
- EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE (Case 176/03), Commission v. Council, Judgment of 13.09.2005, *Rec. 2005*, p. I-7879
- EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE (Case 440/05), Commission v. Council, Judgment of 23.10.2007, *Rec. 2007*, p. I-9097

5.3 LITERATURE

- AEBI, M.F. (2008), Measuring the Influence of Statistical Counting Rules on Cross-National Differences in Recorded Crime, in AROMAA, K. & HEISKANEN, M. (eds.), (2008), *Crime and Criminal Justice Systems in Europe and North America 1995-2004* (pp. 196-215), Helsinki: HEUNI
- ALBRECHT, P.A. & BRAUM, S. (1999), *Deficiencies in the Development of European Criminal Law*, European Journal of Law, Vol. 5/3, pp. 293-310
- ALVAZZI DEL FRATE, A. (2008), Trends and Methodological Aspects in the International Collection of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics, in AROMAA, K. & HEISKANEN, M. (eds.), (2008), *Crime and Criminal Justice Systems in Europe and North America 1995-2004* (pp. 215-231), Helsinki: HEUNI
- AMBOS, K. (2005), *Is the development of a common substantive criminal law for Europe Possible? Some preliminary reflections*, Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law, Vol. 12, pp. 173-191
- BANTEKAS, I. (2007), *Some theoretical foundations of EU criminal law*, European Journal of Law Reform, Vol. VIII, pp. 343-357
- BARCLAY, G. C (2000), *The Comparability of data on convictions and sanctions: Are international comparisons possible?*, European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, Volume 8, Number 1, March 2000 , pp. 13-26(14)
- BIDERMAN, A.D., LYNCH, J.P., & PETERSON, J.L. (1991), *Understanding crime incidence statistics*, New York (N.Y.) : Springer
- BOTTOMLEY, A.K. & PEASE, K. (1986), *Crime and Punishment: Interpreting the Data*, Bristol: Open University Press
- CADOPPI, A. (1996), *Towards a European Criminal Code?*, European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice, Vol. 1, pp. 2-17
- COLEMAN, C. & MOYNIHAN, J. (1996), *Understanding Crime Data: Haunted by the Dark Figure*, Kuckingham: Open University Press
- CORSTENS, G.J.M. (2003), *Criminal Law in the First Pillar?*, European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice, Vol. 11/1, pp. 131-144
- DE BONDT, W. en VERMEULEN, G. (2009), "Esperanto for EU Crime Statistics. Towards Common EU offences in an EU level offence classification system", in M. COOLS et al, Readings On Criminal Justice, Criminal Law & Policing, Maklu, Antwerpen-Apeldoorn, 87-124;

- DE BONDT W. & DE MOOR A. (2009) “De Europese Metamorfose, de implicaties van het Verdrag van Lissabon voor het Europees Strafrecht”, *Panopticon*, 31-53;
- DE BUSSER, E. (2008), *A European criminal records database: An integrated model*, In STEFANO, C. & XANTHAKI, H. (2008), *Towards a European Criminal Record* (pp. 336-254), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- DELMAS-MARTY, M. (1997), *Corpus Juris, introducing penal provisions for the purpose of the financial interests of the European Union*, Paris: Economica
- DELMAS-MARTY, M. (1998), *The European Union and Penal Law*, *European Law Journal*, Vol. 4/1, pp. 87-115
- DELMAS-MARTY, M. & VERVAELE, J.A.E. (2000), *The implementation of the Corpus Juris in the Member States*, Antwerp: Intersentia
- EUROPEAN SOURCEBOOK GROUP (2006) , *European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2006, Third Edition*, Den Haag: Boom Juridische Uitgevers
- FAURE, M., SMITS, J. & SCHNEIDER, H. (2002), *Towards a European Ius Commune in Legal Education and Research*, Maastricht: Maastricht University
- FERRARINI, A.G. (2004), The European Market Abuse Directive, *Common Market Law Review*, Vol. 41, N° 3, 2004 , pp. 711-741
- HERLIN-KARNEL, E. (2007), *Recent developments in the area of European Criminal Law*, *Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law*, Vol. 14, pp. 15-37
- HOFFMANN, E. (1997), *Methodological Issues in the development, use, maintenance and revision of statistical classifications*, Note prepared for the Third meeting of the Expert Group on International Economic and Social Classifications, New York 1-3 december 1997.
- JEHLÉ J-M (2000), *Prosecution in Europe: Varying structures, convergent trends*, *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, Volume 8, Number 1, March 2000 , pp. 27-42(16)
- JOUTSEN, M. (2006) *The European Union and Cooperation in Criminal Matters: the Search for Balance* (HEUNI nr.25, 2006,)
- KAIAFA-GBANDI, M. (2001), *The Development towards Harmonisation within Criminal Law in the European Union – A Citizen’s perspective*, *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, Vol. 9/4, pp. 239-263
- KLIP, A. (2002), *Conditions for a European Corpus Juris Criminalis*, In FAURE, M., SMITS, J. & SCHNEIDER, H., *Towards a European Ius Commune in Legal Education and Research*, (pp. 109-123), Maastricht: Maastricht University
- KLIP, A. (2006), *Europese Integratie en harmonisatie en het strafrecht, Preadvies Nederlandse Juristenvereniging*, 136e Handelingen. Handelingen Nederlandse Juristen-Vereniging, pp. 105-153
- KLIP, A. & VAN DER WILT, H (Eds.) (2002), *Harmonization and harmonizing measures in criminal law*, Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences
- KLIP, A. (2009), *European Criminal Law. An Integrated Approach*. Antwerp-Apeldoorn: Intersentia.
- LESSING, H. (1993), *The Federalization of Europe. Towards a Federal System of Criminal Justice*, *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Justice and Criminal Law*, Vol. 3, pp. 212-229
- MAGUIRE, M., MORGAN, R. & REINER R. (2007), *The Oxford handbook of criminology*, Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press Inc
- MALTZ, M.D. (1977), *Crime Statistics: A Historical Perspective*, *Crime Delinquency*, Vol. 23, pp. 32-40

- MEEUSEN, J. & STRAETEMANS, G. (2007), *Politie en justitiële strafrechtelijke samenwerking in de Europese Unie. Welk evenwicht tussen vrijheid, veiligheid en rechtvaardigheid?*, Antwerpen: Intersentia
- MURSCHEZ, V. (2007), *The Future of Criminal Law within the European Union – Union Law or Community Law Competence*, VUW Law Review, pp. 145-156.
- PRADEL, J. & CORSTENS, G. (2002), *European Criminal Law*, The Hague: Kluwer International
- RICE, P. (2003), *Harmonisation of Criminal Environmental Liability throughout the EU*, Environmental Claims Journal, Vol. 15/2, pp. 281-286
- SCHÜNEMANN, B. (2007), *Alternative-project for a European Criminal Law and Procedure*, Criminal Law Forum, Vol. 18, pp. 227-251
- SIEBER, U. (1999), *Memorandum on a European Model Penal Code*, European Journal of Law Reform, Vol. I, 445-471
- SMIT, P., HAEN MARSHALL, I. & VAN GAMMEREN, M. (2008), *An Empirical Approach to Country Clustering*, in AROMAA, K. & HEISKANEN, M. (eds.), (2008), *Crime and Criminal Justice Systems in Europe and North America 1995-2004* (pp. 169-196), Helsinki: HEUN
- SPENCER, J.R. (2002) *Why is harmonization of penal law necessary?*, In KLIP, A, & VAN DER WILT, H (Eds.) (2002), *Harmonization and harmonizing measures in criminal law* (pp. 43-54), Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences
- STEFANOUC, C. (2007), *European Criminal Law and European Integration Theory*, European Journal of Law Reform VIII, 325-341
- STEFANOUC, C. & XANTHAKI, H. (2008), *Towards a European Criminal Record*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- TADIĆ, F.M. (2002), *How Harmonious can harmonization be? A theoretical approach towards harmonization of (criminal) law*, In KLIP, A, & VAN DER WILT, H (Eds.) (2002), *Harmonization and harmonizing measures in criminal law* (pp. 1-23), Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences
- TRANSCRIME (2005), *Study to assess the scope of and collect available statistics and meta-data on five crime types and propose harmonised definitions and collection procedures for these types of crime for the EU Member States and the acceding countries*
- UNODC (2007), *Making the world safer from crime, drugs and terrorism*, Vienna: Vienna Information Centre
- VAN DER WILT, H. (2002), *Some critical reflections on the process of harmonization*, In KLIP, A, & VAN DER WILT, H (Eds.) (2002), *Harmonization and harmonizing measures in criminal law* (pp. 77-86), Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences
- VERMEULEN, G. (2002), *Where do we currently stand with harmonisation in Europe?*, In KLIP, A, & VAN DER WILT, H (Eds.) (2002), *Harmonization and harmonizing measures in criminal law* (pp. 65-76), Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences
- VERMEULEN, G., VANDER BEKEN, T., DE BUSSEER, E. & DORMAELS, A. (2002), *Blueprint for an EU Criminal Records Database*, Antwerp: Maklu
- VERMEULEN, G. (2006), *Europese en Internationale Instellingen en Organisaties*, Antwerpen: Maklu
- VERMEULEN, G (2007), *Vijftien jaar uniestrafrecht: verwezenlijkingen en perspectieven*, In MEEUSEN, J. & STRAETEMANS, G. (2007), *Politie en justitiële strafrechtelijke samenwerking in de Europese Unie. Welk evenwicht tussen vrijheid, veiligheid en rechtvaardigheid?* (pp. 79-108), Antwerpen: Intersentia

- VERMEULEN, G. (2008), *Mutual recognition, harmonisation and fundamental (procedural) rights*, In MARTIN, M. (ed.) (2008) *Crime Rights and the EU. The future of police and judicial cooperation* (pp. 89-104), London: Justice
- VOGEL, J. (2002), *Why is harmonisation of penal law necessary? A comment*, In KLIP, A, & VAN DER WILT, H (Eds.) (2002), *Harmonization and harmonizing measures in criminal law* (pp. 55-64), Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences
- WALKER, M.A. (1995), *Interpreting Crime Statistics*, Oxford : Clarendon press,
- WEYEMBERGH, A. (2002), *L'Harmonisation des législations : condition de l'espace pénal européen et révélateur de ses tensions*, Brussel : Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles
- WEYEMBERGH, A. (2006), *Le Rapprochement des incriminations et des sanctions pénales*, *Revue International de Droit Pénal*, Vol. 77, pp. 185-193.
- ZEITLER, H.E. (2006), *Environmental Criminal Law*, *Revue International de Droit Pénal*, Vol. 77, pp. 255-263

5.4 ELECTRONIC SOURCES OF INFORMATION

- AUSTRALIAN BUREAU OF STATISTICS (1997), *1234.0 Australian Standard Offence Classification (ASOC)*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.abs.gov.au/Ausstats/abs@.nsf/66f306f503e529a5ca25697e0017661f/a255559553152085ca25697e00184ac1!OpenDocument> [Accessed 10th July 2008]
- AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY (2008) [Online] Available from: <http://www.aic.gov.au/> [Accessed 12th June 2008]
- BRITISH SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY (2008) [Online] Available from: <http://www.britisoccrim.org/links.htm> [Accessed 21st May 2008][Online] Available from: <http://www.ceop.gov.uk/> [Accessed 21st May 2008][Online] Available from: <http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal%5Faffaires/legal%5Fco%2Doperation/Prisons%5Fand%5Falternatives/> [Accessed 12th May 2008]*Draft ad hoc terms of reference for the Council for Penological Co-operation relating to probation and aftercare services in the European criminal justice systems*, [Online] Available from: [http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_co-operation/steering_committees/cdpc/documents/pc-cp%20\(2006\)%2007%20rev3%20-%20e%20\(ToR%20probation\).pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_co-operation/steering_committees/cdpc/documents/pc-cp%20(2006)%2007%20rev3%20-%20e%20(ToR%20probation).pdf) [Accessed 16th May 2008]
- *Revised terms of reference of the Committee of Experts on the Evaluation of Anti-Money Laundering Measures and the Financing of Terrorism (MONEYVAL)*, [Online] Available from: [http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/moneyval/About/MONEYVAL\(2007\)Terms.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/moneyval/About/MONEYVAL(2007)Terms.pdf) [Accessed 16th May 2008]
- [Online] Available from: <http://www.esc-eurocrim.org/> [Accessed 21st May 2008]*Project* [Online] Available from: <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsSubscribe.nav?prodId=Journal201644&contribId=526989> & [Accessed 8th June 2008]*TE-SAT 2008 EU Terrorism situation and Trend Report*, [Online] Available from: http://www.europol.europa.eu/publications/EU_Terrorism_Situation_and_Trend_Report_TE-SAT/TE-SAT2008.pdf [Accessed 16th May 2008]
- [Online] Available from: <http://www.europeansourcebook.org/> [Accessed 18th July 2008] Available from: <http://pagesperso-orange.fr/societe.internationale.de.criminologie/> [Accessed 8th June 2008][Online] Available from: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/> [Accessed 10th May 2008] Available from: <http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/index.html> [Accessed 8th June 2008]

- 2008]SWEDISH NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR CRIME PREVENTION [Online] Available from: http://www.bra.se/extra/pod/?action=pod_show&id=1&module_instance=11 [Accessed 30th May 2008]
- THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY (2006) [Online] Available from: <http://www.asc41.com/> [Accessed 12th June 2008]
 - *The European Union and Cooperation in Criminal Matters: the Search for Balance*[Online] Available from: http://www.heuni.fi/uploads/gg29d0zcr1rpk_1.pdf/ [Accessed 21st May 2008]
 - *Crime and Culture Project* [Online] Available from: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/whats-new/welcome.htm/> [Accessed 8th June 2008]
 - U.S DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (2005), *About the UCR Program.* [Online] Available from: <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/killed/2005/aboutucr.htm> [Accessed 20th June 2008]
 - U.S DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION *A word about UCR data.* [Online] Available from: <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/word.htm> [Accessed 19th June 2008]
 - U.S DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS *Key crime and justice facts at a glance* [Online] Available from: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/glance.htm> [Accessed 19th June 2008]
 - [Online] Available from: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/whats-new/welcome.htm/> [Accessed 8th June 2008]