

PC-S-ST (99) 8 DEF

European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics

Directorate General I Legal Affairs

PC-S-ST (99) 8 DEF

Strasbourg, le 12 October 1999 dajIII/st/docs99/8edefst99.doc

EUROPEAN COMMITTEE ON CRIME PROBLEMS CDPC

European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics

prepared by the

Enlarged Group of Specialists on trends in crime and criminal justice (statistics and other quantitative data) (PC-S-ST)*

For the composition of the Group please refer to Chapter 0 «The Sourcebook Project : General Introduction» and the list of national correspondents.

List of national correspondents

Vasilika Hysi	Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Tirana	ALBANIA
Arno Pilgram	Researcher, Institut für Rechts- und Kriminalsoziologie, Vienna	AUSTRIA
Lucien Nouwynck	Conseiller Général, Ministry of Justice, Brussels	BELGIUM
Boyan Stankov	Professor, Deputy President of the Council for Criminological Research, Sofia	BULGARIA
Davor Krapac	Professor, School of Law, University of Zagreb	CROATIA
Androula Boularan	Criminological Research Officer, Ministry of Justice and Public Order, Nicosia	CYPRUS
Zdenek Karabec*	CZ Researcher, Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention, Prague	ECH REPUBLIC
Flemming Balvig	Professor, Institute of Legal Science, University of Copenhagen	DENMARK
Andri Ahven*	Researcher, Information and Communications Department, Police Board, Tallinn	ESTONIA
Kauko Aromaa	Research Director, National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Helsinki	FINLAND
Bruno Aubusson de Cavarlay* Pierre Tournier*	Ingénieur de recherches, CESDIP/CNRS, Ministry of Justice, Paris Ingénieur de recherches, CESDIP/CNRS, Ministry of Justice, Paris	FRANCE
Jörg-Martin Jehle*	Professor, Law Faculty, University of Göttingen	GERMANY

^{*} Member of the Enlarged Group of Specialists on trends in crime and criminal justice (PC-S-ST)

Calliope Spinellis*	Professor, Law School, University of Athens	GREECE
Imre Kertesz*	Professor, Advisor of the Chief Public Prosecutor's Office, Budapest	HUNGARY
Hildigunnur Ólafsdottir	Nordic Co-operation Council for Criminology Reykjavik	ICELAND
Noel O'Sullivan	Chief Superintendent, Crime Branch, Garda Headquarters, Dublin	IRELAND
Uberto Gatti*	Professor, University of Genoa	ITALY
Andrejs Vilks	Director of the Council of Crime Prevention, Criminological Research Centre, Riga	LATVIA
Antanasius Dapšis	Director, Institute of Law, Vilnius	LITHUANIA
Célestin Lommel	Conseiller juridique, NSIS/SIRENE, Gendarmerie grand-ducale, Luxembourg	LUXEMBOURG
Nancy Grosselfinger	Professor, Institute of Forensic Studies, University of Malta	MALTA
Comelia Vikleanschi	Public Prosecutor, Head of Department, General Prosecutor's Office, Chisinau	MOLDOVA
Max M. Kommer*	Policy Advisor, Ministry of Justice, The Hague	NETHERLANDS
Paul Smit*	Researcher, Minstry of Justice, WODC	NORWAY
Arnt Even Hustad	Executive Officer, Statistics Norway, Oslo	POLAND
Andrzej Siemaszko	Director, Institute of Justice, Ministry of Justice, Warsaw	

	PORTUGAL
Ana Vaz	Deputy Director General, Ministry of Justice, Lisbon
	ROMANIA
Ion Argesanu	Chief Prosecutor, Department of Criminology, General Prosecutor's Office, Bucarest
	RUSSIAN
Youri Golick	Advisor to the Chairman of the Council
Touri Gonek	of the Federation, Assembly of the Russian Federation, Moscow
	SLOVENIA
Franc Brine	Professor, Department of Criminology, Law Faculty, University of Ljubljana
	SPAIN
Alberto Laguia Arrazola*	Head of the Department for international organisations, Ministry of Justice, Madrid
	SWEDEN
Hanns von Hofer*	Professor, Department of Criminology, University of Stockholm
	SWITZERLAND
Martin Killias*	Professor, Institut de Police Scientifique
	et de Criminologie, UNIL–BCH, Lausanne University
Marcelo Aebi*	Assistant professor, Institut de Police Scientifique
	et de Criminologie, UNIL-BCH, Lausanne University
	THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA
Vlado Kambovski	Professor, Faculty of Law,
	"St. Cyril and Metodij" University, Skopje
	TURKEY
Feridun Yenisey	Professor, Faculty of Law, Marmara University, Istanbul
	UNITED KINGDOM
Gordon Barclay*	Head of Criminal Justice Information Co-ordination Group, Home Office, London

European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

0	Zero is a figure between 0 and 0.49
	Indicate that data is not (yet) available or that the
question	/ concept does not apply.
> 1000	More than one thousand

N.B.: In a number of tables, columns are headed by the variable name used in the SPSS database to analyse the data (e.g. R11HOT0 in table 1.B.1, first column). These variable names are included in the current edition for technical reasons and will be removed at a later stage.

CONTENTS

0. The Sourcebook Project: General Introduction	5
Appendix I14	4
Appendix II Offence definitions	7
1. Police statistics	9
1.A General comments	9
1.B Tables	1
1.C Technical information80	0
1.D Sources	9
2. Prosecution statistics	3
2.A General comments	3
2.B Tables	5
2.C Technical information	2
2.D Sources	7
3. Conviction statistics)
3.A General comments109)
3.B Tables	ĵ
3.C Technical information168	3
3.D Sources	ĵ
4. Correctional statistics)
4.A General comments)
4.B Tables	
4.C Technical information)
4.D Sources	•
5. Survey data	•
5.A General comments)
5.B Tables	
5.C Technical information	
5.D References	,

0 The Sourcebook Project: General Introduction

0.1 Background

1. The assessment of trends in crime and criminal justice has been a permanent concern of the European Committee on Crime Problems (CDPC). Periodic events, such as criminological and penological conferences and colloquia and, in particular, the quinquennial *Conferences on Crime Policy* have been set up to keep those trends under permanent review and to provide those responsible for tackling crime and running criminal justice institutions with appropriate up to date information.

2. Due to ongoing developments in Greater Europe and the ensuing enlargement of the membership of the Council of Europe, the necessity for such periodic assessment and comparison in the above mentioned areas had become even more apparent.

3. Against this background, the CDPC created in 1993 a Group of Specialists on "Trends in crime and criminal justice: statistics and other quantitative data on crime and criminal justice system" (PC-S-ST), which was composed of experts from France, Germany, Hungary, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom¹.

4. During a relatively short period of time, a great number of theoretical and technical issues were addressed (such as data comparison, offences to be considered and their definitions, appropriate table formats, statistical routines including counting rules in the various countries, interpretation of the available data, infrastructure needed for a full implementation of the Sourcebook Project etc.).

5. In 1995, the Group presented the European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics. Draft model (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1995, 194 pp) to the CDPC. The Draft model presented crime and criminal justice data for twelve European countries in 1990. Extensive technical comments were added to the tables in order to document the many methodological problems involved in international data collections. It was stated that: "Having found a practical and satisfactory way of handling the difficult problem of varying offence definitions and counting rules, the Group reached the conclusion that a European Sourcebook on crime and criminal justice statistics [was] indeed feasible." (op. cit., p. 190).

6. Thus, at its 45th plenary session in June 1996, the CDPC entrusted the Group of Specialists with preparing a compendium of crime and criminal justice data for the whole of Europe. The final document should represent an enlarged version of the already existing Model Sourcebook

¹ The members of the Group were: Martin Killias (Switzerland), Chaiman of the Group, Gordon Barclay (United Kingdom), Hanns von Hofer (Sweden), Inve Kertesz (Hungary), Max Kommer (Netherlands), Jörg-Martin Jehle (Germany), Chris Lewis (United Kingdom), Pierre Tournier (France). HEUNI was represented as an Observer (Kristiina Kangaspunta). Secretary to the Group : Wolfgang Rau, Directorate of Legal Affairs, Council of Europe

covering, if possible, the total membership of the Council of Europe and presenting crime and criminal justice data for the years 1990 to 1996. The Group was enlarged by additional specialists in the collection of statistical data and members were given responsibilities as "regional co-ordinators".²

7. In its work, the Group took account of the periodic surveys carried out by the UN and INTERPOL. These surveys relied on the provision of data by national sources who were asked to follow standard definitions. This approach contrasted with the Group's adopted methodology, where a co-ordinated network of national correspondents provided data from current statistical sources within each country. This data was then supplemented by the collection of information on statistical and legal definitions. The Group, which included several members involved in recent UN surveys, felt that this approach would allow more comprehensive and accurate data to be produced.

8. The system of national correspondents required that each country should have one person responsible for the collection and initial checking of the data. Each correspondent would be an expert in crime and criminal justice statistics and act as a helpline. They would also be entrusted with checking their country's reply to ensure good quality data.

9. The list of national correspondents was endorsed by the CDPC. The national correspondents had full responsibility for the accuracy of the data provided by their respective countries. A group of three or four national correspondents were 'coached' by each member of the Enlarged Group in their capacity as 'regional co-ordinators'.

10. The revised formal questionnaire was finalised in the summer of 1997, in both official languages of the Council of Europe. Completed questionnaires were received from 36 countries (including England & Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland).

11. The data was checked and corrected mainly during the second half of 1997 and the first half of 1998. The data collected was put into a database that was set up by the *Institut de police scientifique et de criminologie (IPSC)* of Lausanne University during the summer and autumn of 1998.³ The data in paper format was then returned to the regional co-ordinators for checking in co-operation with the national correspondents (for further details please refer to the section on *Validation*). The present report was drafted during spring 1999.

0.2 Offence definitions

12. Comparative criminology has to face the problem of national offence definitions which are often incompatible. The Group adopted the following procedure: For all offences included in the Sourcebook, a standard definition was used and countries were invited to follow the

² The new members of the Enlarged Group of Specialists were: Marcelo Aebi (Switzerland), Andri Ahven (Estonia), Uberto Gatti (Italy), Zdenek Karabec (Czech Republic), Vlado Kambovski (The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Alberto Laguia Arrazola (Spain) and Calliope Spinellis (Greece). Paul Smit (Netherlands) and Bruno Aubusson de Cavarlay (France) joined the Group in December 1997 and April 1998 respectively.

³ The database was developed by Mr Marcelo Aebi, who produced the tables presented in the Sourcebook. They were devised in Excel and SPSS for Macintosh.

standard definition where possible. Offence definitions and related commentaries are given in Appendix II to this chapter providing for each of the selected offences:

- the standard definition,
- a list of those countries which were not able to meet entirely this definition with an indication of which elements of the definition they were unable to meet. Countries not listed were able to fully conform to the standard definition.

0.3 The Structure of the Sourcebook

13. Although the aim of the Sourcebook Project was to collect data for the 1990-1996 period it was clear that this would put too heavy an administrative burden on countries. The data was therefore divided into:

- Key items: crimes, suspects and convictions (selected offences only).
- Non-key items: number of juveniles, women, aliens and sanctions/ineasures for selected offences. Resources, prison capacity.

14. The data for 1990-1996 was collected for key items. Data for 1995 only was collected for non-key items (the 1996 data was not available in many countries at this time). It was clearly a difficult decision to exclude time series data for sanctions/measures; however the Group felt that this decision was sensible as the many legal and administrative changes in Central and Eastern European countries rendered comparisons extremely difficult, in particular for the early 1990's.

15. Each chapter is subdivided into four sections:

- A. General comments
- B. Tables
- C. Technical information
- D. Sources

16. The Sourcebook is divided into five chapters:

1. *Police data* (offences and offenders [suspects] known to the police; police staff and expenditure). This chapter provides information on the volume of crime and the number of suspected offenders in each country. Most of the data is available as time series data for 1990-1996.

The selected offences focus almost exclusively (except for drug offences) on so-called *traditional* crimes. *Modern* crimes such as those relating to organised crime are not covered. The offences were:

1. Homicide

of which completed homicide (according to police and vital statistics)

- 2. Assault
- 3. Rape
- 4. Robbery

of which armed robbery

5. Theft

of which theft of motor vehicle

- of which bicycle theft
- of which burglary

of which domestic burglary

6. Drug offences

of which drug trafficking of which serious drug trafficking

II. *Prosecution statistics*. The chapter deals with the outcome of procedures at public prosecutor's level (prosecutors/investigative judges) during the years 1990-1996. It also provides data on the staff of the prosecuting authorities in 1995. Unlike most other tables in the Sourcebook, this chapter was not limited to specific types of offences, but covers *all offences* dealt with by the prosecuting authorities.

III. Conviction statistics. The tables in this chapter concern persons who bave been convicted, i.e. found guilty according to law, of having committed one of the selected offences. Information is presented by offence (1990-1996); the sex, age group, and nationality of the offender (1995); the type of sanctions imposed as well as the duration of unsuspended custodial sentences (1995). Sanctions were grouped under the following categories:

1. Fines

- 2. Non-custodial sanctions and measures
- 3. Suspended custodial sanctions and measures
- 4. Unsuspended custodial sentences
- 5. Death penalty

IV. Correctional statistics. The chapter contains data on prison populations (1990-1997) stemming from the Annual Penal Statistics of the Council of Europe (SPACE) and from the Sourcebook questionnaire; the number of penal institutions (1995); expenditure related to the prison service and persons under the supervision or care of the correctional services (1990-1996). The chapter also contains a summary of information available on reconviction studies.

V. Survey data. The chapter presents data from international victimisation surveys on crimes against individuals.

0.4 Methodological issues

0.4.1 Data recording methods

17. Since the timing and method of recording can have a considerable impact on a statistical measure the Group paid much attention to the way in which national data were collected and recorded, and what operational definitions were applied at the several stages of the criminal justice process. Detailed information provided on this has been summarised in the form of tables and short comments.

0.4.2 Validation

18. Validation is often the most important and in many cases the most forgotten stage of the data collection process. As a first step, the Group identified and discussed obvious problems relating to this process. It then produced a series of check-tables to assist further validation. The function of these tables was:

- 1. To check whether individual cells added up to the totals given in the tables. It turned out that this was not always the case.
- II. To compare figures and to ensure that they were consistent throughout the replies to the Sourcebook questionnaire. It had to he checked, for example, whether the number of persons sentenced to unsuspended custodial sentences was compatible with the figure contained in the sentence length tables.
- III. To calculate rates per 100,000 population for the key items and to check for 'outliers', i.e. extreme values which are difficult, if not impossible, to explain.
- IV. To look at the attrition process of recorded offences, suspects, convictions and imprisonment; to recheck 'outliers' assuming that, starting with recorded crime (on an offence basis), the number of suspects (person's basis) will be lower and the number of convictions leading to an unsuspended custodial sentence will be lower still.
- V. To compare the proportion of juveniles, women and aliens in the tables for the number of suspects and convictions. Did these proportions make sense (80 per cent juvenile suspects would seem out of proportion) and were they consistent with other relevant figures?

19. This procedure resulted in the need to go hack to many national correspondents for clarification and additional cross-checking. Although some errors were made when completing the questionnaire, it became apparent that the survey had identified many differences in national systems of criminal justice statistics, which had not become apparent in the previous Model Sourcebook. Part of this was due to the problems of language, as several national correspondents had to translate the questionnaire into their respective national languages and, in doing so, altered the definition of the information required. Other problems were related to the different criminal justice processes in the countries concerned. It is important to note that:

- I. in several countries serious cases (eg homicide) entered the criminal justice process at public prosecutor's level and were therefore not reflected in the police statistics.
- II. the items of the Sourcebook questionnaire concerning prosecution statistics failed to fully identify what happened to cases that did not reach the court.
- III. there was a general problem with homicide statistics, namely whether the figures collected represented those initially or finally recorded as homicides.
- IV. when is a vehicle said to have been stolen? It was important to ensure that if a vehicle was recovered the offence was still included.
- V. the inclusion of fines by the prosecutor in the sentencing tables (i.e. sanctions/measures) was not always possible since a breakdown by offence was not always available. In addition, the sentencing tables often combined data from more than one source and were therefore likely to include double-counts.
- VI. the different ways in which countries handled juvenile offenders led to inconsistencies as to whether they were included or not in every table.

20. In some cases it was possible to correct the data, whilst in others more or less detailed explanations had to be given. However, despite the considerable efforts made by the Group to detect errors and inconsistencies in the data, not all of these might have been identified; nor was it possible to deal with all errors and inconsistencies in a fully satisfactory way.

0.5 **Presentational details**

21. In order to increase the clarity of the present report, the Group took the following practical decisions, namely

- I. To make *all* raw data and *all* comments available in a separate document through the Council of Europe ("Basic tables and commentaries")⁴. Thus, the present document contains only a selection of all the data and commentaries submitted.
- II. To eliminate all tables where the number of reporting countries was less than ten (with the exception of the tables concerning serious drug trafficking in Chapter 1).
- III. To use decimals sparingly so as to avoid the impression of false precision.
- IV. To use the following symbols throughout the tables:
 - a) "0" to indicate a number between 0 and 0.49;

⁴ Available on request from the Division of Crime Problems, Directorate of Legal Affairs, Council of Europe, F – 67075 Strasbourg CEDEX.

b) "..." to indicate that data is not (yet) available or that the question / concept as used in the Sourcebook questionnaire does not apply;

c) "> 1000" to indicate that the percentage change between 1990 and 1996 is above one thousand per cent.

- V. to condense the vast amount of technical information on definitions, data collection methods, processing rules etc. into clearly arranged summary tables, listings and footnotes.
- VI. whenever possible and reasonable, figures were transformed into rates per 100,000 population or indicated as percentages. The population figures used are contained in the appendix to this introduction.
- VII. national currencies were converted into ECU. The respective exchange rates are contained in the appendix to this introduction.
- VIII. to use the following measures throughout the tables to provide information on the date's dispersion:

a) Mean: The arithmetic average; the sum of scores divided by the number of countries that provided data. The value of the mean is sensitive to the presence of very high or very low scores. For this reason the median was also included as an indicator of the central tendency of the data.

b) Median: The median was the score that divides the distribution of scores into two exact halves

- c) Minimum: The lowest score in the table.
- d) Maximum: The highest score in the table.
- e) Percentage change 1990-96 (based upon unrounded scores whenever possible).

0.6 Comparability

22. The basic aim of the Sourcebook data collection was to present comparable information on crime and criminal justice statistics in Europe. However, the issue of whether or not it is feasible to use official criminal justice statistics for decision-making in crime policy or for conducting scientific studies is one of the classic debates of criminology. The problems involved are even more serious when it comes to international comparisons, because nations differ widely in the way they organise their police and court systems, the way they define their legal concepts, and the way they collect and present their statistics. In fact, the lack of uniform definitions of offences, of common measuring instruments and of common methodology makes comparisons between countries extremely hazardous. This is the reason why criminologists in recent years have developed alternatives to complement the existing official statistics:

international comparative victimisation studies on the one hand and international comparative self-report studies on the other (see Chapter 5).

23. There can be no doubt that international comparisons based on official statistics give rise to delicate problems. The Fifth Criminological Colloquium of the Council of Europe in the beginning of the 1980's was exclusively devoted to these issues. The question, however, whether official data can be used or not, cannot be answered once and for all. The answer is *empirical* in nature. Thus, the intended use of the data should determine whether or not the data is suitable as a basis for analysis.

24. Comparative analyses generally fall into one of three categories: (I) distributive comparisons, (II) level comparisons and, (III) trend comparisons.

- I. *Distributive* comparisons are aimed at answering questions such as: Do theft offences dominate the crime picture in most countries? What is the age profile of sentenced offenders in the various countries?
- II. Relevant questions for *level* comparisons are of the following type: Which country reports the highest robbery rate? Which countries show low rates of incarcerated offenders?
- III. In contrast, interpretations of *trends* deal with such questions as: did the increase in rape offences differ over time in various countries? Did the number of community sentences increase in all countries between 1990 1996?

25. Before these and other questions can be answered, it should be noted that official crime and criminal justice statistics are fundamentally dependent upon three sets of circumstances: (i) *actual circumstances* such as the propensity of individuals to commit crimes, the opportunity structure, the risk of detection, the willingness of the public to report crimes, the efficiency of criminal justice authorities; (ii) *legal circumstances* such as the design of the Criminal Code, the Code of Criminal Procedure and other relevant legislation; the formal organisation of criminal justice agencies and the informal application of the law in everyday life; and (iii) *statistical circumstances* such as the formal data collection and processing rules and their practical implementation.

26. To ensure comparability when making *distribution* and *level* comparisons, one must carefully control the legal and statistical circumstances before concluding that similarities or dissimilarities can be taken as real. The demands are somewhat different when it comes to ascertaining crime *trends*. For such analyses, the "real" crime level does not need to be known; it is sufficient to control for possible changes to the legal and statistical systems. This is of course a difficult task, and identifying *informal* changes in criminal justice procedures and in statistical routines is especially difficult.

27. In order to facilitate the use of the data contained in this Sourcebook, comprehensive additional information concerning the definition of offences and sanctions, the data collection and processing rules was collected. This information is contained in section C of each chapter. More specifically, each table is accompanied by a list of questions intended to clarify the scope

of data. For example, in some countries "assault" included legally and/or statistically not only "wounding" but also "causing bodily pain". Consequently, the latter will report a higher frequency of assault - *ceteris paribus*. By studying these specific questions carefully, it should be possible to identify those countries which tend to over-report (or to under-report) offence frequencies. However, it is not possible to easily quantify the extent to which over or under-reporting occurs.

0.7 Basic rules on how to use the statistical information contained in the Sourcehook

- 1. Do not use any figures from the Sourcebook without referring to the technical information provided in section C of each chapter.
- 2. Do not over-interpret relatively 'small' differences in the tables, especially between countries.
- 3. Do not over-interpret relatively 'large' differences in the tables, especially between countries.
- Do not stress differences between individual countries too much. It is better to compare an individual country with a larger group of countries or with the average for all countries.
- 5. Whenever possible, avoid using the tables on police reported offences for 'level' comparisons between countries. Rather, they should be used for 'trend' comparisons.
- 6. Avoid interpreting 'large' variations from one year to another as evidence for changes in the measured phenomenon. Sudden increases or decreases are often merely indicative of modifications in the law or in the underlying statistical routines/counting rules.

APPENDIX I POPULATION FIGURES AND CURRENCY EXCHANGE RATES

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997
Albania	3273	3259	3189	3154	3178	3219	3263	3300
Austria	7718	7808	7907	7995	8059	8101	8126	8133
Belgium	996 2	999 3	10036	10077	10109	10134	10152	10165
Bułgaria	8966	8914	8869	8495	8448	8399	8345	8291
Croatia	4754	4796	4714	4687	4723	4701	4661	4665
Сургиз	681	694	707	719	727	733	739	744
Czech Republic	10310	10309	10319	10329	10333	10327	10313	10298
Denmark	5141	5154	5171	5188	5206	5234	5271	5305
Estonia	1573	1568	1546	1517	1496	1474	1454	1437
Finland	4986	5014	5041	5065	5086	5105	5122	5137
France	56735	57055	57373	57655	57902	58149	58391	58609
Germany**	(62679)	(65001)	(80732)	(81281)	(81613)	(81860)	(82021)	(82072)
Greece	10123	10280	10349	10414	10469	10519	10569	10616
Hungary	10352	10352	10343	10326	10307	10285	10259	10232
Ireland	3508	35 30	3549	3563	3573	35 84	3595	3607
Italy	56761	56764	56804	56856	56897	56909	56878	56831
Latvia	2672	2663	2631	2586	2547	2504	2461	2421
Lithuania	3702	3709	3707	3694	3677	3657	3636	3617
Luxembourg	382	386	391	3 97	402	409	415	420
Malta	354	357	361	365	368	371	374	377
Moldova	4398	4428	4448	44 6 0	4463	4462	4459	4457
Netberlands	14952	15066	15174	15275	15382	15459	15561	15650
Norway	4242	4261	4285	4310	4334	4357	4379	4400
Poland	381 09	38242	38359	3 8456	38537	38590	38611	38615
Portugal	98 71	9865	9863	9880	9 9 04	9921	9929	9931
Romania	22775	22728	22 692	22660	22627	22582	22524	22463
Russia	148088	148465	148592	148483	148306	148124	147746	147306
Slovenia	19 69	1966	1 9 59	1960	1965	1970	1974	1973
Spain	3879 3	38847	38930	38998	39044	39073	39090	39108
Sweden	8559	8624	8 673	8722	8783	8828	8846	8865
Switzerland	6844	6919	6994	7062	7127	7178	7213	7240
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	2031	2 039	2056	2071	1946	1967	1982	1996
Turkey	56123	57196	58266	5932 8	60385	61437	62484	63530
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	50898	51044	51217	51376	51565	51757	51917	52061
Northern Ireland	1578	1583	1588	1 59 3	1599	1605	1610	1614
Scotland	5031	5045	5062	5078	5097	5115	5131	5145

Table IA Population Estimates, 1990-1997 (in 1000s)*

* Figures are mid-year population numbers.

** See table IB.

Source: The International Data Base from the US Bureau of Census. The official population statistics of the United Kingdom were used to calculate the figures for England & Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

Table (B	Population	estimates	for Germany,	1990-1996*
----------	------------	-----------	--------------	------------

	-	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Police	West-Germany incl. West-Berlin	63254	p.4-					
statistics	West-Germany incl. whole of Berlin	- * -			*-*			
	Germany incl. Former East	•••	79984	80594	81179	81422	81661	81896
Prosecution	West-Germany incl. West-Berlin	63254	64074	64865				
statistics	West-Germany incl. whole of Berlin		***		66831	67160		
	Germany incl. Former East	***					81661	81 89 6
Conviction	West-Germany incl. West-Berlin	63254	64074	64865	65534	65858		
statistics	West-Germany incl. whole of Berlin	***		***			67458	67643
	Germany incl. Former East				***			
Correctional	West-Germany incl. West-Berlin	63254	64074	***	,			
statistics	West-Germany incl. whole of Berlin		•••	***	66831	67160		-+-
	Germany incl. Former East					•-	81661	

* The table shows the reference population for the different statistics in the course of adaptation to the unification of West and East Germany.

Source: Statistical Yearbook 1997 (published by the Federal Statistical Office), tables 3.1 and 3.2.

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997
Albania	20.505	32.500	120.183	110.544	117.576	123.831	129.147	
Austria	14 595	13.896	14.068	13.600	13.492	13.256	13.725	
Belgium	42.352	40,651	41.110	40.443	39.160	38.651	40.102	
Bulgaria	3.828	23. 790	29.488	36.635	81.192	92.900	610.650	
Croatia	44.5		-++	7.349	6.924	6.985	6.942	•••
Cyprus	0.595	0.571	0.598	0.582	0.585	0.600	0.589	
Czech Republic	+=+			33,544	34.501	34.952	34.244	
Denmark	7.896	7.687	7.750	7.585	7.482	7.287	7.448	
Estonia			15.998	15.543	15.240	15.061	15.587	
Finland	4.968	5,373	6,499	6.478	5.834	5.728	5.819	5.983
France	7.011	6.734	6.822	6.602	6,576	6.439	6.562	
Germany	2.042	1.971	2.000	1.933	1.905	1.883	1.948	1-1+
Greece	215.473	227.864	265.865	279.126	295.323	311.471	309.516	•••
Hungary	84.001	98,306	104.039	112.784	136.149	183.264	206.657	
Ireland	0.770	0.742	0.761	0.794	0.795	0.819	0.746	
Italy	1544.847	1496.430	1822.445	1908.480	2004.531	2082.296	1917.842	
Latvia	4+4	***		0.666	0.674	0.706	0.697	0.651
Lithuania				4.368	4.920	5.256	5.012	
Luxembourg	42.352	40.651	41.110	40.443	39.160	38.651	40.102	***
Malta	0.411	0.398	0.463	0.442	0.453	0.463	0.451	***
Moldova				4.077	5,252	5.912	5.826	**-
Netherlands	2.310	2.223	2.248	2.174	2.134	2.108	2.185	
Norway	8.075	7.765	8.579	8.420	8.317	8.303	8.072	+++
Poland	*#*	1.425	1.954	2.390	2.998	3.243	3.602	3.883
Portugal	(82.63)	174.439	181.833	198.029	195.684	196.329	195.950	***
Romania	47.449	245.700	569 .9 40	1429.120	2173.410	3387.492	5055.855	
Russia	** -	2.171		1.397	4.366	6.097	6.967	
Slovenia			120,183	147.661	155.546	165.551	177.299	
Spain	132.475	125.694	142.018	159.280	162.039	159.531	164.488	
Sweden	7.789	7.188	8.726	9.299	9.177	8.749	8.609	**-
Switzerland	1.770	1.762	1.804	1.656	1.613	1.511	1.687	
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia				•••	***		***	
Turkey	4005.4	6603.9	10611.3	16209.8	47633.0	78380.1	135042.1	
United Kingdom	0.709	0.696	0.819	0.756	0.787	0.848	0.738	

fable IC Exchange Rates, 1990-1997. National currency in ECU*

* End of period, mid-point rates. Calculations in Euro were not possible since no exchange rates exist for the years 1990-1996. Exchange rates for 1997 are given only for countries that gave figures in national currency for that year. All currency exchange rates are being given with three decimals except for Turkey.

Sources:

1990-1992: United Nations, Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, Vol. L No. 1 (January 1996), pp. 188-193 (Table 52. Exchange rates). 1993-1996: United Nations, Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, Vol. LII No. 7 (July 1998), pp. 192-197 (Table 51. Exchange rates). 1997: United Nations, Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, Vol. LII No. 11 (November 1998), pp. 192-197 (Table 51. Exchange rates).

APPENDIX II OFFENCE DEFINITIONS

The offence definitions given hereafter are operational, not legal definitions ('standard' definitions). They were devised so as to allow national correspondents to provide the necessary data for their countries and to specify the scope of the statistical (and legal) definitions underlying their (police and conviction) statistics. Where the legal concept used differed from the standard definition – which occurred in particular in connection with conviction statistics – this is indicated in the technical comments (see 3.C.0).

A) Intentional homicide

According to the standard definition, intentional homicide means intentional killing of a person. Where possible, the figures include:

- assault leading to death
- euthanasia
- assistance with suicide
- infanticide.

This means that the providers of the data (= national correspondents) were requested to ensure that 'their' figures included, where available from their national statistics, 'assault leading to death', 'euthanasia', etc.

Countries which were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects are presented in the following table.

Table 0.II.A: Deviations from the standard definition of homicide

	assault leading to death	euthanasia	assistance with suicide	infanticide
Belgium	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
Bulgaria	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	
Croatia	Excluded		Excluded	
Cyprus			Excluded	
Czech Republic	Excluded		Excluded	Excluded
Denmark		Excluded	Excluded	
Estonia	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	
France			Excluded	
Germany	Excluded		Excluded	
Greece	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
Hungary			Excluded	
Ireland		Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
Italy		Excluded	Excluded	
Latvia	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
Luxembourg		***		
Malta			Excluded	
Moldova	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	
Netherlands	Excluded			
Norway	Excluded			Excluded
Portugal			Excluded	
Romania		Excluded	Excluded	
Russia		Excluded	Excluded	
Slovenia		Excluded		
Sweden			Excluded	Excluded
United Kingdom:				
England & Wales			Excluded	
Nortbern Ireland			Excluded	

B) Assault

According to the standard definition, assault means inflicting bodily injury on another person with intent. Where possible, the figures exclude:

- assault leading to death
- threats
- only causing pain
- slapping/punching
- sexual assault.

Countries which were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects are presented in the following table.

	assault leading to death	threats	only causing pain	slapping / punching	sexual assault
Сургиз			Included	Included	
Czech Republic	Included				
Denmark	Included		Included	Included	
Estonia	Included		Included	Included	
Finland		Included	Included	Included	Included
Germany	Included				
Greece	Included			Included	
Ireland				Included	
Latvia	Included				
Lithuania	***		1 .		- 1 4
Malta				Included	
Moldova	Included				
Netherlands	Included		Included	Included	
Norway			Included	Included	
Portugal			Included	Included	
Russia	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
Sweden			Included	Included	
The F.Y.R.O. Macedouia	Included		Included	Included	
Turkey			Included	Included	
United Kingdom:					
Scotland			Included	Included	

Table 0.II.B: Deviations from the standard definition of assault

C) <u>Rape</u>

According to the standard definition, rape means sexual intercourse with a person against her/his will (per vaginam or other). Where possible, the figures include:

- violent intra-marital intercourse
- sexual intercourse without force with a helpless person
- sexual intercourse with force with a minor

but exclude:

- sexual intercourse with a minor without force
- other forms of sexual assault.

Countries which were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects are presented in the following table (see also the remarks relating to the table).

	violent intra- marital intercourse	sexual intercourse without force with a helpless person	sexual intercourse with force with a minor	sexual intercourse with a minor without force	other forms of sexual assauli
Belgium				Included	
Bulgaria	Excluded			Included	
Croatia	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded		
Cyprus				Included	
Denmark		Excluded			
Germany	Excluded	Excluded			
Greece	Excluded	Excluded			
Hungary	+14			Included	
Italy				Included	Included
Latvia	Excluded	Excluded			
Moldova	Excluded				
Netherlands	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded		
Norway			Excluded		
Portugal				Included	
Romania	Excluded				
Sweden		Excluded			
Turkey	Excluded			Included	
United Kingdom:					
Northern Ireland	Excluded				

Table 0.11.C: Deviations from the standard definition of rape

Remarks concerning the definition of rape:

Finland: Violent intra-marital intercourse has been included since 1995. The figures refer to female victims only.

France: Figures include sexual intercourse with a minor if the act is committed by a person who is the minor's parent or (temporary) guardian.

Lithuania: Figures include attempts.

Romania: Figures relate to female victims only.

Switzerland: Violent intra-marital intercourse, sexual intercourse without force with a helpless person and sexual intercourse with force with a minor have been included since 1.10.1992.

The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia: Violent intra-marital intercourse, sexual intercourse without force with a helpless person and sexual intercourse with force with a minor have been included since 1996.

D) <u>Robbery</u>

According to the standard definition, robbery means stealing from a person with force or threat of force. Where possible, the figures include:

- muggings (bag-snatching)

- theft immediately followed by violence

but exclude:

pickpocketing

- extortion

blackmail

Figures for all countries exclude pickpocketing and blackmail.

Countries which were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects are presented in the following table (see also the remarks relating to the table).

	muggings (bag- snatching)	theft immediately followed by violence	extortion	
Bulgaria			Included	
Сургиз			Included	
Czech Republic	Excluded	Excluded		
Hungary	Excluded			
Italy	Excluded	Excluded		
Lithuania		Excluded		
Malta		Excluded		
Poland	Excluded			
Sweden	Excluded			
United Kingdom:				
Scotland		Excluded		

Table 0.11.D: Deviations from the standard definition of robbery

Remarks concerning the definition of robbery:

Belgium: Figures refer to all kinds of "aggravated" theft.

Estonia: The definition of robbery includes theft with minor violence or minor threats.

Lithuania: The definition of robbery was widened as from 1 January 1995.

E) Armed robbery

According to the standard definition, armed robbery means robbery committed by using weapons. Where possible, the figures include:

- all kinds of weapons, not only firearms

- replica of weapons, toys, etc.

Countries which were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects are presented in the following table (see also the remarks relating to the table).

Table 0.II.E: Deviations from the standard definition of armed robbery

	all kinds of weapons, not only firearms	replica of weapons, toys, etc.		
Belgium		Excluded		
Bulgaria		Excluded		
France	Excluded	Excluded		
Germany	Excluded	Excluded		
Ireland				
Lithuanía		Excluded		
Poland		Excluded		
Portugal		•••		
Romania		Excluded		
Russia		Excluded		
Sweden	Excluded			

Remarks concerning the definition of armed robbery

Sweden: Robberies committed with replica of weapons (or toys) are included only if they look like firearms.

F) <u>Theft</u>

According to the standard definition, theft means depriving a person/organisation of property without force with the intent to keep it. Where possible, the figures include:

employee theft
theft of small value
but exclude:
embezzlement
receiving/handling of stolen goods.
Figures for all countries exclude these two offences.

Countries which were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects are presented in the following table.

Table 0.11.F: Deviations from the standard definition of theft

	employee theft4	theft of small value
Austria		Excluded
Сургиз		Excluded
Czech Republic		Excluded
Estonia	Excluded	
Germany	Excluded	
Hungary		Excluded
Lithuania		Excluded
Moldova		Excluded
Norway		Excluded
Poland	Excluded	
Romania	Excluded	
Russia		Excluded
Switzerland		Excluded

⁴ The indications given here should be taken with caution since, in most continental countries, theft by employees who have a legitimate access to goods is considered as embezzlement. Often, however, the actual circumstances were unclear at the point in time where such "thefts" were recorded.

G) Theft of motor vehicle

According to the standard definition, theft means depriving a person/organisation of property without force with the intent to keep it. Where possible, the figures include:

- motorboats

- receiving/handling stolen vehicles

Figures for all countries exclude receiving/handling stolen vehicles.

Countries which were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects are presented in the following table (see also the remarks relating to the table).

Table 0.II.G: De	viations from the s	standard definition o	of motor vehicle theft

	motorboats		
Croatia	Included		
Finland	Included		
Greece	Included		
Lithuania	Included		
Norway	Included		
Poland	Included		
Sweden	Included		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	Included		
Turkey	Included		

Remarks concerning the definition of motor vehicle theft:

Belgium: Figures refer to theft of cars only.

Poland: Figures refer to theft of cars only.

Remark concerning bicycle theft:

Luxembourg: Figures include theft of motorbikes.

H) <u>Burglary</u>

According to the standard definition, burglary means gaining access to a closed part of a building or other premises by the use of force with the objective to steal goods. Where possible, the figures include:

- theft from a factory, shop, office, etc.
- theft from a military establishment
- theft using counterfeit keys
- but exclude: theft from
- cars
- containers
- vending machines
- parking meters
- fenced meadow/compound

Countries which were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects are presented in the following table (see also the remarks relating to the table).

	from a factory, shop, office, etc.	from a military establish- ment	by using false keys	from a car	from a container	from a vending machine	from a parking meter	from a fenced meadow / compound
Albania				Included				
Austria					Included		Included	
Bulgaria		Excluded	Excluded	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
Croatia								***
Czech Republic				Included	Included	Included	Included	
Estonia				Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
Finland				Included	Included		***	• p.=
Greece				Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
Italy	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded					
Latvia			Excluded					
Moldova				Included	Included		Included	Included
Netherlands				Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
Norway				Included				Included
Poland				Included	Included			Included
Romania	Excluded	Excluded						
Russia				Included	Included	Included		Included
Slovenia					Included	Included	Included	Included
Sweden					Included	Included	Included	
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia				Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
United Kingdom:								
Northern Ireland			Excluded		Included			
Scotland		Excluded						

Table 0.II.H: Deviations from the standard definition of burglary

Remarks concerning the definition of burglary:

Northern Ireland: Figures include burglary committed from a container only if the latter is being used as a permanem structure (e.g. as a store).

I) Domestic burglary

According to the standard definition, domestic burglary means gaining access to private premises by the use of force with the objective of stealing goods. Where possible, the figures include:

- theft from an attic, basement in a multi-dwelling building

- theft from a secondary residence (even if unoccupied)

but exclude: theft from

- a detached garage, shed, barn or stable

- a fenced garden, porch, patio

Countries which were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects are presented in the following table.

Table 0.11.1: Deviations from the standard definition of domestic burglary						
	from an attic, basement in a multi-dwelling building	from a secondary residence (even if it is unoccupied)	from a detached garage, shed, barn or stable	from a fenced garden, porch, patio		
Albania			Included	Included		
Bulgaria			Included	Included		
Estonia	Excluded	Excluded				
Finland	Excluded					
Hungary			Included			
Ireland			Included			
Italy	Excluded	Excluded				
Latvia		Excluded				
Netherlands			Included	Included		
Norway	Excluded					
Poland		Excluded		Included		
Romania			Included	Included		
Russia			Included	Included		
Sweden	Excluded	Excluded				
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia			Included	Included		
Turkey			Included	Included		
United Kingdom:						
Scotland			Included			

J) Drug offences

Unlike the other definitions, drug offences have a fairly standard meaning due to international conventions. Where possible, the figures *include:*

- · possession of drugs
- cultivation
- production
- sale
- supplying
- transportation
- importation
- exportation
- financing of drug operations.

Figures for all responding countries include production, sale and supplying.

Countries which were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects are presented in the following table (see also the remarks relating to the table).

	possession	cultivation	transportation	importation	exportation	financing of drug operations
Austria						Excluded
Belgium						Excluded
Bulgaria						Excluded
Croatia	Excluded					
Czech Republic	Excluded					
Estonia						+4 =
Finland						
France						Excluded
Germany						Excluded
Hungary						
Ireland			Excluded		Excluded	Excluded
Italy	Excluded					
Latvia						Excluded
Lithoania						
Netherlands						
Poland	Excluded					
Romania						Excluded
Stovenia	Excluded					
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia				Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
United Kingdom:						
England & Wales	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded			Excluded
Scotland						Excluded

Remarks on the definition of drug offences

Croatia: Drug possession became punishable in 1996.

Finland: The scope of drug offences was widened in 1994.

Hungary: With effect from 15 May 1993, drug possession for personal use is no longer punishable if the offender is undergoing drug treatment.

Italy: Consumption of drugs has not been punishable since 1994.

Lithuania: Illegal use of narcotics has not been punishable since 1994.

Netherlands: Drug offences are usually not prosecuted if the offence concerns small quantities and/or personal use. Thus, the figures given refer almost exclusively to drug trafficking.

K) Drug trafficking

All countries providing figures consider *trafficking* (i.e. an aggravated offence) as handling drugs (as listed under J) not for personal use, but with the aim of giving access to drugs to another person, usually with the intent of making a profit. This differentiation is not necessarily a legal one, but it results frequently from police practice. The differentiation between trafficking and other drug offences (i.e. mainly consumption) is not made in all countries. This explains why some countries do not provide figures for either trafficking, or the total of drug offences.

L) Serious drug trafficking

In some countries, a further differentiation is made – either in law or at the level of police statistics – between drug trafficking in general, and more serious trafficking offences. <u>Serious</u> drug trafficking, as an aggravated offence, presupposes either the handling of large quantities of drugs, making large profits, or large-scale commercial or professional organisation.

1 POLICE STATISTICS

1.A GENERAL COMMENTS

1.A.1 Background

1. This chapter provides information on offences recorded by the police, the number and some characteristics of suspected offenders, the number of police staff and expenditure related to police work.

1.A.1.1 Police statistics as a measure of crime

2. Although police statistics are collected by all countries they do not in themselves provide a good measure of crime. There are several reasons for that.

3. The first is, that victims may choose not to report the crime to the police or even may not be aware that they were a victim. There may be reasons for not reporting an offence: reporting may be self-incriminating (e.g., when the victim was in one way or another an offender at the same time) or humiliating; or the victim may think that nothing is to be gained by reporting (e.g., the victim expects the police not to be able to solve the burglary or return the stolen goods). Whatever the reason, if a victim did not report and the police did not learn about the offence from another source, the offence will not be recorded by the police and therefore not counted in police statistics. In criminological literature, the general opinion is that sexual offences and domestic violence, for example, tend to be underreported, while the reporting of property offences will depend on whether the property was insured or not.

4. Even when a crime is reported to the police, it might not be recorded in police statistics. There are many reasons why a reported crime is not recorded: the main one is that after initial inquiries the police think that the event reported did not actually constitute an offence.

5. In some circumstances the police may also know of a crime even if it was not reported to them by the victim or witness. This is sometimes the case with violent offences e.g. homicide (a dead body is found), and it is certainly the case with the so-called victimless offences (i.e., offences against rules and regulations, such as illegal possession of arms, drunken driving and most drug offences).

1.A.1.2 The position of the police in the criminal justice system

6. In addition to what was said in the previous paragraph, it is important to make three remarks on the position of the police in the criminal justice system, which might have an impact on the number of offences recorded and the number of police staff and expenditure.

7. Although in most countries the police can be regarded as the first stage of the criminal justice process, this does not mean that the figures on recorded crime given in this chapter of the Sourcebook give a complete impression of the total input to the criminal justice system. In a number of countries, the prosecuting authorities may initiate criminal proceedings without having received a police report. For example, in some of the Eastern European countries serious violent offences will not always be recorded by the police, but by the public prosecutor's office. Also in many countries, other agencies (military police, customs, border police, fiscal fraud squads) and individuals (foresters, judges, or even citizens) may have the power to initiate criminal proceedings by filing a complaint with the prosecution authorities or the court. However, most of the offences covered by the Sourcebook – with the possible exception of drug offences – will be reported to / detected by the police.

8. The position of the police in the criminal justice system is not only relevant to the extent to which crime recorded at police level may be seen as a measure of the input into the criminal justice system. It may also directly influence the number of offences recorded and their classification. Firstly, in some countries the police may be quite independent in its activities, while in others they work under the close supervision of the prosecutor or the court. Secondly, the police may have the power to 'label' the incidents they investigate as specific offences, or they may have to leave this task to the prosecutor. This difference may also have consequences for the relative distribution of the various types of offences dealt with in the Sourcebook (see below).

9. When looking at police staff and expenditure, and especially when trying to relate these to the "output" of the police in terms of reported or recorded crime, it is important to note that there are large differences between countries in the tasks the police carry out. In some countries, these tasks are limited to dealing with criminal offences. In most countries the police deal with traffic offences like drunken driving, causing bodily harm or petty traffic offences (like speeding and illegal parking). Also, in most countries, the police have the additional task of maintaining public order and of assisting the public in different situations (from providing information to rendering first aid). This might not apply, however, to all types of police or related agencies, which have been included in the tables on police staff and expenditure. Therefore, care should be taken when relating police resources to the volume of recorded crime or the number of suspected offenders.

1.A.1.3 Counting offences and offenders

10. Apart from the classification problem -a dead body in the road is a dead body, but should it be recorded as a murder victim, a victim of assault, a victim of a parachuting accident or of natural death? – there are three other problems to be kept in mind when looking at police statistics. The first is the point in time at which the offence was recorded in the statistics. Was it following an initial report ("input" statistic) or subsequent to an initial investigation ("output" statistic)? The second is

the so-called multiple offence problem: one offence can consist of several offences (e.g. rape, followed by a homicide and the use of an illegal weapon). It is important to know whether the offences committed were counted separately or whether a principal offence rule was applied (i.e. only counting the most serious offence). The third problem is that of serial or continuous offending. Is a gang rape counted as one rape or several? If a woman reports that her husband battered her on many occasions over a period of several weeks, does this represent one offence or several offences? What about somebody who operates a laboratory in which amphetamines are produced over a long period?

11. Similar problems arise in connection with the counting of offenders. In most countries, a person will only be considered as an offender if his or her guilt has been proven. However, such a conclusion is the end-result of a judicial process. Therefore, at police level it is common practice to speak of "suspects" or "suspected offenders". This fact however introduces new problems: at what point in time, exactly, is it appropriate to record a person as a suspected offender? Here again, major differences between countries exist, where practices range from recording a person as a "suspected offender" as soon as the police are reasonably convinced that he or she was the offender (even though they may not have questioned him or her), to recording a person as a "suspect" only after the prosecutor has started criminal proceedings against him or her.

12. It was obviously beyond the reach of the Group to standardise counting rules or to harmonise offence definitions. Therefore, an attempt has been made to provide the user of the Sourcebook with information that might be helpful in correctly interpreting the data presented (see section 1.C).

1.A.1.4 Counting police officers and determining police expenditure

13. European countries organise their police systems in different ways. Most of them have more than one police force, e.g. State police, communal police, municipal police, gendarmerie or judicial police, all of which perform tasks in connection with the offences under consideration in this Sourcehook. In addition, there may also be special police forces or units which are less important in this context (e.g. tax and military police); the same might apply to certain categories of staff of the general police force (e.g. police reserves and cadet police officers).

14. Such differences should be kept in mind when comparing the number of police officers between countries. Therefore, we have asked the national correspondents to use a standard definition of "police officer" which would include criminal police, traffic police, border police, gendarmerie and uniformed police, but exclude customs police, tax police, military police, secret service police, part-time officers, police reserves and cadet police officers (see tables 1.C.3.1 - 1.C.3.2).

15. The differences in police organisation also make it difficult to determine police expenditure. Though in most countries there is a budget for the police at national level, there may be additional budgets at regional or local level. In addition, the different police forces in a country may be funded by several national sources. The

Group was not in a position to overcome these difficulties; however, it was agreed to collect information on police expenditure, expecting that it would at least be able to give some indications as to the differences in the level of expenditure related to police work.

1.A.1.5 Comparisons with alternative statistical sources

16. In general, one of the best means for assessing the validity of data from a given source, is to compare it with data from other sources. For the statistics in this chapter, two alternative sources are available. The figures on completed homicide reported in police statistics were compared to data from vital statistics, as provided by the World Health Organisation (see table 1.A.1.3).

17. Data on other violent crimes and on property offences can be compared to the results of crime victimisation surveys. Relevant results are presented in Chapter 5.

18. Though comparisons are a way to validate data, the results must be interpreted with caution. In the present case, level-differences between police and victimisation data should be understood mainly as a consequence of the methods of collecting information used. However, if there are similar trends, these may well be understood as reflecting real changes in the level of crime.

1.A.2 COMMENTS

1.A.2.1 Methodology

19. Three countries (Luxembourg, Malta and Turkey) reported not to have written counting rules (i.e. rules regulating the way in which the data shown in this table are recorded). As two of these countries are small, it can still be assumed that there is some consistency in the recording practices of the police. For countries that report to have written counting rules it should be kept in mind that the existence of counting rules is not a guarantee for consistency, hut rather a stimulus.

20. Variations from the standard definition supplied are important when comparing levels of recorded crime. In particular it should be noted that:

- Twelve countries excluded assault leading to death from their homicide statistics and seven infanticide.
- Assaults vary widely in definition with sixteen countries including minor assaults which consist of only slapping and punching and three including threats. It also became clear during the survey that many Eastern European countries counted many assaults as public order offences.
- Rape statistics will be affected by the exclusion of violent intramarital intercourse (ten countries) or sexual intercourse without force with a helpless person (seven countries).
- Theft of small value was excluded by seven countries.

- The concept of burglary varies widely with some countries adopting a relatively narrow definition while others apply the (continental law) concept of aggravated theft. Thirteen countries include theft from a car as burglary. Definitions for domestic burglary appeared more consistent.
- For drug offences the standard definition could not be met by twenty-two countries.

21. The point in time in which the data is recorded, varies between countries. Only fifteen countries reported that offences were recorded (immediately) when the offence was first reported to the police. In thirteen countries recording is done subsequently, and in eight only after investigation. It is difficult to interpret these findings, but it seems safe to assume that the answers "immediately" and "subsequently" imply that the legal labelling of the offence is the task of the police (*input statistics*), while the answer "after investigation" seems to indicate that the tabelling is done by the prosecuting authorities (*output statistics*) once the police enquiry has been completed. This might explain some of the differences in levels between countries, in particular for such offences as homicide and assault.

22. The rules for recording both multiple and serial offences vary between countries. Fifteen countries replied saying that they would record a multiple offence as two or more offences and eighteen countries as one offence (for details refer to tables 1.C.1 and 1.C.2.1.).

23. Thirty-three countries answered the question on the number of police officers. About one half (sixteen) were not able to meet the standard definition of a police officer (for details refer to tables 1.C.3.1. and 1.C.3.2).

1.A.2.3 Commentary on data collected

24. Some rather simple conclusions can be drawn from the data. In the following paragraphs rates per 100,000 population will be discussed for homicide, assault, rape, burglary and drug offences including trends in these rates. Brief comments on police staff and expenditure will also be made.

25. Some countries show very large increases in both recorded crime and suspected offenders over the years 1990 - 1996. This generally reflected low 1990 figures in several central and eastern European countries rather than high 1996 figures. In addition, large increases do not usually reflect actual increases in the rates under consideration, but more likely improvements in data collection or changes in policy.

26. For tables 1.B.2.2.1 to 1.B.2.2.3 (percentage of female, juvenile and alien suspected offenders) there was a wide variation between countries which could not be explained easily. However, for all offences and countries – with only two exceptions – the proportion of female offenders was considerably lower than 50%.

27. The highest proportions of suspected juvenile offenders (persons under 18) were found for theft of motor vehicles and bicycles and the lowest for violent and drug offences.

28. Only one half of the countries provided figures on the percentage of suspected offenders who were aliens. This is obviously a sensitive subject and, in practice, the nationality or ethnic origin of the suspected offender is not always recorded in the relevant statistics.

Homicide

29. Homicide rates varied considerably between countries, especially when attempted homicide was included. In 1990, the highest rate of total homicide (in Northern Ireland) was about 40 times as high as the lowest (in Ireland). In 1996, Ireland still had the lowest rate (despite a considerable increase over this period), but the highest rate (about 14 times higher) was reported by Russia. Seven countries showed a decrease in homicide rates between 1990 and 1996; the highest fall was for Northern Ireland, due to the cessation of paramilitary activity in 1994-1996.

30. For completed homicide (excluding attempts) in 1990, the lowest rate again was found in Ireland, but the highest in Russia. In 1996, Luxembourg had the lowest rate and Russia the highest. The largest increase was found in Ireland; ten countries reported a decrease. Several countries in central and eastern Europe had high increases up to 1994 and a fall between 1994 and 1996.

31. The comparison of the rates of completed homicides for nineteen countries with intentional homicide as recorded in health statistics, shows interesting differences as is indicated in summary table 1i. Though there is some correlation between the two indicators, police statistics seem to underestimate the volume of completed homicides for Austria, Denmark and Switzerland and overestimate it for France, Hungary, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Portugal.

32. The proportion of suspected female offenders in 1995 had a maximum of 21% for completed homicide; this proportion was only usually higher for theft (total). The overall proportion of juvenile offenders among those suspected of homicide was smaller than for most other offences with a maximum of 10%.

Assault

33. It should be borne in mind that the assault rates presented in the Sourcebook might sometimes exclude a specific sub-category of offences, which could be called "breach of the public order" or "hooliganism", as seems to be the case in several eastern European countries such as Bulgaria, Russia or Romania. In the countries mentioned offences of this type are not recorded at police level and for this reason assault rates tend to be surprisingly low. This issue of definition was not taken into account in the Sourcebook questionnaire.

34. Apart from this specific problem, other rather big differences between countries could not be explained in a fully satisfactory way. In principle, countries where "only causing pain" and "slapping/punching" were included in the definition of assault should have high rates of assault, as was the case for Sweden and Scotland; however, there were exceptions to this rule such as Cyprus, Estonia and Turkey. Differences in the rules for counting multiple assaults may also be important here.

35. Although, in general, assault rates increased between 1990 and 1996, in five countries there were falls of 10% or more (Czech Republic, Ireland, Malta, Moldova, Spain). The proportion of suspected female offenders was, overall, relatively high, that of juveniles relatively low in relation to their share in the total population.

police statistics	lowest 33% (< 1.5)	middle 33% (1.5 - 2.65)	highest 33% (> 2.65)
health statistics	(< 1.5)	(1.5 - 2.05)	(> 2.00)
lowest 33%	Greece	France	
	Norway	Luxembourg	
	Sweden	Netherlands	
niddle 33%	Austria	Germany	Нипдагу
	Denmark	Poland	Portugal
	Switzerland	Slovenia	-
ighest 33%			Bulgaria
Ų.			Estonia
			Finland
			Latvia
			Russia

Table 1.i: Completed intentional homicide in 1994, rate per 100,000 according	
to police statistics and health statistics	

Rape

36. The level of rape offences recorded by the police will be influenced by the willingness of victims to report such offences. Changes in such reporting may be reflected in the changes measured between 1990 and 1996. It is therefore interesting to compare police statistics to the results of crime victimisation surveys. In summary table 1.ii, the average rape rate over 1990 - 1996 is cross tabulated against the average sexual assault rate for 1988 - 1995 from the international crime victim survey (ICVS).⁵ According to police statistics, between 1 and 20 rapes were recorded per 100000 inhabitants, while according to the ICVS between 1 and 3400 people per 100000 become victims of sexual assault. Of course, a large part of this difference will be due to the fact that the concept of sexual assault is broader than that of rape.

37. If we use both rates as indicators of the occurrence of sexual offences, it is interesting to note that some countries had very low police figures but very high ICVS figures (Albania, Italy). The scores for Bulgaria and Northern Ireland were relatively high in the police statistics, but very low in the ICVS.

⁵ We used the sexual assault rate for urban areas, as given in the ICVS, because this allows ranking of the largest number of countries.

rape (police statistics)	lowest 33% (< 5.1)	middle 33% (5.2 - 7.9)	highest 33% (> 8.0)
sexual assault (ICVS)			
lowest 33% (< 1.0%)	Croatia Hungary Malta Spain Switzerland	Latvia Romania	Bulgaria Northern Ireland
middle 33% (1.0 - 1.7%)	Lithuania The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	Finland Germany Scotland	Belgium France Netherlands England & Wales
highest 33% (> 1.7%)	Albania Italy	Austria Czech Republic Estonia Poland Slovenia	Norway Russia Sweden

Table 1.ii: Rape, rate according to police statistics, averaged over 1990 - 1996 vs. sexual assault, rate according to ICVS, averaged over 1988 - 1995

38. In most countries rape offences recorded by the police rose between 1990 and 1996. The main exceptions were Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Russia, Slovenia and Switzerland. However, as stated previously, any changes may only reflect differences in reporting practices.

39. It is rather surprising to see women among the offenders suspected of having committed rape offences; several countries such as France and the Netherlands actually reported figures of up to four percent. The most likely explanation is that suspected female offenders acted as accomplices in rape incidents. The proportion of juvenile suspects varied considerably between countries, but was on average slightly lower than for most other offences.

Burglary

40. The proportion of burglaries defined as domestic varied to a large extent: in Albania, France, Germany, Ireland, England & Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland, for instance, about half of all burglaries recorded were domestic, while countries such as Austria, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Finland, the Netherlands, Sweden and "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" reported much lower proportions. Such differences appear to be related to whether or not theft from a car was included in total burglaries.

41. In a number of countries both total burglaries and domestic burglaries having risen from 1990 and 1993 have fallen since then. The overall proportion of women among suspected offenders was relatively low, while that of juveniles was relatively high.

Drug offences

42. None of the twenty-six countries which provided figures on drug offences (total) for the whole period 1990 - 1996 reported a decrease. Only four of them showed an increase of less than 15% while four other countries reported an increase of more than 1000%. For many countries the increase was from a very low base rate leading to apparent increases of more than 1000% (e.g. Romania).

43. Approximately one third of the countries had less than 20 drug offences (total) per 100000 population in 1996. Another third had levels of more than 100 drug offences per 100000.

44. Fewer countries (eighteen) could provide figures on drug trafficking with the proportion varying from at least 50% of all drug offences to only 20%. This seems to reflect different policies as regards drug possession/use. For example, in Italy and the Netherlands possession of small quantities of drugs for an offender's own use would not be recorded as an offence whereas in France and Switzerland it would be (for details refer to table 0.II.J and 1.B.1.13).

45. The proportion of suspected female offenders varied widely among countries, with Poland having a relatively high figure (50%) for drug offences (total) and Italy for drug trafficking (40%).

Trends

46. The following table summarises trends (i.e. percentage changes between 1990 and 1996) in police data for several types of offences.

	Но	Homicide		Homicide A		Rape	Robbery (Total)	T	heft	Burglary (Total)	Drug offences (Total)
	Total	Com- pleted	-			Total	Motor vehicle	-			
Albania											
Austria	0	0	0	-	+	-	-	-	++		
Belgium											
Bulgaria	++	÷	+-+	+	+++	++	++	+-+			
Croatia	-		0	-	0	*		-	++		
Cyprus	+	-	+-+	++	÷	++		0	++		
Czech Republic	+	+	-	-	+	+	++	+			
Denmark	0	+	0	**	0	0	+	-	0		
Estonia	++	+	+	+	++	+	+		+-+		
Finland	+	0	+	0	14-	0	0	+	++		
France	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+		
Germany	+	+	÷	0	+	0	+	+	+		
Greece	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+-+		
Hungary	+	+	÷	0	0	+	++	+	++		
Ireland	.++	++		+	+	0	0	0	+		
Italy	-	-	+	+	-	-	0	0	+		
Latvia	÷		++	0		+	+		++		
Lithuania	+		÷	_	++	+	++		++		
Luxembourg	+		+	+	0	_	+	+	0		
Malta	0		-	++	_	-	•	-	-		
Moldova	+		_	-	0	-		-	+		
Netherlands	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	0	0		
Norway				U		Ū		0	0		
Poland	÷	+	+	0	+	0	++	+	+		
Portugal				-							
Romania	0	0	+	+	+-+	++	+		++		
Russia	+	+	+		++	÷	++	+	++		
Slovenia	+	+	+	-	++	-	+	_	++		
Spain	0		_								
Sweden	+	-	+	+	0	0	-	0	+		
Switzerland	-	-	+	_	õ	-	*	õ	++		
The F.Y.R.O.	+	0	+	0	++	+	++	÷+	++		
Macedonia	,	0	·	0	.,				, ,		
Turkey	+		+		+	++	++				
United Kingdom			,								
England &	++	0	+	+	++	0	0	+			
Wales		v	F	ſ	17	U	v	,			
Northern			+	++	0	0	+	0	++		
Ireland					-			-			
Scotland	+	++	+	++	÷	-	0	-	++		

Table 1.iii: Trends in police data (percentage change between 1990 and 1996)

-- = decrease of 50% or more, - = decrease of 10 - 50 %, 0 = decrease or increase of less then 10%, + increase of 10 - 100%, ++ increase of 100% or more

Police staff

47. The rate of police officers (excluding civilians) per 100000 population (hereafter referred to as police density), in the countries that provided data varied between 200 and 700. In summary table 1.iv, the distribution over five density categories is given.

роршанов (р	sonce density) in	1993		
under 200	200 - 299	300 - 399	400 - 499	500 and over
Denmark	England &	Albania	Croatia	Cyprus
Finland	Wales	Austria	Czech Republic	Northern
Netherlands	Luxembourg	Belgium	Greece	lreland
Romania	Moldova	Estonia	Italy	
Switzerland	Norway	France	Lithuania	
	Poland	Hungary	Malta	
	Scotland	Ireland		
	Slovenia	Latvia		
	Sweden	Portugal		
	Turkey	Spain		
	-	The F.Y.R.O.		
		Macedonia		

 Table 1.iv: Number of police officers (excluding civilians) per 100000

 population (police density) in 1995

48. 33% of the countries had a police density between 300 and 400 and 60% had a density between 200 and 400. Densities of more than 500 were only found in Cyprus and Northern Ireland, while densities below 200 existed in Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Romania and Switzerland. Overall there does not seem to be a clear relationship between police density and the level of recorded crime.

49. There were considerable differences in the ratio police officers/civilian employees. In four countries (Lithuania, Slovenia, Sweden and England & Wales), about one third of the staff were civilians. In five countries (Croatia, Hungary, Netherlands, Norway and "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia") about a quarter of the police staff were civilians, while in eleven countries (Albania, Belgium, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Turkey) this proportion was about one tenth or less. In summary table 1.v civilian staff was included in police density and the distribution given over five categories.

under 300	300 - 399	400 - 499	500 - 599	600 and over
Denmark Finland Luxembourg Moldova Netherlands Romania Sweden Switzerland Turkey	Albania Belgium England & Wales France Ireland Norway Poland Portugal Scotland Spain	Austria Estonia Hungary Latvia Slovenia The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	Cyprus Czech Republic Malta	Croatia Lithuania Northern Ireland

Table 1.v: Police staff (officers and civilians) per 100000 population in 1995

Police expenditure

50. Figures on police expenditure (running costs) were provided by 25 countries: only 20 of them were able to provide data on capital costs. When the expenditure in ECUs per 100000 population was computed (see table 1.B.1.3), eight countries (Cyprus, Finland, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway and England & Wales) emerged which had running costs of between 100000 and 150000. Four countries (Croatia, Greece, Malta and Portugal) had running costs between 50000 and 100000, and eleven (Belgium, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Switzerland, Turkey and Scotland) reported running costs of less than 50000. However, since the definition of a police officer and the methods used to estimate running and capital costs varied widely between countries such conclusions must be treated with caution.

I.B. TABLES

Offences per 100'000 population 1.B.1

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R11HOT0	RITHOT	R11HOT2	R11HOT3	R11HOT4	R11HOT5	R11HOT6	PCIIHOT
Albania		11,5		[8.8]	17.1	15.8	18.4	
Austria	2.5	2.7	2.8	2,4	2.6	2.3	2.3	-7
Belgium		4 - 7				3.9	4.0	
Bulgaria	4.0	8.1	9.9	11.1	11.0	9.9	8.9	125
Croatia	7.6	15.1	14.4	9.7	7.7	8.6	6.8	-10
Сургиз	2.5	1.4	1.1	1.8	1.7	2,0	3.2	30
Czech Republic	2.1	1.9	2.5	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.6	26
Denmark	4.3	5.0	4.6	4.8	4.9	3.9	4.3	-2
Estonia	8.7	8.7	15.5	21.6	24,4	20.6	18.4	i12
Finland	8.6	8.9	9.1	9.0	10.5	10.2	10,1	81
France	4.8	5.0	5.1	5,3	5.2	5.1	4.7	-2
Geгтару*	3.8	3.4	4. J	5.2	4.6	4.8	4.3	13
Greece	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.7	3.0	49
Hungary	4.0	5.2	5.I	5,7	5_5	5.I	5.0	23
Ireland	.5	.8	.9	.8	.7	1.3	1.4	152
Italy	6.7	7.4	5.9	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.7	-29
Latvia*	6.2	8.0	11.1	16.6	14.7	11.2	10,4	68
Lithuania	6.1	7.0	8.2	13.0	14.2	13.7	11.1	84
Luxembourg	7.6	10.6	8.7	7.3	11.9	13.2	10.6	40
Malta	2.8	3.9	4.4	3.8	2.4	2.2	2.9	4
Moldova ⁶	6.6	6.5	11.2	8.6	8.6	9.0	8.9	35
Netherlands	14.8	15.3	18.8	22.5	19.1	19.3	19.0	28
Norway		2.5	2.8	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.6	
Poland	2.3	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.4	49
Portugal								
Romania	6.5	7.5	7.4	6.9	6.7	6.5	6.7	3
Russia	10.5	10.9	15.5	19.7	21.8	21,4	19.9	89
Slovenia	4.4	4.2	5.4	3.7	5.1	5.0	6.0	35
Spain	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.7	2,5	2.5	-1
Sweden	7.0	7.2	8.4	8.7	9.5	9.3	10.3	46
Switzerland	3.1	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.3	2.3	2.8	-12
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	3.2	3.5	4.1	3.8	4.4	4.0	4.0	23
Furkey	3.3	3.7	4.3	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.7	41
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	2.2	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.6	16
Northern Ireland ⁷	19.5	30.4	26.6	32.8	21.3	3.7	6.8	-65
Scotland	10.0	12.0	15.9	13.1	14.4	15.0	15.5	55
Mean	5.7	6.8	7.5	8.4	8.2	7.3	7.2	
Median	4.4	5.1	5.1	5.3	5.2	5.0	4.7	
Minimum	0.5	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.7	1.3	1.4	
Maximum	19.5	30.4	26.6	32.8	24.4	21.4	19.9	

'Fable 1.B.1.1 INTENTIONAL HOMICIDE: TOTAL (Offences per 100'000 population)

* See notes on tables 1.B.1.1 to 1.B.1.15

Moldova: The increase of homicides in 1992 should be seen in the context of the war at that time.
 Northern Ireland: In 1994, a paramilitary cease fire came into effect in August 1994. It ended in February 1996.

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R11HOC0	R11HOC1	R11HOC2	R11HOC3	RIIHOC4	R11HOC5	R11HOC6	
Albania		6.3		8.5	8.3	6.5	7.6	
Austria	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.1	1.3	1.1	1.4	-1
Belgium			•••		1.2	1.4	1.2	
Bulgaria	2.7	4.5	5.6	6.1	6.3	5.9	5.2	95
Croatia								
Сургиз	1.8	.7	.6	1.3	1.1	1.4	1.4	-23
Czech Republic	i .5	1.3	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.7	12
Denmark	.8	1.3	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.1	1.3	60
Estonia	7.5	7.6	14.0	18.6	20.2	16.7	14.7	96
Finland	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.7	-1
France	2.8	2.8	2.7	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.6	-4
Germany*	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.8	[7	L.7	1.5	25
Greece	0.1	1.3	1.3	1,4	1.3	1.4	1.6	56
Hungary	2.9	3,9	3.9	4.1	4.3	3.9	3.6	24
ireland	.5	.7	.7	.6	.7	1.2	1.2	141
Italy	3.2	3.5	2.7	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.8	-45
Latvia*			9.8	15.0	13.7	9.8	8.8	
Lithuania				*	***			
Luxembourg	2.4	1.0	1.3	.5	1.7	.2	1.0	-59
Malta	***	4 + +						
Moldova	•							
Netherlands	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.9	1.5	1.8	1.8	14
Norway		1,2	1.1	.9	.8	1.0	1.0	
Poland	1.8	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.3	27
Portugal ⁸		- * *		4.3	4.3	4.1	3.9	
Romania	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.2	-7
Russia	8.6	8,8	10.4	14.4	15.6	15.5	15.3	78
Slovenia	2.3	2.2	2.7	1.4	2.4	2.6	2.7	17
Spain				•••				
Sweden	1.4	1,6	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.2	-18
Switzerland	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.2	-28
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.4	2.5	2.2	2.1	5
Turkey			• • •		***	•••		* * *
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	1.3	1.4	1,3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.3	0
Northern Ireland ⁹	5.2	7.6	7.0	6.7	5.4	1.5	2.4	-53
Scotland	1.7	1.7	2.8	2.4	2.2	2.7	2.6	52
Mean	2.6	2.8	3.3	3.9	3.9	3.4	3.4	
Median	1.8	1.7	2.1	2.0	2.1	1.8	1.9	
Minimum	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.2	1.0	
Maximum	8.6	8.8	14.0	18.6	20,2	16.7	15.3	

Table J.B.1.2 INTENTIONAL HOMICIDE: COMPLETED (Offences per 100'000 population)

 ⁸ Portugal: The definition of homicide is large and includes all cases where such a possibility cannot be ruled out at the time incidents are recorded in statistics (i.e. at the end of the month), even if death was more likely due to suicide or an accident. This explains why completed homicide is, according to police statistics, several times as high as homicide according to health statistics.
 ⁹ Northern Ireland: In 1994, a paramilitary casefire carre into effect in August 1994. It ended in February 1996.

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	ZTHOS0	ZHHOSI	Z11HOS2	Z1 IHOS3	Z11HOS4	Z11HOS5	Z11HOS6	PCZTIHOS
Albania		- • •	4.1	6.0				
Austria	1.6	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.0	1.2	-25
Belgium	1.4	1.4	1.7	2.0	1.8			
Bulgaria	3.2	4.0	4.7	4,9	5.1			
Croatia	2.8	3.8	5.1	4,8	3.3	3.3	3.0	6
Cyprus					** -			
Czech Republic	1.9	1.8	1.9	2.1	2.3	1.8	1.7	-11
Denmark	1.0	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.1	12
Estonia	11.0	10.8	19.6	25.8	28.2	22,2	19.9	81
Finland	3.2	3.1	3.4	3.3	3.2	2.9		
France	1.1	1.1	1.0	1,1	1.1	1.1	1.0	-9
Germany	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	11	1.1	10
Greece	1.1	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.3	1.6	45
Hungary	3,1	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.5	3.5	3.2	3
Ireland	0.6	0.6	8,0	0.6	0.7	0.7		
Italy	2.6	2.8	2.2	1.7		* • •		
Latvia	9.2	11.5	16.0	24.7	23.0	18.2	15.3	67
Lithuania	7.6	9.1	10.5	12.5	13.4	11.7	9.3	22
Luxembourg	2.9	2.3	2.0	0.3	1.2	0.7	1.0	-66
Malta	1.1	0,3	1.7	1.6	0.8	0.8	1.3	22
Moldova	9.1	8.9	13.8	12.6	14.4	16.6	13.6	50
Netherlands	0.9	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.2		•••
Norway	1.2	1.5	1.1	1.0	0.8	1.0		
Poland	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.7	3.0	2.8	2.6	-10
Portuga! ¹⁰	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.3	-24
Romania	5.3	4.5	4.9	4.3	4,4	4.1	3.8	-28
Russia	14.3	15.3	22.9	30.7	32.6	30.8	26.7	87
Slovenia	2.1	2.5	2.4	1.4	2.0	2.4	2.1	0
Spain	I.0	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.9		
Sweden	1.3	1.5	1,3	1.3	1.2	1.0	1.2	-8
Switzerland	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.3			
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia				***		- • •		
Turkey	- • -			• • •				
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.7	0.7	0.6	20
Northern Ireland	4.3	4.7	4.6	5.5	6.1	6.9	3.0	-30
Scotland	1.7	1.5	2.7	1.7	2.2	2.0	2.5	47
Mean	3.3	3.5	4.4	5.1	5.3	5.1	5.1	
Median	1.8	1.7	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.7	2.1	
Minimum	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.6	
Maximum	14.3	15,3	22.9	30.7	32.6	30.8	26.7	

Table 1.B.1.3 INTENTIONAL HOMICIDE: RECORDED IN HEALTH STATISTICS (Offences per 100'000 pop.	ble 1.B.1.3 INTENTIONAL HOMIC	DE: RECORDED IN HEALTH STATE	STICS (Offences per 100'000 pop.)
--	-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Source: World Health Organization, with thanks to Dr. Rafael Lozano. Partly published in: United Nations / Department for Economic and Social Information and Policy Analysis, Demographic Yearbook, relevant years.

¹⁰ Porrugal: The definition of homicide is large and includes all cases where such a possibility cannot be ruled out at the time incidents are recorded in statistics (i.e. at the end of the month), even if death was more likely due to suicide or an accident. This explains why completed homicide is, according to police statistics, several times as high as homicide according to health statistics.

Table 1.B.1.4 ASSAUL	T (Offences	per 100'000	population)
----------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

	6990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R11AS0	RHASI	R11AS2	R11AS3	R11AS4	R11AS5	R11AS6	PCIIAS
Albania		29	- + +	41	39	29	22	
Austria	385	397	428	408	418	400	385	0
Belgium			- • -		335	449	467	.,,
Bulgaria ¹¹	2	6	8	10	13	15	14	692
Croatia	25	20	24	24	25	24	24	-3
Сургиз	10	9	8	14	16	18	16	57
Czech Republic	86	85	78	77	71	78	76	-12
Denmark	150	156	169	180	190	165	163	9
Estonia	18	21	24	25	27	28	27	46
Finland ¹²	414	406	378	368	390	434	479	16
France ¹³	86	93	97	98	109	122	129	50
Germany*	313	291	318	335	341	371	390	25
Greece	65	67	66	67	72	65	61	-6
Hungary	69	88	99	99	103	102	97	40
freland	31	24	18	17	15	16	15	-50
Italy	34	35	37	37	37	38	42	22
Latvia*	14	15	37	41	42	39	33	135
Lithuania	9	9	9	9	10	8	10	12
Luxembourg	230	242	302	263	290	292	291	26
Malta	20	17	21	28	24	20	15	-26
Moldova	13	12	11	11	13	13	- 11	-10
Netherlands	150	147	157	161	181	181	193	28
Norway		168	184	193	204	216	231	- * ►
Poland	27	33	35	43	47	48	50	86
Portugal		* - *		316	325	350	357	
Romania	3	4	4	5	5	6	5	69
Russia	28	28	36	45	52	42	36	31
Slovenia	20	22	21	24	21	24	23	18
Spain	27	26	24	24	24	23	21	-20
Sweden	475	469	522	584	611	616	607	28
Switzerland	49	50	53	53	51	52	58	17
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	20	17	20	26	28	28	25	22
Farkey	21	22	23	26	27	29	33	53
United Kingdom: England & Wales	351	360	380	384	406	393	440	25
Northern Ireland	160	183	194	213	227	269	287	79
Scotland	901	938	974	928	1001	1030	1048	16
Mean	131	132	144	148	161	168	172	
Median	32	34	37	45	51	50	54	
Minimum	2	4	4	S	5	6	5	
Махітит	901	938	974	928	1001	1030	1048	

 ¹¹ The figures for Bulgaria refer only to cases where serious injury was intended.
 ¹² Finland: since 1995, the scope of assault was widened where the offence took place in a private place.
 ¹³ The figures for France include only cases where the bodily injury caused inability to work for at least 8 days.

Table 1, B, 1.5	RAPE	(Offences per	100'000 population)
-----------------	------	---------------	---------------------

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R11RA0	RIIRAI	RHRA2	R11RA3	R11RA4	R11RA5	R11RA6	PCHRA
Albania		3.3		4.9	4.7	3,0	3.0	
Austria	7.6	7.1	7.8	7.5	7.6	7.6	6.4	-15
Befgium					8.3	11.3	12.5	
Bułgaria	4.6	8.6	8.9	9,5	8.7	9.0	7.5	61
Croatia	3.4	2.6	2.3	3.1	2.0	1.7	2.0	-41
Cyprus	.4	1.2	1.4	E, E	2.1	2.3	2.0	361
Czech Republic	8.6	7.4	6.9	7.4	7-1	7.0	6.6	-24
Denmark	9.5	10.3	10.8	9.6	9.2	8.4	7.4	-22
Estonia	3.4	3.9	4.7	6.9	8.3	6.9	6.5	92
Finland	7.6	7.5	7.3	7.2	7.6	8.7	7.7	1
France	8,1	8.9	9.3	9.7	11.3	12.6	12.3	52
Germany*	8.1	7.3	7.8	7.9	7.5	7.6	7.6	-6
Greece	1.9	2.4	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.2	1.7	-8
Hungary	4.5	4.5	4,2	4.0	4,2	4.1	4.1	-9
Ireland	2.5	3.1	3.6	4.0	5.1	5.3	5.0	97
Italy	1,2	1,3	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.7	2.0	67
L/atvia*	5.0	6.0	4.7	5.0	5.1	6,3	5.3	5
Lithuania	5.3	5.1	5.2	5.3	4.5	5.5	4.6	-13
Luxembourg	7.3	6.7	5.1	5.3	6.5	8.8	9.9	35
Malta	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.1	1.3	2.9	160
Moldova	8.0	7.8	6.5	6.7	6,0	5.2	6.2	-23
Netherlands	8.9	8.9	8.9	9.8	10.0	9.1	9.2	3
Norway	** 4	9,0	10.0	9.2	8.4	8.5	9.7	* * *
Poland	5.0	5.3	5,2	5,4	5.7	6.1	5.4	8
Portugal	**-		e	4.9	5.0	5.4	5.0	* * *
Romania	4.2	5.3	4.7	6.2	6.1	6.5	6.0	45
Russia	10.1	9.5	9.2	9.7	9.4	8.4	1.3	-87
Slovenia	7.1	6.8	7.1	6.8	6.1	6.2	5.3	-25
Spain	4.6	5.0	4.1	4.0	4.1			
Sweden	16.5	17.0	19.5	24.7	20.6	19.3	18.2	10
Switzerland	6.3	4.8	4,5	4.8	3.9	4.2	4.8	-24
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	2.7	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.7	2.6	-1
Turkey			.6	.9	1.0	1.1	1.3	
United Kingdom:			<i>.</i>			0 (
England & Wales	6.7	7.9	8.1	8.9	9.8	9.6	11.1	66
Northern Ireland	7.9	9.8	9.7	12.1	13.0	16.1	18.1	129
Scotland	6.5	6.3	6.9	6.7	7.7	7.9	8.7	34
Mean	6.0	6.2	6.1	6.5	6.5	6.8	6.6	
Median	6.3	6.3	5.2	6.2	6.1	6.5	6.0	
Minimum	0.4	1.2	0.6	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.3	
Maximum	16.5	17.0	19,5	24.7	20.6	19.3	18.2	

Table 1.B.1.6	ROBBERY:	TOTAL	(Offences p	000°001 no	population)
---------------	----------	-------	-------------	------------	-------------

	1990	19 9 1	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	RHROTO	RIIROTI	R11ROT2	RHROT3	R11ROT4	R11ROT5	R11ROT6	PCHRO
Albania		7		9	7	8	8	
Austria	30	30	35	31	30	26	26	-15
Belgium ¹⁴						123	129	• • •
Bulgaria	[4]	44	62	72	78	73	70	4[8
Croatia	11	19	17	14	9	10	11	0
Cyprus	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	15
Czech Republic	37	40	38	40	37	39	42	[]
Denmark	42	47	45	43	39	39	43	3
Estonia	84	112	171	200	199	211	195	131
Finland	53	53	44	40	42	43	41	-23
Fгапсе	106	116	122	125	127	128	136	28
Germany*	56	61	70	76	71	78	83	49
Greece	11	12	15	14	12	15	14	29
Hungary	28	38	32	28	25	26	26	-5
freland	92	124	152	164	166	181	182	99
Italy	65	69	55	55	53	50	55	-15
Latvia*	104	90	101	46	45	36	42	-60
Lithuania ¹⁵	9	11	13	20	115	78	96	961
Luxembourg	67	63	70	64	72	62	63	-6
Malta	55	58	48	50	41	59	44	-20
Moldova	56	62	61	64	66	66	59	7
Netherlands	80	86	102	107	104	102	97	21
Norway		27	26	24	23	22	23	- * *
Polaud	41	42	41	45	50	52	53	29
Portugal				121	145	145	130	
Romania	8	17	18	21	18	18	17	119
Russia	11	12	20	27	26	25	23	110
Slovenia	8	13	12	12	15	17	27	254
Spain	276	283	168	154				
Sweden	70	72	72	70	61	65	66	-6
Switzerland	56	64	67	71	53	46	52	-7
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	2	2	4	5	6	7	10	335
Furkey	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	42
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	71	89	103	113	116	132	143	101
Northern Ireland	103	117	117	108	98	96	107	4
Scotland	92	123	134	110	104	104	102	11
Mean	54	59	62	61	61	62	63	
Median	54	50	48	46	47	50	52	
Minimum	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	
Maximum	276	283	171	200	199	211	195	

¹⁴ The Belgian figures refer to all kinds of "aggravated" theft. ¹⁵ In Lithuania, the definition of robbery was extended (from January 1st, 1995) to certain acts ("open theft") which before were considered as thefts only.

	1990	199t	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	RHROAD	RHROAT	R11ROA2	R11ROA3	RTIROA4	R11ROA5	R11ROA6	
Albania		+ + +						
Austria	• • •			- • -				
Belgium			• • •		14.6	20.6	25.8	
Bulgaria	.1	.6	1.1	2.6	2.9	3.3	3.4	> 1000
Croatia	- • -							
Cyprus		•••						
Czech Republic	• - •				3.2	3.1	4.2	
Denmark		. ·				- 4 .		* * *
Estonia	- • -		6.5	10.9	18.9	21.8	17.3	* * *
Finland		4 * *	- + -					
France	15.3	16.5	17.0	19.4	17.7	15.7	16.1	6
Germany*	5.4	5.7	6.9	7.4	7.2	7.7	8.3	55
Greece		• • •		•-	•••			
Hungary	.7	1.4	1.3	1.4	18	1.7	2.7	287
Ireland	30.7	35.8	42.3	55.4	44.6	46.3	50.8	66
Italy								
Latvia*	4 * 1-		1.1	3.3	9.4	0.01	14.1	
Lithuania	1	.1	.1	1,4	3.3	3.3	2.8	> 1000
Luxembourg	3.1	2.8	4.9	4.5	3.0	3.4	3.1	0
Malta	12.4	23.2	11.6	9.9	5.4	14.6	11.5	-7
Moldova	9.2	9.0	11.8	15.9	15.9	18.4	17.9	94
Netherlands		7.9	10.1	13.0	8.9	6.9	16.6	
Norway		4.1	5.7	5.4	5.0	4.0	4.4	
Poland	5.0	6,9	7,8	8.8	9,8	10.7	10.1	102
Portugal	- • •			***	34.9	36.1	37.7	
Romania				.1	.2	.2	.2	
Russia			1.4	3.5	3.5	2.3	1.9	
Slovenia	1.8	3,1	2.1	2.1	3.1	2.6	4.2	127
Браїл					• • •			
Sweden	8.1	11.2	12.3	13.7	8.8	8.6	9.2	13
Switzerland	11.9	14.9	14.3	14.2	11.4	10.9	13.1	10
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	.0	.0	.6	.5	.2	.7	.7	> 1000
Furkey								
United Kingdom:			-					- • •
England & Wales	7.7	10.4	11.4	11.5	8,0	7.7	7.0	-10
Northern Ireland	36.7	43.3	54.5	47.1	41.1	38.6	40.7	11
Scotland	4.9	8.7	10.0	7.8	7.3	4.7	4.4	-9
Mean	9.0	10.8	10.7	11.3	11.1	11.7	12.6	
Median	5.4	7.9	7.4	7.8	7.6	7.7	8.7	
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Maximum	36.7	43.3	54.5	55.4	44.6	46.3	50.8	

Table 1.B.1.7 ARMED ROBBERY (Offences per 100'000 population)

Table 1.B.).8 THEFT: TOTAL (Offences per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	RIITHTO	RIITHTI	RHTHT2	R11THT3	RIITHT4	RIITHT5	R11THT6	PCIITHI
Albania	.,,	49		37	39	30	27	
Austria	2904	2869	2 9 61	2758	2723	2591	2620	-10
Belgium						3257	3144	
Bulgaria	576	1653	2092	2102	2119	1912	1755	205
Croatia	912	833	1123	978	679	624	544	-40
Cyprus ¹⁶	186	161	164	146	134	106	124	-33
Czech Republic	1546	2118	2598	2946	2717	2588	2661	72
Denmark	8323	8254	8438	8627	8618	8448	8267	-1
Estonia	1165	1655	2232	1892	[749	1988	1770	52
Finland	3648	3762	3897	3956	3792	3590	3455	-5
France	3903	4133	4377	4395	4252	3937	3797	-3
Germany*	4256	4060	4887	5113	4749	4713	4485	5
Greece	431	502	489	520	548	706	721	67
Hungary ¹⁷	2236	2909	2574	2160	2081	2268	2662	19
Ireland	1732	1750	1765	1652	1557	1598	1610	-7
italy	2828	2999	2602	2409	2343	2352	2451	-13
Latvia*	814	1094	1814	1522	1068	984	950	17
Lithuania	657	855	1152	1174	1095	1138	1227	87
Luxembourg	1020	811	711	741	803	794	760	-26
Malta	2147	2433	2234	2231	1892	1756	1815	-15
Moldova	581	651	576	535	518	512	442	-24
Netherlands	5519	5639	6079	6098	6179	5684	5197	-6
Norway		4155	4084	3917	3939	4195	4127	**•
Poland ¹⁸	417	365	326	345	468	548	408	-2
Portugal	•••	* * *		1344	1476	1403	1417	•••
Romania	84	214	220	318	378	452	451	438
Russia	617	836	1111	1064	887	923	817	33
Slovenia	757	796	965	780	723	511	501	-34
Spain			•••			•••		•••
Sweden	8581	8428	8366	7949	7377	7693	7799	-9
Switzerland ¹⁹	4527	4797	4470	4329	4076	3882	3978	-12
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	185	195	296	260	311	286	260	4 1
Furkey	75	81	90	123	132	96	199	166
United Kingdom: England & Wales	6643	7798	8209	8022	7411	7133	6835	3
Northern Ireland	1810	1975	2107	2027	2021	2035	2000	10
Scotland	7052	7887	7534	6804	6292	5 74 7	5235	-26
Mean	2456	2628	2829	2626	2504	2471	2415	
Median	1546	1750	2170	1959	1820	1912	1770	
linimum	75	49	90	37	39	30	27	
Maximum	8581	8428	8438	8627	8618	8448	8267	

¹⁶ In Cyprus, the limit of theft of small value (not included in the figures indicated here) was raised from 15 to 100 £ C.P. since 1993.

17 In Hungary, the limit of theft of small value (not included in the figures indicated here) was raised from 2'000 to 5'000 HUF since May 15, 1993.

18 In Poland, the limit of theft of small value (not included in the figures indicated here) was increased to tenfold of its former value; this change affected the 1996 figures.

19 In Switzerland, the limit of theft of small value (not included in the figures indicated here) was raised from approximately 100 to 300 SF since January 1st, 1995.

				1993	1994	(995	1996	% change 90-96
	RIITHV0	RJITHV1	RIITHV2	R11THV3	RIITHV4	R11THV5	RIITHV6	PCIITHV
Albania				4	5	4	6	
Austria	118	110	115	107	101	93	86	-27
Belgiom ²⁰	+				* - *	373	341	
Bulgaria	71	95	143	197	223	179	144	104
Croatia		64	118	63	53	47	44	
Cyprus							* * *	* * *
Czech Republic	135	119	232	274	272	265	287	112
Denmark	831	833	860	890	879	882	977	18
Estonia	101	116	113	173	170	133	113	12
Finland	366	4 43	472	416	414	387	396	8
France	764	834	880	879	836	780	760	-1
Germany*	169	197	297	341	335	322	276	63
Greece	68	84	82	93	98	121	118	75
Hungary	69	171	161	80	103	125	165	J 40
freland	347	328	340	372	337	328	373	7
Italy	552	646	572	547	532	537	559	ł
Latvia*	109	117	171	165	167	153	132	20
Lithuania	42	48	54	78	173	184	172	311
Luxembourg	128	170	242	288	223	292	197	54
Malta	353	405	401	304	247	259	290	-18
Moldova								
Netherlands	333	399	441	469	500	461	401	21
Norway		532	509	494	480	517	490	• • •
Poland ²¹	39	49	77	90	119	142	132	241
Portugal	• • •			157	185	175	201	
Romania	7	10	7	9	10	12	8	18
Russia	9	14	24	35	32	33	28	218
Slovenia	56	64	64	69	70	74	71	26
Spain	349	327	292	276	256	253	291	-17
Sweden	1036	972	907	846	754	796	809	-22
Switzerland	435	458	453	404	373	354	340	-22
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	23	33	32	22	35	41	47	106
Turkey	10	9	12	18	18	25	37	285
<i>United Kingdom:</i> England & Wales	971	1140	1148	1163	1051	982	951	-2
Northern Ireland	446	534	590	566	561	486	522	17
Scotland	718	878	937	843	823	733	666	-7
Mean	298	329	347	325	316	310	E	
Median	135	171	242	274	223	256	239	
Minimum	7	9	7	4	5	4	6	
Maximum	1036	1140	1148	1163	1051	982	977	

Table 1.B.1.9 THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE (Offences per 100'000 population)

 $^{^{20}}$ The Belgian figures refer to theft of cars only. 21 The Polish figures refer to theft of cars only.

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	RIITIBO	RIITHBI	RIITHB?	R11THB3	R11THB4	R11THB5	R11THB6	
Albania		4				- • •		
Austria	296	307	342	295	294	254	228	-23
Belgium			•••	***	+ - +	296	287	
Bulgaria	6	21	20	15	18	18	23	314
Croatia	22	12	6	17	6	5	7	-69
Cyprus	• • •					•••		
Czech Republic	91	166	231	279	238	204	180	98
Denmark	1843	1827	1865	2041	2409	2158	1857	1
Estonia	+							
Finland								
France			- • •					
Germany*	565	545	662	649	651	629	545	-4
Greece			4	- • -	* * *	- • -		
Hungary	157	200	193	194	201	224	264	68
Ireland	21	20	23	21	15	12	9	-55
Italy			***		* * -			
Latvia*			91	65	34	25	26	* - *
Lithuania	12	10	20	28	34	42	47	304
Luxembourg ²²	85	84	92	77	79	86	59	-31
Malta	22	17	14	24	15	22	14	-38
Moldova		,			***			
Netherlands	1299	1259	1232	1093	1104	1049	942	-27
Norway		578	620	573	566	610	588	_,
Poland	- • •	,						
Portugal	•••	***						
Romania	4	11	11					
Russia	13	17	20			•••		
Slovenia	73	105	145	97	91	57	35	-53
Spain								
Sweden	1246	1344	1438	1452	1364	1386	1304	5
Switzerland	1074	1135	1104	1069	1105	1026	987	8
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	25	24	28	24	29	21	22	-12
Turkey								
United Kingdom:		***	- • •			•••		* * *
England & Wales	327	416	434	371	343	327	287	-12
Northern Ireland	87	94	118	92	118	118	94	9
Scotland	192	245	227	198	204	222	187	-3
Mean	355	367	388	413	425	400	363	
Median	87	105	145	194	201	213	183	
Minimum	4	4	6	15	6	5	7	
Maximum	1843	1827	1865	2041	2409	2158	1857	

Table 1.B.1.10 BICYCLE THEFT (Offences per 100'000 population)

 $^{^{\}rm 22}$ The figures for Luxeinburg include theft of motorbikes.

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	RIIBUTO	RIIBUTI	R11BUT2	RIIBUT3	R11BUT4	RIIBUT 5	R11BUT6	PC11BU
Albanîa		45		34	34	26	21	
Austria	708	694	774	705	674	648	625	-12
Belgium					1530	1853	1774	
Bulgaria	352	996	1201	1203	1174	961	840	139
Croatia	492	522	713	610	386	333	316	-36
Cyprus	174	164	162	159	178	137	179	3
Czech Republic	707	1037	1122	1204	1083	969	955	35
Denmark	2380	2335	2377	2342	2043	2035	2085	-12
Estonia			859	1200	1155	1394	1254	
Finland	1432	1820	1927	1938	1940	1890	1737	21
France	687	730	780	813	810	745	747	9
Germany*	618	632	814	884	842	838	797	29
Greece	265	309	303	315	325	403	405	53
Hungary	745	1063	889	764	765	799	926	24
Ireland	800	906	906	918	916	865	827	3
Italy	371	363	341	338	349	373	405	9
Latvia*			571	634	516	441	439	• - •
Lithuania		- • •			** 7			
Luxembourg	437	392	450	534	580	516	529	21
Malta	634	632	625	528	452	490	527	-17
Moldova	405	430	380	329	308	302	276	-32
Netherlands	2645	2778	3123	3272	3238	3058	2851	8
Norway		2017	1929	1836	1824	1925	1861	
Poland	1131	931	862	817	790	790	792	-30
Portugal		- • •		481	557	507	506	
Romania	46	121	106		- * *			
Russia	189	268	406	423	360	323	285	51
Slovenia	293	349	377	306	303	288	253	-13
Spain								
Sweden	1800	1807	1798	1785	1609	1615	1638	-9
Switzerland	1061	1116	1005	981	93 3	934	1030	-3
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	251	337	601	554	490	461	529	111
Turkey								
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	1978	2389	2646	2666	2437	2395	2243	13
Northern Ireland	939	1046	1078	988	1057	1025	1001	7
Scotland	2022	2302	2235	1927	1734	1451	1256	-38
Mean	873	984	1045	1016	981	962	935	
Median	687	730	836	813	800	795	794	
Minimum	46	45	106	34	34	26	21	
Maximum	2645	2778	3123	3272	3238	3058	2851	

Table 1.B.1.11 BURGLARY: TOTAL (Offences per 100*000 population)

* See notes on tables I.B.I.1 to I.B.I.15

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R11BUD0	RIIBUDI	R11BUD2	R11BUD3	R11BUD4	RHBUD5	RHBUD6	
Albania		24		21	17	13	11	
Austria	229	214	215	190	176	169	170	-26
Belgium	- + +		* * *		* * *	,	* * *	
Bulgaria	84	254	297	317	374	365	319	281
Croatia					• - •			
Cyprus								
Czech Republic	148	169	163	171	143	135	131	-11
Denniark	664	648	703	699	624	629	646	-3
Estonia	214	381	516	470	460	555	472	121
Finland	213	248	243	260	252	226	201	-5
France	373	390	417	430	426	409	405	8
Germany*	310	291	364	406	396	397	381	23
Greece				- +	۶ × +		4 - <i>x</i>	
Hungary	139	193	196	172	204	218	294	111
Ireland	432	497	493	512	524	516	492	14
Italy	371	363	341	338	349	373	405	9
Latvia*			142	164	246	203	206	
Lithuania	128	155	178	189	202	173	237	86
Luxembourg	193	1.58	180	224	250	232	235	22
Maita		199	201	143	138	156	166	
Moldova	104	143	142	153	139	127	120	16
Netherlands	695	667	735	785	806	764	668	-4
Norway		461	452	446	405	436	425	
Poland	255	189	150	138	148	161	171	-33
Portugal		- • •		196	234	221	230	
Romania	**-	57	82	123	70	79	75	
Russia	138	198	294	303	262	204	181	32
Slovenia	119	135	137	114	108	107	93	-22
Spain								
Sweden	262	256	248	232	201	189	190	-27
Switzerland	- • •			- * *				
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	12	4	7	12	15	11	8	-33
Turkey								* * *
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	1040	1224	1383	1416	1317	1244	t160	12
Northern Ireland	412	455	470	503	591	609	530	29
Scotland	1193	1381	1341	1156	1042	874	795	-33
Mean	336	346	374	355	349	338	325	
Median	229	248	248	232	250	221	235	
Minimum	12	4	7	12	15	11	8	
Maximum	1193	1381	1383	1416	1317	1244	1160	

Table 1.B.1.12 DOMESTIC BURGLARY (Offences per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	RIIDOTO	RHDOTT	R11DOT2	RHDOT3	R11DOT4	R11DOT5	R11DOT6	PCTIDO
Albania	••			0]]]	12	
Austria	69	75	107	169	I 4 8	144	184	167
Belgium				***	141	305	363	
Bulgaría					.,,	• • •	2	
Croatia	4	10	19	19	18	20	50	> 1000
Cyprus	7	10	11	12	19	21	25	243
Czech Republic			•••	•••	4	11	20	
Denmark	271	336	345	369	301	290	283	4
Estonia	1	1	2	2	2	3	8	> 1000
Finland	51	50	66	78	117	177	154	201
France	100	109	116	112	122	136	131	32
Germany*	164	147	154	151	163	194	228	39
Greece	19	20	20	15	18	28	40	108
Hungary	0	0	I.	2	2	4	4	> 1000
Ireland	66	99	120	108	113	108	101	53
Italy	54	71	74	59	67	67	68	27
Latvia*	4	4	4	8	11	11	15	281
Lithuania	2	3	6	8	9	11	14	585
Luxembourg	197	215	266	154	187	187	208	6
Malta								
Moldova	3	4	3	6	6	12	16	473
Netherlands ²³	39	29	22	20	26	22	42	7
Norway	***	285	302	299	312	507	607	
Poland	5	8	8	16	14	13	19	314
Portugal		• • •		69	69	65	62	
Romania	0	0	0	L	1	2	3	> 1000
Russia	11	13	20	36	50	54	65	496
Slovenia	10	10	13	4	21	23	34	240
Spain								
Sweden	310	357	337	467	351	323	349	13
Switzerland	276	339	441	541	567	585	591	114
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	1	1	2	3	6	8	7	412
Turkey				* * *				
United Kingdom:						*		
England & Wales				***				
Northern Ireland	14	18	39	51	80	89	68	396
Scotland	190	237	268	354	378	484	468	146
Mean	72	91	103	108	107	126	133	
Median	17	20	22	36	50	54	56	
Minimum	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	
Maximum	310	357	441	541	567	585	607	

Table 1.B.1.13 DRUG OFFENCES: TOTAL (Offences per 100'000 population)

²³ Netherlands: Drug offences are usually not prosecuted if the offence concerns small quantities and/or for personnal use. Thus, the figures given here refer almost exclusively to drug trafficking.

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	RIIDTT0	RHDTTI	RHDTT2	R11DTT3	R11DTT4	RIIDTTS	RIIDTT6	PCHDTT
Albania		-						
Austria	- + 4		• • •	, - +				
Belgium	- • -	• •		• • •		68	82	
Bulgaria	• •	.				• • -	2	
Croatia						• - •		
Сургиз								
Czech Republic			• • •		4	10	15	
Denmark	,	· .			* * *	- • •		
Estonia			***					
Finland		* * *				···		
France	13	14	15	16	15	10	9	-33
Germany*			- * *					
Greece								
Hungary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	707
Ireland	* = 4			• • •	***			• - •
ltaly						• - •		
Latvia*	- + +	* - *	0	1	2	1	2	
Lithuania		••••	* * +					
uxembourg					***			
Malta								
Moldova				* - *		• - •		***
Netherlands	39	29	22	20	26	22	42	7
Norway		159	168	167	170	255	291	
Poland	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	> 1000
Portugal	6 + F	* * *		41	46	45	39	
Romania			•••	* * *				***
Russia			•••					
Slovenia	4	5	9	6	13	16	23	437
Spain	40	45	46	44	40	39	39	-2
Sweden	116	142	126	205	98	72	69	-40
Switzerland	80	92	99	121	111	105	112	40
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	1	1	2	2	5	6	6	531
furkey		•						
<i>United Kingdom:</i> England & Wales	20	22	27	29	36	41	43	117
Northern Ireland	I	1	5	6	10	22	13	> 1000
Scotland	56	66	81	103	116	156	136	144
Mean	31	44	43	51	43	51	51	
Median	16	22	18	20	21	22	31	
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Maximum	116	159	168	205	170	255	29 1	

Table 1.B.1.14 DRUG TRAFFICKING: TOTAL (Offences per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	t996	% change 9/1-96
	RHDTS0	RIIDTSI	R11DTS2	RHDTS3	RIIDTS4	R11DTS5	R11DTS6	PCHIDTS
Albania				• • •			* * *	
Austria	28	28	41	77	30	25	27	-3
Belgium	- • -							
Bulgaria		› - +	+ <i></i> -			- + *		
Croatia			**-		- + -			- + •
Cyprus	* - *		- • •	+ · · ·			• • •	
Czech Republic				* * •				
Denmark	22	20	20	19	17	15	18	-20
Estonia								
Finland				4 + -				
France					- • -	* * *		
Germany*	5	5	4	5	6	7	7	59
Greece			4 + 2			• • •		
Hungary	* * 4		- * *	0	0	0	0	
Ireland				** *	* * *			
Italy	- • •					• • •		
Latvia*					•••	** *		
Lithuania					• • •			
Luxembourg	***		* * -					
Malta					•••	• • •		
Moldova								
Netherlands				** *				
Norway		4	11	10	15	19	21	
Poland								
Portugal								
Romania								
Russia								
Slovenia	1	1	l	i	1	1	2	24
Spain								
Sweden	• • •							
Switzerland								•••
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Furkey								
United Kingdom:								•••
England & Wales						► 4 B		
Northern Ireland			***	• • •	•••			
Scotland		***		• • •				
Mean	11	11	13	16	10	10	11	
Median	5	9	8	5	6	7	7	
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Maximum	28	28	41	77	30	25	27	

Notes on table 1.B.1.1 to 1.B.1.15

Germany: The figures for Germany and 1990 refer to the territory of the former Federal Republic of Germany including West Berlin, i.e. without the former German Democratic Republic. The figures from 1991 refer to the actual territory of united Germany. However, organizational problems related to the transition led to serious undercounts of offences in 1991 and 1992.

Latvia: There were several changes in offence definitions in 1993-94 which might have affected the numbers of recorded offences.

1.B.2 Offenders

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R12IHOT0	R121HOT1	R121HO'f2	R121HOT3	R121HOT4	R121HOT5	R121HOTo	90-96 PC121HOT
Albania				24	26	21	22	
Austria	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	-18
Belgium						*	***	
Bulgaria	4	б	8	9	9	8	8	126
Croatia	7	12	15	9	8	8	6	~14
Cyprus	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	9
Czech Republic	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	25
Denmark	•••	***		- + +		- * *	***	
Estonia	6	7	9	17	19	20	19	185
Finland ²⁴	8	9	8	8	10	10	10	26
France	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1
Germany*	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	26
Greece*	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	28
Hungary	4	5	5	6	6	5	5	26
freland*	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	118
Italy	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7
Latvia*	4	6	5	10	9	10	9	116
Lithuania								
Luxembourg	10	13	11	6	9	12	9	-8
Malta			** *	•••		***		
Moldova	5	6	6	5	6	7	6	16
Netherlands	14	14	18	20	18	20	20	43
Norway	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	-48
Poland*	2	3	3	3	3	4	3	78
Portugal		··•						
Romania	7	8	8	7	7	7	7	1
Russia	9	9	11	15	16	16	16	82
Slovenia	4	5	6	4	5	5	6	49
Spain	2	2	3		***	***		
Sweden	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	25
Switzerland	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	14
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	15
Turkey	5	6	6	7	7	7	8	51
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	29
Northern Ireland			•••	n +				•••
Scotland	***			***		***		
Mean	5	5	6	7	7	7	7	
Median	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	
Minimum	0	1	1	1	1	1	Ĩ	
Maximum	14	14	18	24	26	21	22	

Table 1.B.2.1.1 INTENTIONAL HOMICIDE: TOTAL (Offenders per 100'000 population)

* See notes on tables 1.B.2.1.1 to 1.B.2.1.14

²⁴ Finland: Assault leading to death is not included.

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R121HOC0	R121HOC1	R12tHOC2	R121HOC3	R121HOC4	R121HOC5	R121HOC6	PC121HOC
Albania				12	12	9	- 9	
Austria								
Belgium					۰ - ۰			
Bulgaria	2	3	5	4	5	4	5	89
Croatia			+ - +					
Cyprus	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	-18
Czech Republic	2	L	2	2	2	2	2	10
Denmark					****			
Estonia	6	6	8	15	15	16	15	175
Finland	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5
France	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3
Germany*						- + +	•••	
Greece*					- • •			4++
Hungary	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	27
Ireland*	0	1	1	1	1	I.	1	115
Italy	ł	2	1	1	1	1	1	-6
Latvia*	4	5	5	9	8	9	8	112
Litbuania			4 - +					
Luxembourg	3	1	3	ł	1	0	1	-67
Malta								- , .
Moldova					***			
Netherlands	2	2	3	4	3	3	4	60
Norway	1	Ĩ	1	1	1	1	1	-33
Poland*		***						
Portuga)			***	3	3	3	2	
Romania	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	-9
Russia	9	9	10	14	16	16	15	80
Slovenia	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	0
Spain	***		- * 1		-1 = +			
Sweden	1	I	1	1	1	1	1	1
Switzerland		- * *						. * 4
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	5
Turkey						4.7.1	-15	
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	1	l	1	1	1	1	1	27
Northern Ireland	•••	•••	***					
Scotland				* * *				
Mean	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	
Median	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	
Minimum	0	l	0	I	1	0	1	
Maximum	9	9	10	15	16	16	15	

Table 1.B.2.1.3 ASSAULT (Offenders per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R121AS0	R121ASI	R121AS2	RI21AS3	R121AS4	R121AS5	R121AS6	PC121AS
Albania				52	50	37	24	
Austria	345	357	382	369	376	363	348	ł
Belgium	• • •		•-					
Bulgaria	1	5	7	9	12	14	14	861
Croatia	27	21	22	25	27	25	26	-2
Сургия	12	11	10	15	18	24	30	144
Czech Republic	65	64	61	62	78	65	65	0
Denmark	• • •			* * *	- + -		+	
Estonia	.	4	10	17	15	18	20	* * -
Finland	363	367	341	326	348	386	459	26
France	67	72	75	75	86	97	103	53
Germany*	293	268	292	312	321	351	368	26
Greece*	73	75	74	75	80	73	69	-6
Hungary	58	54	62	64	65	64	58	-1
Ireland*	26	20	13	13	12	12	12	-53
Italy	33	35	37	38	38	37	40	21
Latvia*	15	14	15	17	19	27	27	84
Lithuania	* * 4	•	***		+			
Luxembourg	287	328	385	356	393	364	362	26
Maita			- • -			•••		
Moldova	8	8	7	7	8	9	8	0
Netherlands	100	95	99	96	106	117	130	29
Norway	34	34	38	43	47	42	46	37
Poland*	18	21	22	25	31	30	31	73
Portugal				381	391	428	443	
Romania	3	5	4	5	5	6	6	71
Russia	18	18	20	27	30	30	27	51
Stovenia	20	24	22	25	22	26	26	27
Spain	14	13	14	15	17	18	18	27
Sweden	120	123	128	142	142	142	125	4
Switzerland	44	44	46	45	46	48	53	22
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	24	22	25	33	34	36	32	29
Turkey	35	36	34	39	43	48	51	44
United Kingdom: England & Wales	194	196	20 3	197	196	148	155	-20
Northern Ireland					6 8 e	* • •		
Scotland								***
Mean	85	83	87	97	102	103	106	
Median	34	34	35	4]	44	40	43	
Minimum	1	4	4	5	5	6	6	
Maximum	363	367	385	381	393	428	459	

Table 1.B.2.1.4	RAPE (Offenders per 100'000 population))
-----------------	---	---

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R121RA0	R121RA1	R121RA2	R121RA3	R121RA4	RI21RA5	R121RA6	PC121RA
Albania		· •		7	6	4	4	
Austria	5	5	6	5	6	5	5	-6
Betgium	***					• • •		
Bulgaria	5	8	9	9	9	10	9	94
Croatia	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	-47
Сургиз	0	1	1	!	2	3	3	576
Czech Republic	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	-26
Denmark	· , •				***			
Estonia	3	2	3	5	4	6	4	56
Finland	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	0
France	6	7	7	7	8	10	10	57
Germany*	6	5	6	6	6	6	6	3
Greece*	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	-27
Hungary	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	-8
treland*	2	3	3	3	4	.4	4	117
Italy	E	1	I]	2	2	2	89
Latvia*	5	6	4	3	2	5	5	-4
Litbuania				*		•••		
Luxembourg	9	5	3	4	7	11	10	17
Malta				4 H P		***		
Moldova	6	6	5	5	5	4	4	-38
Netherlands	5	5	6	6	6	7	7	23
Norway	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	-57
Poland*	3	3	3	4	4	5	4	21
Portugal			***	5	5	6	5	
Romania	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	0
Russia	11	9	8	9	9	8	7	-37
Slovenia	7	7	7	7	6	6	5	-22
Spain	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	-14
Sweden	3	2	3	4	3	3	2	-25
Switzerland	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	-4
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	-3
Turkey	I	1	1	1	2	2	2	106
United Kingdom: England & Wales	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	17
Northern Ireland			4 - 1			•••		
Scotland	* • •	•••			• • •			
Mean	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	
Median	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	
Minimum	0	1	1	1	2	1	I	
Maximum	11	9	9	9	9	11	10	

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R121ROT0	R121ROT1	RI2IROT2	R121ROT3	R121ROT4	R121ROT5	R121ROT6	PCIZIROT
Albania		•••		15	12	12	10	
Austria	15	15	15	16	18	14	14	-6
Belgíum	- • -							
Bulgaria	1	21	30	35	40	42	4)	> 1000
Croatia	5	6	8	7	6	7	6	17
Сургия	i	3	3	3	2	4	2	20
Czech Republic	20	21	19	23	24	24	25	27
Denmark								
Estonia	31	33	41	70	75	84	88	189
Finland	36	36	31	26	30	32	30	-18
France	26	28	28	28	32	35	37	44
Germany*	31	31	36	41	40	46	50	65
Greece*	6	7	12	12	8	9	5	۰3
Hungary	16	21	20	21	21	19	19	19
lreland*	23	25	27	33	40	53	50	112
Italy	13	15	15	17	16	15	16	16
Latvia*	14	15	20	23	21	20	25	72
Lithuania		* * *			•••			
Luxembourg	47	47	44	31	44	30	38	-20
Malta				• • ·	•••			* * *
Moldova	25	29	28	27	29	26	27	9
Netherlands	28	31	38	42	39	44	43	55
Norway	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	-16
Poland*	18	20	20	23	31	33	32	79
Portuga!	• • •			75	95	105	112	
Romania	11	18	19	19	18	18	18	70
Russia	10	10	15	20	21	21	21	102
Slovenia	8	14	17	14	18	20	4!	422
Spain	43	44	49	50	45	45	49	14
Sweden	11	ΙI	11	12	10	10	10	-7
Switzerland	17	18	22	22	17	18	22	26
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	3	3	8	7	8	11	15	456
Farkey	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	50
<i>United Kingdom:</i> England & Wales	15	17	18	19	19	20	23	53
Northern Ireland	+ + +							
Scotland		•••		•.,				
Mean	17	20	22	25	26	28	29	
Median	15	18	20	21	21	20	24	
Minimum	1	3	3	3	2	4	2	
Maximum	47	47	49	75	95	105	112	

Table 1.B.2.J.5 ROBBERY: TOTAL (Offenders per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	RIZIROA0	R121ROA1	R121ROA2	R121ROA3	R121ROA4	R121ROA5	R121ROA6	PC121RO
Albania								
Austria		4						
Belgium		• • •						
Bulgaria					• • •			
Croatia			- • -		* * *		.,,	
Cyprus	• - •		- • -				,	
Czech Republic	•••				4	3	4	
Denmark	, - +			- • •	•••			
Estonia	2	ŧ	3	8	8	14	11	507
Finland		•••	• • •				•	
France	6	7	6	7	7	7	7	15
Germany*					***			
Greece*		···	- + -		• • •			
Hungary		l	1	1	t	1	1	
ireland*	9	10	12	17	14	13	20	110
Italy	** *			* - *		•••		
Latvia*	4	***					- • •	
Lithuania	***		•			+ # *		
Luxembourg	7	5	9	9	6	6	7	~8
Malta				* • • •	• • •			
Moldova	7	7	7	7	9	8	8	4
Netherlands		- * *	* * *					
Norway	2	2	2	3	3	2		
Poland*	3	4	4	5	6	7	6	133
Portugai	* * 1							
Romania				0	0	0	0	•••
Russia	- + *	÷		***				
Slovenia	1	2	2	2	4	2	4	182
Spain	2	2	37	38	35	35	38	> 1000
Sweden	2	3	4	5	4	3	3	13
Switzerland				* * *				
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	> 1000
Furkey		***	- • •		•••			•••
United Kingdom: England & Wales	***	*-*	-*+					
Northern Ireland	•••							
Scotland								
Mean	4	4	8	8	7	7	8	
Median	2	3	4	5	5	5	6	
Minimum	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Maximum	9	10	37	38	35	35	38	

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% chunge 90-96
	R1217HT0	R121THT1	R121THT2	R121THT3	R121THT4	RI2ITHT5	R121THT6	PCI2FTH
Albania	• • •			32	34	26	21	
Austria	396	391	416	382	386	371	370	-7
Belgium			1 * *	• • •		· • ·	4 - 1	
Bulgaria	115	446	563	539	592	587	607	429
Croatia	212	161	282	284	202	209	180	-15
Cyprus	115	106	122	86	102	101	116	2
Czech Republic	254	352	419	464	430	463	454	78
Denmark								
Estonia	129	155	301	408	357	389	408	217
Finland	1600	1451	1592	1526	1448	1344	1369	-]4
France	416	426	429	407	428	408	405	-3
Germany*	898	809	944	1022	949	974	1012	13
Greece*	75	93	97	102	95	97	66	-11
Hungary	386	453	458	422	399	432	466	21
Ireland*	698	763	779	830	919	916	912	31
Italy	185	211	202	193	194	193	187	ł
Latvia*	163	215	317	359	272	325	334	105
Lithuania		* * 1						
Luxembourg	213	861	173	295	172	137	93	~56
Malta			- * *					***
Moldova	137	173	175	172	192	181	166	21
Netherlands	688	689	740	743	737	708	684	-1
Norway	243	223	218	219	218	081	185	-24
Poland*	105	110	97	101	144	171	106	1
Portugal				324	338	338	319	
Romania	58	95	119	181	250	286	325	458
Russia	167	219	304	348	382	427	414	148
Slovenia	410	388	496	397	356	266	304	-26
Spain	+ #)							
Sweden	419	444	418	456	405	3 99	353	-16
Switzerland	571	575	556	549	515	517	514	-10
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	188	185	266	249	312	273	249	32
Turkey	73	77	73	74	90	103	105	44
United Kingdom:							1	
England & Wales	539	568	602	559	546	511	482	-10
Northern Freland	***		•••	• • •				•••
Scotland		* * *		• • •		•••		
Mean	350	368	413	404	395	391	386	
Median	213	223	317	359	356	338	334	
Minimum	58	77	73	32	34	26	21	
Maximum	1600	1451	1592	1526	1448	1344	1369	

Table 1.8.2.1.7 THEFT: TOTAL (Offenders per 100'000 population)

	1990 R121THV0	1991	199 2	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
		R121THV1	R121THV2	R121THV3	R121THV4	R121THV5	R121THV6	PC12ITHV
Albania				4	7	4	5	
Austria	30	28	30	30	29	26	25	-16
Belgium						+		
Bulgaria	15	18	23	23	24	23	20	32
Croatia						+		
Cyprus		,	+	- + +	• • •	+		4-+
Czech Republic	46	34	51	53	50	52	51	11
Denmark						. * *		
Estonia			19	49	43	44	•••	
Finland	231							
France	74	73	72	67	69	67	65	-11
Germany*	42	43	57	64	63	65	61	45
Greece*	34	13	18	19	17	16	7	-37
Hungary		11	9	9	10	10	12	
Ireland*	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	10
ltaly	29	35	34	32	29	29	27	-5
Latvia*	12	15	23	25	20	23	24	95
Lithuania								
Laxembourg	66	70	67	65	138	45	15	-78
Malta					***			
Moldova	•••	•••						
Netherlands								
Norway	 33	31	29	27	27	 22	 24	-28
Poland*					10	14	14	
	•••		***	 24	27	28	31	
Portugal Romania	5		 5	4	5	5	4	-23
	3	0		4	4	5	5	
Russia		44		44	47	51	43	 I
Slovenia	43				256	253	291	-17
Spain	349	327	292	276 61	230 54	233 56	46	-17
Sweden	67	66	63					
Switzerland								140
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	25	35	28	21	48	53	63	148
Turkey	6	5	5	7	8	8	9	59
<i>United Kingdom:</i> Englaud & Wales	18	21	23	30	31	29	28	51
Northern Ireland				4.8.8				
Scotland								
Mean	58	46	45	41	42	39	38	
Median	30	31	29	27	28	27	24	
Minimum	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	
Maximum	349	327	292	276	256	253	291	

Table 1.8.2.1.8 THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE (Offenders per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R121THB0	R121THB1	RI21THB2	R121THB3	R121THB4	RI21THB5	R121THB6	PC121THB
Albania				J				
Austria	10	11	14	11	12	12	9	-10
Belgium	• •							
Bulgaria					- **	+	× - +	
Croatia		• • •	,		• • •			
Cyprus			• • •					
Czech Republic	7	13	19	26	25	22	19	193
Denmark		• • •		***			* , ,	
Estonia	4 * -	- + •		• • •				
Finland		- * *		• - +				···
France				+ 1 •	* - +		* * *	
Germany*	33	30	36	34	33	36	33	-1
Greece*								
Hungary		30	37	33	34	32	33	+ - +
ireland*	9	8	11	11	11	9	8	-10
Italy		* - 1				• · · •		- + -
Latvia*	5	5	6	7	7	7	7	34
Lithuania	***	* > >		- * *				
Luxembourg	12	7	8	5	4	5	7	-39
Malta			···		* * *			
Moldova		• • •				* * *		
Netherlands								
Norway	2	3	4	3	3	4	4	101
Poland*	* - *		> - #		• • •	• • •		
Portugal								
Romania	2	5	6				4	113
Russia			***					
Slovenia	14	15	29	21	17	13	7	-50
Spain			- * *			* * *		
Sweden	9	11	13	15	14	15	12	33
Switzerland				,				,
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	20	21	27	25	31	16	20	5
Turkey						4 * 1		
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	10	11	11	9	8	8	7	-36
Northern Ireland					•••	• - •		1 4 +
Scotland			•••					* * *
Mean	11	13	17	15	17	15	13	
Median	10	11	13	11	13	12	8	
Minimum	2	3	4	1	3	4	4	
Maximum	33	30	37	34	34	36	33	

Table 1.B.2.1.9 BICYCLE THEFT (Offenders per 100'000 population)

Table J.B.2.1.10 B	BURGLARY; TOTAL (Offenders per	100'000 population)
--------------------	-------------------	---------------	---------------------

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R121BUT0	R121BUTI	R121BUT2	R121BUT3	R121BUT4	R121BUT5	R121BUT6	PC121BU
Albania				27	28	23	16	
Austria	66	64	74	69	71	65	67	1
Belgium		- 4 -		÷ + -	- + -	• • •	** *	
Bulgaria	50	186	228	231	253	217	205	308
Croatia	66	73	143	144	97	81	79	19
Сургиз	134	101	147	194	146	102	196	47
Czech Republic	114	177	191	202	190	191	181	58
Denmark						- • •	• • •	
Estonia	56	73	68	132	156	221	246	338
Finland	+	•••					- + -	
France	85	86	86	85	92	82	85	0
Germany*	89	90	108	116	113	119	118	33
Greece*	43	53	52	58	53	48	34	-23
Hungary	103	156	147	142	146	148	153	47
Ireland*	215	252	257	267	293	270	279	30
Italy	32	33	32	32	32	34	33	2
Latvia*			- # -	- • •				• - •
Lithuania		1.1.7		- + +	** *			
Luxembourg	18	16	14	11	28	11	22	23
Malta					•• -	• • •		+ - 4
Moldova				• • • •				1
Netherlands	232	241	295	315	323	302	287	24
Norway	147	137	134	141	135	107	106	-28
Poland*	142	14]	138	133	167	167	163	15
Portugal				119	129	129	131	
Romania	64	111	116				143	123
Russia	40	51	79	105	113	108	115	189
Slovenia	155	194	213	171	154	126	140	-10
Spain	85	80	88	95	91	96	102	20
Sweden	89	90	83	83	76	72	60	-33
Switzerland	120	130	122	124	114	114	125	4
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	271	350	583	536	515	456	545	101
Turkey								
United Kingdom: England & Wales	145	156	156	147	137	123	116	-20
Northern Ireland				***	***			
Scotland	•••							
Mean	107	127	148	147	146	136	144	
Median	89	106	128	132	129	114	122	
Minimum	18	16	14	11	28	11	16	
Maximum	271	350	583	536	515	456	545	

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R121BUD0	R121BUD1	R121BUD2	R121BUD3	R121BUD4	R1218UD5	R121BUD6	PCIZIBUD
Albania	,	• • • •	• • •	18	15	11	8	
Austria	20	20	21	19	19	18	18	-11
Belgium			- • •					
Bulgaria				- • •				
Croatia			• • •				* - *	•••-
Сургиз	• • •				•••-	* * -		
Czech Republic	22	26	26	29	31	29	29	33
Denmark								
Estonia		,	9	58	64	67	• • •	
Finland								
France	34	36	36	37	40	38	40	17
Germany*	32	29	33	36	38	41	42	29
Greece*		- * *				• • •		
Hungary		26	25	27	31	30	35	•••
Ireland*	100	131	128	137	163	156	163	63
Italy	32	33	32	32	32	34	33	2
Latvia*	50	60	63	63	55	63	62	23
Lithuania					+ 4 F			
Luxembourg	6	11	6	4	10	6	9	59
Malta	- • •							
Moldova								
Netherlands		4 + r						
Norway	25	28	26	31	30	24	25	-1
Poland*	* * *	- **						
Portugal		•••		55	58	60	62	
Romania			,					
Russia	26	35	52	67	74	61	61	130
Slovenia	58	64	61	57	40	34	41	-29
Spain	6	6	7	7	7	8	8	44
Sweden	14	15	14	14	13	11	10	-30
Switzerland	• • •				+			
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	12	4	6	11	14	9	7	-41
Turkey	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	-2
<i>United Kingdom:</i> England & Wales	54	57	59	60	62	5 6	54	0
Northern Ireland				•••	•••			
Scotland								
Mean	31	34	34	38	40	38	37	
Median	26	28	26	31	32	32	33	
Minimum	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	
Maximum	100	131	128	137	163	156	163	

Table 1.B.2.1.11 DOMESTIC BURGLARY (Offenders per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R121DOT0	R121DOTT	R121DOT2	R121DOT3	RI2IDOT4	R12IDOT5	R121DOT6	PC121DOT
Albania				i	2	13	15	
Austria	48	58	84	119	138	142	185	283
Belgium			* - +		* - *		4	
Bulgaria			* - *		* - *		2	
Croatia	3	5	8	13	12	14	42	> 1000
Cyprus	11	13	17	16	24	29	33	198
Czech Republic	- ++	4	+ = -		3	4	9	
Denmark					,	- * •		
Estonia	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	790
Finland	51	49	68	82	115	188	168	228
France	98	105	112	104	119	136	147	50
Germany*	127]][115	117	131	152	179	41
Greece*	29	29	32	23	28	41	59	106
Hungary	0	1	ł	2	3	4	5	> 1000
Ireland*	59	87	100	102	113	112	110	86
Italy	67	88	101	79	88	84	85	27
Latvia*	2	2	3	3	5	9	8	328
Lithuania	4 + 1							
Luxembourg	280	326	385	216	292	309	330	18
Malta	- + *							
Moldova	1	2	2	3	5	7	9	643
Netherlands	53	56	32	33	28	57	57	8
Norway	79	84	91	88	80	90	102	30
Poland*	1	5	5	11	10	9	10	656
Portugal		+11		105	101	82	94	
Romania				1	2	2	2	
Russia	11	13	20	36	- 50	54	65	496
Slovenia	11	11	17	17	24	27	38	262
Spain			***					
Sweden	78	82	82	77	91	103	100	28
Switzerland	216	254	304	359	369	379	385	78
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	2.10	3	4	6	9	11	10	302
Turkey	4	4	4	4	8	7	8	100
United Kingdom:			-	.1	Б	,	ľ ľ	
England & Wales	92	97	109	121	153	166	169	85
Northern Ireland		***		•••	- • •			
Scotland	- • •		* - •		- • •	•••		- • -
Mean	55	62	71	64	72	80	84	
Median	39	39	32	33	28	48	57	
Minimum	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	
Maximum	280	326	385	359	369	379	385	

Table 1.B.2.1.12 DRUG OFFENCES: TOTAL (Offenders per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R121DTT0	R121DTT1	R121DTT2	R121DTT3	R12IDTT4	R121DTT5	R121DTT6	PC121DTT
Albania		• -	- + >					
Austria								
Belgium					• • •	* * *		
Bulgaria			+				2	
Croatia				- • •			+ - +	
Cyprus					***	***	- • •	
Czech Republic			***		3	4	8	
Denmark			**-			• • •		
Estonia	- • -						• • •	
Finland		•••			• • •			
France	81	18	20	19	21	18	20	12
Germany*		• • •						
Greece*	• • •		*	* 1- *				
Hungary	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	531
Ireland*	* * *							
Italy		• • •	•••				••••	
Latvia*	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	266
Lithuania				- • •				
Luxembourg	4+6		- * *					
Malta	• • •		• * *		+			
Moldova					* * 1			
Netherlands	53	56	32	33	28	57	57	8
Norway	28	30	38	53	49	48	57	102
Poland*	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	> 1000
Portugal				70	72	86	61	
Romania								
Rnssia		***						
Slovenia	5	5	12	13	16	20	27	472
Spain	56	66	66	74	80	76	95	69
Sweden	12	11	11	н	10	9	9	-24
Switzerland	66	76	86	102	89	87	92	38
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	2	3	3	5	8	9	9	362
furkey	2	2	2	2	4	4	3	45
United Kingdom: England & Wales	16	18	21	24	29	33	34	117
Northern Ireland	***				* * *			
Scotland				- • •		•••		
Mean	20	22	22	29	27	30	30	
Median	12	11	12	16	16	18	14	
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Maximum	66	76	86	102	89	87	95	

Table J.B.2.1.13 DRUG TRAFFICKING: TOTAL (Offenders per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R121DTS0	RI2IDTSI	R121DTS2	R12IDTS3	R121DTS4	R121DTS5	RI2IDTS6	PC121DTS
Albania		•						
Austria	12	14	19	28	28	27	31	164
Belgium							• • • •	
Bulgaria				+ - +		- + -		
Croatia	• • •	* * *	•••					-+-
Cyprus			• • •				•••	••
Czech Republic			* * *	- • •	* - 4			
Denmark	• - •							
Estonia			+ = -			* • •		
Finland		•••			•••	* * *		
France					* * -	* * *		• • •
Germany*	5	5	5	6	7	7	8	59
Greece*	***	• • •					,	
Нипдагу				0	0	0	0	• •
freland*		+ - 5		* * -	- * -	- # -		- • •
Italy		+ - +	* * *					
Latvia*	- • -	+ • -	• • •				***	• • •
Lithuania			* - *					* - *
Luxembourg					•••			• - •
Malta					* - *	***		
Moldova				** *	+ + -			
Netherlands								
Norway	7	7	8	10	8	9	9	16
Poland*	***							
Portugal								
Romania			- * *	* 5 *				
Russia	***							
Slovenia	2	1	3	2	2	3	3	112
Spain			- + *			* - *		
Sweden	***	* - \$	•••					
Switzerland	**-			F				
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia*	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2
Turkey				* * *				••••
United Kingdom:								
England & Wates	** -	**1	***	8	10	8	10	•••
Northern Ireland	***				+	•••		•••
Scotland			**-	•••	***	•••		•••
Mean	5	5	7	8	8	8	9	
Median	5	5	5	6	7	7	8	
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Maximum	12	14	19	28	28	27	31	

Table 1.B.2.1.14 SERIOUS DRUG TRAFFICKING (Offenders per 100'000 population)

Notes on tables 1.B.2.1.1 to 1.B.2.1.14

Germany:

a) The figures for Germany and 1990 refer to the territory of the former Federal Republic of Germany including West Berlin, i.e. without the former German Democratic Republic. The figures from 1991 refer to the actual territory of united Germany. However, organizational problems related to the transition led to serious undercounts of offences in 1991 and 1992.

b) If the same offender commits several different offences, he will be counted as a suspect under each offence; otherwise, he will be counted only once.

Greece: There are unexplained inconsistencies between the numbers indicated in tables 1.B.1 and 1.B.2.1.

Ireland: At least one suspect is heing counted for each offence cleared (no precise counts of suspects are available).

Latvia:

a) The figures refer to prosecuted offenders.

b) There were several changes in offence definitions in 1993-94 which might have affected the numbers of recorded offenses.

Poland: If the same suspect commits, with one same act, several offences, or if he/she commits several offences of the same kind, he/she will be counted only under the most serious one. Otherwise, the suspect will be counted under all offences.

The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia: There may be unspecified differences between the offence definitions used in these tables and those used in tables 1.B.1.

England & Wales: Figures refer to those cautioned by the police or prosecuted in the courts.

1.B.2.2. Percentage of females, persons under 18 years of age, and aliens among suspected offenders in 1995

	Intentional homicide: total	Intentiona) homicide: completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery: total	Armed robbery	Theft	Theft of motor vehicle	Bicycle theft	Burglary: total	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: total	Drug trafficking: total	Serious drug trafficking
	P122HOTW	₽122HOCŴ	P122ASW	P122RAW	PIZZROTW	P122ROAW	PI22THTW	PI22THVW	P122THBW	P122BUTW	P122BUDW	P122DOTW	P122DTTW	PI22DTSW
Albania	2	3	1	0	0	1	2	0		2	1	0	- • •	
Austria	20		12	0	13		23	4	7	6	9	18		15
Belgium														•••
Bulgaria	8	10	6	0	4		7	ł		4				
Croatia	8	** •	4		2		6	<i></i>		4		5	* * *	
Cyprus		4 * *		•••								***		• • •
Czech Republic	14	21	7	0	8		7	2	3	4	7			
Denmark														
Estonia	9		8	•••	5		7	1		5	10	5		
Finland	12	12	10	0	13		17					10	•••	
France	13	14	10	4	7	6	15	4		7	9	10	13	
Germany	10		13	1	8		29	4	6	6	11	12		11
Greece	4	• • •	31	3	2		5	0		4		9		
Hungary	17	16	9	1	10	2	9	2	4	5	8	12	7	•••
Ireland	12	13	6		3	1	13	2	2	4	5	Q		
Italy	• • •			• • •				** *	• • •					
Latvia	14	13	11	0	4	•••	11	2	б		14	5	40	
Lìthuania				***				,		•••				

Table 1.B.2.2.1 Percentage of females among suspected offenders in 1995

	Intentional homicide: total	Intentional homicide: completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery: total	Armed robbery	Thefl	Thefl of motor vehicle	Bicycle theft	Burglary: total	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: total	Drug trafficking: total	Serious drug trafficking
Luxembourg	20	0	15	0	4	0	11	3	0	9	13	15		
Malta						•••								
Moldova	13		11	0	6	3	12	0	+	* * *		23		
Netherlands	9	13	9	4	8		17	•••	• •	9	• • •	12	(1)	
Norway	7	6	9	0	9	2	10	6	5	6	10	17	17	10
Poland	13		7	0	4	4	9	1		3		50	9	
Portugal		14	19	2	4		14	5	• • •	10	13	15	12	
Romania	7	10	4	0	18		9			•••		13	.,	
Russia	13		13	1	7		13				17	11		
Slovenia	10	12	1	2	3	7	13	2	8	2	3	8	8	13
Spain	•••		* • •	I	11	• • •	* * -			6			14	•
Sweden	11	8	9	1	5	3	27	4	7	б	10	15	15	
Switzerland	13		11		6	** -	17	+ - 4		4		15	13	••
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	1	3	6	0	3	0	7	0	4	2	3	1	I	0
Turkey	3	***	3	3	1		5	1			7	3	3	
United Kingdom: England & Wales Northern Ireland	10	10	12	0	8		26	4	3	5	6	10	14	19
Scotland	* * *													
Mean	10	10	9	·····	6	3	13	2	5	5	9	12	13	
Median	10	10	9	0	5	3	11	2	5	5	9	13	13	12
	10	0	7	0	5 0	0	2			2	7		15	
Minimum Maximum	20	21	19	4	18	7	2 29	0 6	0 8	10	17	0 50	1 40	0 19

	Intentional homicide: total P122HOTM	Intentional homicide: completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery: total	Armed robbery PI22ROAM	Theft	Theft of motor vehicle P122THYM	Bicycle theft	Burglary: total P12280TM	Domestic burglary P122BUDM	Drug offences: total P122DOTM	Drug trafficking: total P122DTTM	Serious drug Lrafficking P122DTSM
Albania	10	8	14	14	11		32	28		32	29	3	***	
Austria	4		12	8	28		26	44	39	34	28	19		9
Belgium						,				• •	- + Þ	**-		
Bulgaria	8	9	7	15	5		23	15	•	27				
Croatia	3		7	10	17		22			31		5		
Cyprus						* * 1	• • •				,			
Czech Republic	5	5	11	9	32		32	22	43	35	32	19	14	
Denmark	***					•••								
Estonia	4		6	34	26		25	25		30	26	0		- * -
Finland	4	3	13	6	27		24					9		b - 4
France	7	6	12	15	31	12	28	37		30	30	10	5	
Germany	6		16	8	35		30	4]	45	32	29	12		5
Greece	4		1	5	4		11	10		12	* * 1	1		
Hungary	5	6	10	12	28	ľ 1	20	19	28	25	21	4	4	
Ireland	9	9	15	10	17	7	15	32	49	27	20	5	- 1 +	
Italy	2	3	2	3	6		9	5		23	23	3		
Latvia	4	4	5	25	20	•••	23	37	34		24	Ī	7	
Lithuania				•••									•	

Table 1.B.2.2.2 Percentage of persons under 18 years of age among suspected offenders in 1995

	Intentional homicide: total	Intentional homicide: completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery: total	Armed robbery	Theft	ThefL of motor vehicle	Bicycle theft	Burglary: total	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: total	Drug trafficking: total	Serious drug trafficking
Luxembourg	6	0	5	2	16	48	17	3	41	5	13	5		
Malta												•••		• • •
Moldova	6		5	14	19	3	22					5		
Netherlands	8	6	15	14	25		21			23		4		
Norway	10	9	15	16	15	7	29	36	36	27	22	6	4	1
Poland	6	• • •	17	13	26	20	29	14		38		1	б	
Portugal		* 4 *	***	•••	•••									
Romania	5	5	5	11	22		21					4		
Russia	б		5	21	20		20	•••			22	8		
Slovenia	3	2	10	9	50	21	38	39	59	40	28	12	8	0
Spain				3	17					15			3	
Sweden	7	6	20	8	28	20	25	31	21	25	17	4	5	* 4
Switzerland	7		12	5	33		31			26	• • •	9	6	• • •
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	5	10	9	13	22	0	48	71	72	51	31	4	3	0
Turkey	3	- • •	5	3	4	- • •	10	9	• •		1	7	5	***
<i>United Kingdom:</i> England & Wales Northern Ireland	6	7	23	8	45		41	41	58	36	35	12	6	6
Scotland					***									b = 4
Mean	б	6	10	11	23	15	25	28	44	28	24	7	6	3
Median	6	6	10	10	22	11	24	30	42	29	25	5	5	3
Minimum	2	0	1	2	4	0	9	3	21	5	1	0	3	0
Maximum	10	10	23	34	50	48	48	71	72	51	35	19	14	9

	Intentional homicide: total	Intentional homicide: completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery: total	Armed robbery	Theft	Theft of motor vehicle	Bicycle theft	Burglary: total	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: total	Drug trafficking: total	Serious drug trafficking
	P122HOTA	P122HOCA	P122ASA	P122RAA	PI22ROTA	P122ROAA	P122THTA	PI22THVA	P122THBA	P122BUTA	P122BUDA	PIZZDOTA	P122DTTA	P122DTSA
Albania														
Austria	22		18	26	34		27	20	27	23	25	15		27
Belgium											• • •	• • •		
Bulgaria	2	2	1	0	1	b + 4	ĩ	2		1		•••		
Croatia	5		2	3	6		3	** *	•••	4		4		* * *
Cyprus	0	0	14	16	44		24		.,.	17		53	· · ·	
Czech Republic	11	14	4	11	9	•••	5	4	3	5	4	•••		
Denmark			• • •					* * *			•••			
Estonia	64		48	41	54		40			43		60	* 4 -	- • •
Finland						,								
France	16	14	16	13	17	13	14	10		11	12	15	31	
Germany	32		22	32	32		23	19	26	20	21	28	•••	35
Greece	16		1	13	19		22	27		22		7		• - •
Hungary	З	3	1	5	5	16	2	5	Ł	1	1	15	32	1
Ireland	- • •				***			• • •	•••			** -		* * *
Italy												•••-		
Latvia									***			4 b +		
Lithuania	× • •			•••	***						- • •			

Table 1.B.2.2.3 Percentage of aliens among suspected offenders in 1995

	Intentional homicide: total	Intentional homicide: completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery: total	Armed robbery	Theft	Theft of motor vehicle	Bicycle theft	Burglary: total	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: total	Drug trafficking: total	Serious drug trafficking
Luxembourg	40		31	57	69	40	50	76	27	77	92	55	1 * *	***
Malta	* * *	•••	•••		* * *							117		• • •
Moldova	0	0	0	1	2	2	0		0		• • •	1	• • •	
Netherlands	•••	* * *				•••	•••					•••		
Norway	13	18	8	17	14	14	8	3	9	5	3	13	18	24
Poland	2		0	1	2	6	1	2		0		0	2	
Portugal					* * 7									- + •
Romania	1	1	1	0	1		0	•••		***		13		
Russia	1		1	2	3		1	1		++ -	•••	4		* •
Slovenia	12	8	17	13	9	24	7	19	2	6	5	10	14	31
Spain				16	12	•••				13		* * *	15	
Sweden	27	28	18	32	20	20	22	11	11	13	16	16	23	
Switzerland	59	• • •	52	47	54	•••	50			49		33	48	
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	5	10	0	3	3	0	1	1	1	1	3	4	5	23
Turkey	- • •		* * -		• • •							5	• -	•••
United Kingdom: England & Wales				···				***		,		***	**	• - •
Northern Ireland		* * *	***	•••				***			- • •		• • •	
Scotland			•••					•••						
Mean	17	9	13	17	20	15	15	14	11	17	18	19	21	28
Median	11	8	6	13	12	14	7	8	6	12	8	13	18	27
Minimum	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	23
Maximum	64	28	52	57	69	40	50	76	27	77	92	60	48	35

1.B.3 Resources

Table 1.B.3 Police staff a	nd expenditure (i				0.1.1.
	Number of	Number of	Running costs	Capital costs of	Capital + Running costs
	Police officers per 100'000	Civilians per 100°000 pop.	of police per 100°000 pop.	police per 100'000 pop.	of police per
	per 100 000	100 000 pop.	100 000 pop.	100 000 pop.	[00'000 pop.
	R13PSNP5	R13PSNC5	X13PSRC5	X13PSCC5	X13PSTC5
Albania	317	35	• • •		
Austria	344	62			•••
Belgium	350	40	1413	943	2356
Bulgaria				- • •	
Croatia	483	145	8146	613	8759
Cyprus	519	5	11378		
Czech Republic	463	118	932	480	1412
Denmark*	197	56			12323
Estonia	333	81	1753	53	1806
Finland*	165	42	9858	229	10087
France*	337	23	13060		•••
Germany	**-	•••			
Greece	404		5097	627	5724
Hungary	368	118	2541		
Ireland	302	46	14352	598	14950
Italy	488				
Latvia*	367	79	14466	529	14995
Lithuania	477	180	1596	61	1657
Luxembourg	264	16	14763	620	15383
Malta	498	27	6373	241	6614
Moldova	229	40	292		
Netherlands	197	63	13339	1203	14542
Norway	170	53	11280	524	11804
Poland	258	45	1583	55	1638
Portugal	376	18	8224	236	8460
Romania	165	18	536	55	591
Russia					
Slovenia	260	157	1091	1030	2122
Spain	313	11		* * *	
Sweden*	201	84		* 1 4	14749
Switzerland*	198	40	25165	1131	26296
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	353	119			
Turkey	211	17	863	31	894
United Kingdom:					
England & Wales*	246	106	14172		
Northern Ireland	718	171			44165
Scotland	283	78	14186	330	14515
Mean	329	67	7858	479	10254
Median	317	53	8146	502	8759
Minimum	165	5	292	31	591
Maximum	718	180	25165	1203	44165

Table 1.B.3 Police staff and expenditure (in 1'000 ecu) in 1995

* See notes on table 1.B.3

Notes on table 1.B.3

Denmark: The costs include cost of prosecution.

Finland: Data refer to 1997.

France: The data do not include local police forces.

Latvia: Data on costs relate to 1997 and are estimates per 100'000 inhabitants.

Sweden: Data on staff refer to December, 1995. Data on costs refer to 1996.

Switzerland: The data on civilians include 560 cadets and auxiliary female police officers.

England & Wales: Figures on civilians include part-timers.

1.C TECHNICAL INFORMATION ON CHAPTER 1

1.C.1 Data recording methods in connection with tables 1.B.1.1 to 1.B.1.15 (Offences per 100'000 population)

		110	What is the	T.	YT	11	11
Question	Are there written rules regulating the way in which the data shown in this table are recorded?	When are the data in this table collected for the statistics?	counting unit used in this table?	Is a principal offence rule applied? <i>J: Yes</i>	How are multiple offences counted?	How do you count an offence committed by more than one person?	Have the data recording methods described above been substantially modified between 1990 and 1996? 1: Yes
Possible answers	1: Yes 2: No	1: When the offence is	1: Offence 2: Case	1: Tes 2: No	offence	offence	1: Tes 2: No
		reported to	3: Decision		2: As two	2: As two or	2. 140
		the police	4: Other		or more	more	
		2. Subsequently			offences 3:	offences	
		3: After			Uncertain		
	CTIIA	investigation CT11B	CTIIC	CTIIDA	CTHE	CT11F	CT11GA
Albania	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Austria*	1	3	1 .	2	2	1	2
Belgium*	1	2	1	2	2	1	1
Bulgaria*	1	1	1	1	1	1	I
Croatia	1	1	1	1	L	2	2
Cyprus	1	1	2	ł	1	1	2
Czech Republic	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Denmark		1	1	2	2	1	2
Estonia*	1	2	1	2	1	1	2
Finland	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
France	1	2	4	1	2	1	2
Germany	1	3	1	1	2	2	2
Greece	1	2	1	I	1	1	2
Hungary*	1	3	1		2	1	1
lreland	1	1	2	1	2	1	2
Italy	1	3	1	2	2	1	2
Latvia*	1	2	1	1	3	1	2
Lithuania*		2			3		2

1.C.1.1 Description of data recording methods in connection with tables 1.B.1.1 to 1.B.1.15

Question Possible answers	Are there written rules regulating the way in which the data shown in this table are recorded? <i>1: Yes</i>	When are the data in this table collected for the statistics?	What is the counting unit used in this table? 1: Offence	Is a principal offence rule applied?	How are multiple offences counted?	How do you count an offence committed by more than one person?	Have the data recording methods described above been substantially modified between 1990 and 1996? 1: Yes
	2: No	offence is reported to	2: Case 3: Decision	2: No	offence	offence 2: As two or	2: No
		the police	4: Other		2: As two or more	more	
		2 : Subsequently			offences 3:	offences	
		3: After investigation			Uncertain		
	CT11A	CT11B	CTIIC	CT11DA	CTIIE	CT11F	CTIIGA
Luxembourg	2	1	I	2	2	1	2
Malta	2	2	2	1	1	1	2
Moldova	1	2	1	2	1	1	2
Netherlands	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
Norway	1	1	1	1	2	1	2
Poland	1	3	1	1	2	I	1
Portugal*	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Romania	1	3	i	2	1	1	2
Russia	1	1	I	1	1	1	2
Slovenia	1	3	1	2	1	1	2
Spain	1	1	1	1			***
Sweden*	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
Switzerland*	*	2	1	2	2	1	2
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia Turkey	1 2	1 3	1	2 1	2 1	1 2	2 2
<i>United Kingdom:</i> England & Wales*	ι	I	I	1	3	1	2
Northern Ireland	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Scotland	1	2	1	2	2	1	2

* See notes on table 1.C.1.1

- 1) Are there written rules regulating the way in which the data shown in this table are recorded?
- Switzerland: There are no general rules at the federal level, but most cantons use written standards, largely
 following the rules of the Zurich police (who record about 30% of all offences known to the police in
 Switzerland).

2) When are the data in this table collected for the statistics?

- Portugal: The definition of homicide is broad and includes all cases where the possibility of a homicide cannot be ruled out at the time the relevant incident is recorded by the police, even if the death might have been caused by suicide or an accident. This explains why completed homicide is, according to police statistics, several times higher than homicide according to health statistics.
- Switzerland: There is some uncertainty in some cantons as to the exact point in time when offences are recorded.

3) Multiple offences

a) The treatment of multiple offences is not clear in Latvia and Lithuania.

b) Multiple offences are counted as only one offence in:

- Austria: if they are the result of the same criminal intent, or if one act constitutes more than one offence.
- Estonia: if they constitute the same offence (otherwise, more than one offence is counted)
- Hungary: if similar offences are directed against the same victim with the same criminal intent,
- England & Wales: if several offences are committed in the same incident. In cases of violence against the person, and sexual offences involving more than one victim, one offence is counted for each victim.

4) Chauges in data recording methods 1990-1996:

- Belgium: Centralisation and reorganisation of data recording after 1994. From 1994 to 1996, the number of reporting local police agencies increased from 368 to 518.
- **Bulgaria:** From 1991, offences are counted when reported to the police; before that date, only concluded preliminary proceedings were recorded in police statistics.
- Portugal: The statistical procedures for establishing police statistics were significantly altered after 1993.
- Sweden: In 1992, the progressive introduction of a computer-based reporting system might have caused deteriorated data quality.

1.C.2 General remarks on tables 1.B.2.1.1 - 1.B.2.1.14 and 1.B.2.2.1 - 1.B.2.2.3

1.C.2.1 Data recordi	ng methods in con	nection with tables	1.B.2.1.1 - 1.B.2.	1.14 and 1.B.2.2.1 -	1.B.2,2,3
Question	Do the offence definitions used in this table differ from those in the "definitions" section?	Are there written rules regulating the way in which the data showu in this table are collected?	ls a principal offence rule applied?	How are multiple offences counted?	How is a person counted who is suspected of more than one offence in the same year?
Possible answers	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	1: As one offence 2: As two or more offences 3: Uncertain	1: As one person 2: As two or more persons
	CT122AA	CT122B	CT122CA	CT122D	CT122E
Albania	1	1	1	1	2
Austria	2	1	1	1	2
Belgium		•••	** *		
Bulgaria	2	1	1		1
Croatia	2	1	1	1	2
Сургиз	2	1	1	1	2
Czech Republic	2	1	1	1	2
Denmark			4+-		141
Estonia	2	1	3	1	2
Finland	2	2	2	2	2
France	2	1	1	i i	2
Germany	1	1	i	1	1
Greece	2	t	1	1	2
Hungary	2	I.	2	2	2
(reland	2	1	1	2	2
ltaly	1	1	2	2	2
Latvia				3	*
Litbuania		***			
Luxembourg	2	2	2	2	2
Malta	2	2	1	1	1
Moldova	2	1	2	2	1
Netherlands	2	1	1	1	2
Norway	2	1	L	1	1
Poland	2	1	1	1	2
Portugal	2	1	1	1	2
Romania	2	1	2	1	2
Russia	1	1	1	1	1
Slovenia	2	2	2	1	2
Spain	2	1	2	2	2
Sweden	2	T	2	1	*
Switzerland	2	•	2	1	2
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	I	1	2	2	2
Turkey	2	2	1	1	2
<i>United Kingdom:</i> England & Wales	1	1	I	1	2
Northern Ireland			•••		
Scotland	,	•••		***	
*Constant on table 1 C 2 1					

1.C.2.1 Data recording methods in connection with tables 1.B.2.1.1 - 1.B.2.1.14 and 1.B.2.2.1 - 1.B.2.2.3

*See notes on table 1.C.2.1

Notes on table 1.C.2.1

Latvia: Data on suspected offenders is not available. The data supplied concerns persons formally accused of having committed a criminal offence, i.e. after an investigation at police and prosecution level has taken place.

Sweden: As one person = if same offence; as two or more persons = if different offences.

Switzerland: There are no general rules at the federal level, but most cantons use written standards, largely following the rules of the Zurich police (who record about 30% of all offences known to the police in Switzerland).

1.C.2.2 Age brackets used in table 1.B.2.2

All countries count minors as persons who are not yet 18 years old. The only exception is Austria which included 18 years old.

The lower age limit varies widely among countries as far as criminal responsibility is concerned. Persons below the age of criminal responsibility will not be convicted and therefore not counted in conviction statistics (for details refer to 3.C.2.1). However, this is not necessarily the case for police statistics where persons below that age are sometimes included. Several countries did not indicate any lower age limit, suggesting that all persons below 18 would be counted in police statistics.

The following countries indicate a minimum age for consideration in their police statistics:

		····
Albania	14	
Austria	14	
Croatia	14	
Сургия	7	
Czech Republic	6	
Denmark	15	
Estonia	13	
Finland	15	
Germany	6	
Greece	7	
Hungary	14	
Ireland	7	
Ìtaly	14	
Luxembourg	14	
Moldova	14	
Netherlands	12	
Norway	5	
Poland	13	
Portugal	no lower limit	
Romania	14	
Russia	14	
Slovenía	14	
Spain	12	
Sweden	15	
Switzerland	7	
Turkey	11	
United Kingdom:		
England & Wales	10	

Table 1.C.2.2	Minimum	age for	consideration	in	police statistics	
TUDE FUCTOR	IT IL LULABLE GALL	-ec	CONSIDCTATION		bourd statestica	

1.C.2.3 Definition of aliens

- Generally speaking, "aliens" are persons who do not have the nationality of the country concerned.

- Hungary also counts as "aliens" Hungarian nationals with dual citizenship residing abroad,

- Sweden: the data are based on estimates for 1995.

1.C.3 Technical comments on table 1.B.3

a) For most countries, figures on police officers include:

-Criminal police

-Traffic police

-Border police

-Gendarmerie

-Uniformed police

and exclude:

-Customs officers

-Tax police

-Military police

-Secret service police

-Part-time officers

-Police reserves

-Cadet police officers

b) For most countries, figures on civilians include:

-Clerical staff

-Technical staff

-Maintenance staff (cars)

and exclude:

-Cadet police officers

-Traffic wardens

-Domestic staff (including caterers and cleaners)

The exceptions are presented in the following tables.

	Criminal police	Traffic police	Border police	Gendarmerie	Uniformed police	Customs officers	Tax police	Military police	Secret service police	Part-time officers	Police reserves	Cadet police officers
	D13POCP5	DI3POTP5	D13POBP5	D13POGE5	D13POUP5	D13POCO5	DI3POTA5	D13POMP5	D13POSS5	D13POPT5	D13POPR5	DI3POCA5
Albania Austria Belgium	_			N.A.					Included	Included	N.A.	Included Included
Bulgaria Cyprus Czech Republic	***		Excluded	N.A.	6 4 K	 N.A.	N.A.	4.4-	Included N.A.	included N.A.		Included Included
Denmark Estonia Finland			N.A. Excluded	N.A. N.A. Excluded			N.A. N.A.		Included Included N.A.	Included N.A. N.A.	N.A. N.A. N.A.	Included Included Included
France Germany Greece	***		 N.A.	N.A. N.A.		•••	***		N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	···
Hungary Ireland Italy			N.A.	N.A.		N.A. Included	N.A. Included	N.A. Included	N.A.	N.A. N.A.	N.A. N.A.	N.A.
Latvia Lithuania Luxembourg	***	**-	 Excluded	 N.A.	.,.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.		N.A.		N.A.
Malta Moldova Netherlands				N.A. N.A.		N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A. Included	N.A.	Included
Poland Portugal Romania Russia			N.A. Excluded N.A.	N.A. Excluded N.A. N.A.				N.A.		N.A. N.A. N.A.	Included N.A.	Included
Slovenia Spain Sweden Switzerland Turkey	N.A.	N.A.	N.A. N.A.	N.A. Excluded N.A. Excluded		Included N.A.	 N.A. N.A.		Included N.A.	Included Included N.A. N.A.	Included N.A. N.A. N.A.	Included
United Kingdom: England & Wales Northern Ireland Scotland			N.A. N.A. <u>N.</u> A.	N.A. N.A. N.A.			N.A. N.A. <u>N.A</u> .	N.A.	N.A. N.A. N.A.	Included	Included N.A.	

Table 1.C.3.1 Deviations from the standard definition of Police staff in 1995: Police officers

N.A.: Not applicable

	Cadet police officers	Clerical staff	Technical staff	Maintenance staff (cars)	Traffic wardens	Domestic staff (including caterers and cleaners)
	D13CICA5	D13CICS5	D13CITS5	D13CIMS5	DI3CITW5	D13CIDS5
Albania Austria Belgium	Included N.A.	N.A.			N.A. N.A. N.A.	N.A. Included
Bulgarie						
Croatia	Included	***	***	•••	***	***
Cyprus	Included					
Czech Republic	пісіцава	N.A.			Included	Included
Denmark		14.A.			Included	Included
Estonia						
France					+++	Included
Germany						
Greece		•••	** *		***	Included
Hungary					N.A.	Included
Ireland	N.A.			N.A.	Included	Included
Italy	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Latvia						
Lithuania	N.A.		N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	
Malta	Included		134144	14.11.	Dirk.	
Moldova	hjoradod					Included
Netherlands						Included
Norway	Included					theraded
Poland						Included
Portugal		N.A.			N.A.	hielden
Romania					,,,,,,,	Included
Russia	Included					N.A.
Slovenia		Excluded	Excluded	Excluded		
Spain			Excluded	Excluded		
Switzerland	Included		+	Excluded		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	ALCIGUUU.			DAVINGOU		Included
United Kingdom:						TIPIGTED
England & Wales	Included					
Northern Ireland	a.s, alloy					Included
Scotland					Included	

Table 1.C.3.2 Deviations from the standard definition of Police staff in 1995: Civilians

N.A.: Not applicable

D.1 Sources of the data used in Chapter 1

Albania	1.B.1/1.B.2: Ministry of Interior. Criminal Police Directorate. Tirana, Albania. Unpublished.
	1.B.3: Ministry of Interior. Directorate of Personnel. Tirana, Albania. Unpublished.
Austria	1.B.I: Ministry of Interior - Annual Police Statistics
	Data partly calculated by the national correspondent using
	- table 1, sheet 1&2 (crimes recorded)
	- table 2, sheet 1&2 (specific categories of crime)
	1.B.2: Ministry of Interior - Annual Police Statistics
	1.B.3: Bundesfinanzgesetz 1995. Stellenplan (State budget legislation. Planned staff posts).
Belgium	1.B.1: Ministère de l'Intérieur et de la Justice- (SGAP- APSD) Service général d'appui policier - division "appui en matière de politique policière" - "une étude comparative de la criminalité en 1994-1995 basée sur la statistique criminelle interpolicière intégrée" in Manuel des Services de police, Kluwer, Editorial, 1996.
	- "une étude comparative de la criminalité en 1995-1996 basée sur la statistique criminelle interpolicière intégrée" in Manuel des Services de police, Kluwer, Editorial, 1997.
	 1.B.3: Ministère de l'Intérieur et de la Justice- Service général d'appui policier - division "appui en matière de politique policière" - Morphologie des services de police, éd. Kluwer, données chiffrées au 01.01.1996, 1997.
Bulgaria	Ministry of the Interior. Directorate of National Police. Information Centre.
Croatia	Ministry of Interior.
Cyprus	Research and Development Dept. / Police Headquarters
Czech Republic	1.B.1/1.B.2.1: Ministry of Interior - Police Headquarters - Department of Management and Information: Criminal Statistics, published (some figures in the table were unpublished).
	1.B.2.2: Ministry of Interior - Police Headquarters - Department of Management and Information: Criminal Statistics, unpublished.
	1.B.3: Ministry of Interior - Department of Central Filing, unpublished.
Denmark	Annual report of the police, 1990-1996.
Estonia	1.B.1/1.B.2.1/1.B.2.2: Ministry of Internal Affairs. State Police Board. Crime statistics. Unpublished
	1.B.3: Ministry of Internal Affairs. State Police Board. Personnel and financial statistics. Unpublished.

Finland	1.B.1: a) Crimes reported to the police / Statistics Finland 1990 1996; b) Cause-of-death statistics / Statistics Finland.			
	1.B.2: Crimes reported to the police / Statistics Finland			
	1.B.3: Police Department, Ministry of the Interior.			
France	1.B.1/1.B.2: Ministère de l'Intérieur - Statistiques des crimes et déli constatés par la police et la gendarmerie.			
	1.B.3: Direction de l'administration de la police nationale, ministèr de l'Intérieur. Direction de la Gendarmerie nationale, ministère de Défense.			
Germany	Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik Bundeskriminalamt Wiesbaden relevant year.			
Greece	Ministry of Public Order, Statistical Yearbook of the Hellenic Polic relevant year.			
	Additional sources for table 1.B.1: a) National Statistical Service of Greece, Statistics of Justice, Years 1990-1994, table 1.B.; b) Personal communication from the Ministry of Public Order for the years 1990 and 1996.			
	Additional source for table 1.B.3: Personal communication on th number of police officers.			
Hungary	1.B.1/1.B.2: Statistical Department of the Chief Prosecutor's Office (Joint statistics of police and prosecution). Published.			
	Additional source for table 1.B.1: Vital statistics: Central Statistica Office, Division of Population and Health Statistics. 1990-199 published, 1996 unpublished.			
	1.B.3: a) National Police Headquarters. Unpublished; b) National Border-police Headquarters. Unpublished.			
Ireland	1.B.1/1.B.2: Annual report of An Garda Stochana (National Polic Crime Statistics)			
	1.B.3: Department of Justice, Equality and Law reform.			
Italy	1.B.1/1.B.2: Istat penal statistics (Istat = Italian National Institute of Statistics)			
	1.B.3: Unpublished information.			
Latvia	1.B.1/1.B.2: The Information Centre of the Ministry of Interior.			
	1.B.3: Administration for Personnel Affairs and Finance an Planning division of the State Police.			
Lithuania	Ministry of Internal Affairs.			
Luxembourg	1.B.1/1.B.3: Ministère de la force publique. Rapport d'activité relevant years.			
	1.B.2: Statistiques annuelles du Service de Traitement et d Transmission des Informations (service commun de la gendarmerie de la police), unpublished.			
Malta	1.B.1: Police Annual Statistical Reports 1990-1996.			
	1.B.3: Financial report for 1997.			

Moldova	1.B.1/1.B.2.1: Les rapports statistiques présentés par la police et les			
	parquets subordonnés au Bureau du Procureur Général.			
	1.B.2.2: Ministère de l'Intérieur - Département de l'information et documentation de la population - Direction de l'information - Rapports statistiques annuels.			
	1.B.3: Ministère de l'Intérieur - Direction des finances et de l'économie, Rapport statistique.			
Netherlands	1.B.1/1.B.2: The Netherlands Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS).			
	1.B.3: Ministry of the Interior.			
Norway	1.B.1/1.B.2: Statistics Norway, Division for Social Welfare Statistics.			
	1.B.3: a) St. PRP NR 1 1995-1996; b) St. PRP NR 1 1996-1997.			
Poland	1.B.1/1.B.2: Police Headquarters, Statistical Information Bureau. The Institute of Justice processed the data.			
	1.B.3: National Police Headquarters-Staff and Training Bureau.			
Portugal	1.B.1/1.B.2: Department of Research and Planning, Ministry of Justice.			
	1.B.3: The data were computed on the basis of quantitative information provided by the four main police forces operating in the country (criminal police; uniformed police; gendarmerie, including one specialised brigade dealing with traffic; and border police).			
Romania	1.B.1/1.B.2: Direction de la police criminelle (1990-1996), I.G.P.			
	1.B.3: Situation statistique des fonctionnaires de police pour 1995 (division du personnel et de l'enseignement). Service pour le contrôle financier et gestion, I.G.P.			
Russia	Ministry of the Interior. Russian Federation.			
Slovenia	Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Slovenia, Annual statistical data.			
Spain	1.B.1: Ministerio del Interior: Centro de Proceso de datos. Gabinete de Coordinación. Secretaría General Técnica. Programa estadístico de seguridad.			
	1.B.2: Programa Estadístico de Seguridad del Ministerio del Interior. Impresos de detenidos cumplimentados en dependencias del Cuerpo Nacional de Policia. Dirección General de la Guardia Civil.			
Sweden	1.B.1/1.B.2: Official statistics of Sweden published by: Statistics Sweden (up to 1992) & the National Crime Prevention Council (from 1993). [Number of aliens: Estimates for 1995].			
	1.B.3: Oral information from the National Police Board. Costs: Regeringens proposition 1997/1998: 1, Utgiftsområde 4, p.12.			

Switzerland	1.B.1/1.B.2: a) Office fédéral de la police (Ed.), Statistique policière de la criminalité, Berne: Office fédéral de la police, relevant years; b) Office central stupéfiants (Ed.), Statistique suisse des stupéfiants, Berne: Office fédéral de la police, relevant years. Data on above statistics of suspected offender (drug offences), unpublished			
	Additional source for table 1.B.1: Office fédéral de la police, Section recherches / RIPOL: Unpublished.			
	1.B.3: a) Office fédéral de la police: Unpublished; b) Administration fédérale des finances (Ed.), <i>Finances publiques en Suisse 1995</i> , Berne: Office fédéral de la statistique, 1997.			
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	1.B.1/1.B.2: Ministry of internal affairs. Department of analysis and research.			
	1.B.3: Ministry of internal affairs. Legal and personnel Department			
Turkey	Ministry of Interior, General Directorate of Security, unpublished			
	Additional source for table 1.B.1: Ministry of Interior, Commandership of Gendarmerie, unpublished.			
	Additional source for table 1.B.2.1: Gendarme Forces General Directorate, unpublished.			
United Kingdom:				
England & Wales	1.B.1: Home Office, Criminal Statistics 1996			
	1.B.2: Crime and Criminal Justice Unit, Home Office.			
	1.B.3: Home Office.			
Northern Ireland	Royal Ulster Constabulary			
Scotland	The Scottish Office Home Department, Civil and Criminal Justice Statistics Unit.			

2 PROSECUTION STATISTICS

2.A GENERAL COMMENTS

1. This chapter describes the outcome of procedures at the prosecution stage of the criminal justice process (prosecutors and investigating judges) for the years 1990-1996. It also provides data on the staff of prosecuting authorities in 1995.

2. Four countries (Denmark, Luxembourg, Northern Ireland and Switzerland) were not able to provide any data for this chapter and therefore not listed in the tables. It was clear to the group that although a lot of information was collected, due to the differences in recording procedure explained below, full comparability was not achieved.

2.A.1 Definitions of the prosecution stage

3. Once an offence has been reported to the police and a suspect identified the decision has to be taken whether or not to prosecute, i.e. to bring the case before a court.

4. In a narrow sense, the term *prosecution* refers only to bringing a case before a criminal court. Here, the term is used in the broader sense of processing/disposing of cases (decision making) by the prosecuting authorities, thus including the decision to drop proceedings or to impose a sanction or measure, where this possibility is available to the prosecution.

5. The term *prosecuting authority* refers to the legal body which has as its main task to institute criminal proceedings, i.e. decides, depending on national legislation and practice, whether or not to prosecute. The actual functions vary widely between countries. In most European countries, the prosecution of suspected offenders is dealt with by a special authority: either a public prosecutor and/or an investigating judge.

6. There are of course many differences and variations in the form the prosecution stage takes in the different European countries. For the purpose of the Sourcebook, the prosecution stage is considered to be an intermediate stage between the police and court levels. Accordingly, this chapter deals with the decisions taken at this intermediate stage.

2.A.2 The role of the police in relation to the prosecution stage (case input)

7. In some countries, the input at prosecutor's level is identical with the output at police level (including specialised authorities of public order, such as customs or tax authorities). This is the case in countries (such as France and Germany) in which the police are regarded purely as an institution which assists the public prosecutor in his/her tasks, with no direct powers to dispose of criminal cases. Consequently they are obliged to transfer all cases to the prosecuting authority. This also applies to cases in which no suspect has been identified. The

number of cases input to the prosecuting authority will appear to be disproportionally high in such systems compared to the number of suspected offenders identified by the police, especially when cases without suspects are counted at prosecution level (France, Belgium).

8. However in most European countries, actual practice deviates from this model, i.e. the input at prosecutor's level is not identical to output at police level because the police can exercise some discretion and decide on whether to prosecute or not. Thus certain cases are not transferred to the prosecuting authority and are ended by a police decision, possibly in combination with some sort of sanction (e.g. police cautioning in England and Wales). In addition the prosecuting authority may in some countries include the police themselves (e.g. Ireland).

9. These different structures influence the scale of the input and thus the statistics of the prosecution system. Furthermore, as a consequence of changes in definitions and counting rules between agencies, prosecution statistics may be different from the police "output"

2.A.3 What is recorded?

10. Unlike most other tables in the Sourcebook, this chapter does not differentiate between the types of offences because most of the countries concerned were not in a position to provide a breakdown according to offences. It covers all offences disposed of by prosecuting authorities.

11. In order to make the data comparable the figures were meant to exclude: minor traffic offences (e.g. parking offences), breaches of police and administrative regulations as well as less serious cases disposed of by the police under the responsibility of a prosecutor. Some countries (see technical table 2.C.1) could not apply this rule.

12. The counting unit here should be the *case* in the sense of proceedings, not the offence. Thus, one case may comprise several offences and/or several defendants. In general, these cases are counted as single cases, but there are some exceptions (see technical table 2.C.3) and some countries counted defendants rather than cases (e.g. England & Wales).

2.A.4 Discretion at prosecutor's level and output

13. The data provided for the cases disposed of by the prosecuting authority (table 2.B.1.1) refer to the "output" at public prosecutor's level (table 2.B.1.2), i.e. the type of decision taken. Two countries were not able to give data for the breakdown of the total (Italy, Spain).

14. The structure of prosecuting authorities varies from country to country depending on the discretionary powers available to them. We developed some simple categories for disposals in order to make figures comparable: the number of cases brought before a court, the number of cases dropped, the number of cases ended by a sanction from the prosecuting authorities with or without admission of guilt. Some of these categories may not apply to every country considered.

15. Three *basic structures* are possible:

- There are countries in which the prosecuting authority has neither the power to drop a case nor the ability to impose conditions / sanctions on an offender; in accordance with a strict principle of legality, the prosecuting authority merely has the function of preparing a case for the court.

- In most of the countries dealt with in this chapter the prosecuting authority has the discretionary power to decide whether or not to prosecute (i.e. to drop a case completely) or not.

- In other countries the prosecuting authority has not only the power to decide whether to prosecute or not, but also the possibility of dropping the case under conditions, to be imposed on, and accepted by, the suspected offenders

16. The differentiation between "cases brought before a court" and "proceedings ended by a sanction from the prosecuting authority" is not always as simple as it may appear. It is a matter of how far the court is involved in the public prosecutor's decision-making.

17. Depending on the country, the public prosecutor can be empowered to impose conditions with or without the formal consent of the court. For example, the public prosecutor can suspend prosecution with the court's consent on certain conditions, e.g. that the defendant pays a sum of money to the Treasury or a charitable institution. The necessary acceptance by the offender may infer an admission of guilt, hut no formal admission is necessary.

18. In other cases, sanctions can be imposed by the prosecutor with admission of guilt by the defendant. Relevant examples are the German "Strafbefehl" (penal order) or the French "ordonnance pénale" where the public prosecutor brings a motion for a fine which is issued by the court after summary review. This could be regarded (or counted in statistics) as a sanction of the public prosecutor <u>or</u> a case brought before a court.

19. The category "other disposals" refers to such decisions as the referral to private criminal action (as in Germany) or transfers to another competent authority, and in some countries a significant number of pending cases are either included in "other disposals" and/or in the total of cases disposed of (see general remarks on tables 2.B.1.1 and 2.B.1.2).

2.A.5 Staff of the prosecuting authorities (table 2.B.2)

20. The rates of public prosecutors per 100,000 inhabitants in European countries vary considerably from 26.4 in Latvia to 0.7 in Cyprus. These rates are not in correlation with the crime situation or with the number of police officers under the supervision of the prosecuting authorities. The number of prosecutors depends on national legislation and consequently on their function in the system of State administration.

2.B TABLES

2.B.1 Cases disposed of by the prosecuting authorities

<u> </u>	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R21NCT0	R2INCT1	R21NCT2	R2INCT3	R21NCT4	R2INCT5	R21NCT6	PC2INCT
Albania*	281	332	431	366	373	302	306	9
Austria*			2696	26 75	2576	2520		
Belgium*	14312	14786	15794	16175	16239			,
Bulgaria	1155	1379	2383	3004	3242	3466	3351	190
Croatia	939	663	527	602	581	482	542	-42
Cyprus*	168	172	200	169	153	162		
Czech Republic	563	648	698	870	9 39	1196	1237	120
Estonia			•••	***	2431	2612	2348	•••
Finland*	1722	1663	1653	1414	1336	1365	1338	-22
France*	7847	7979	8719	8208	8422	8110	8058	3
Germany*	4547	4511	4687	5021	4992	4103	4205	-8
Greece								- 1 +
Hungary	735	916	983	916	860	861	870	18
Ireland*	716	768	767	794	854	868	901	26
Italy*	3520	4963	4825	47]4	4908	5163	5229	49
Latvia*	61	68	82	112	200	644	853	> 1000
Lithuania*				***				
Malta	508	568	675	918	651	664	570	12
Moldova	408	431	375	405	416	390	397	-3
Netherlands	1603			1703	1677	1671	1658	3
Norway*	1109	1023	1132	1183	1163	1249	1417	28
Poland*				2317	2500	2735	2603	
Portugal	3080	3355	3537	3712	4108	4074		
Romania	609	808	884	1019	1103	1275	1335	1 19
Russia	56	55	63	67	73	75	74	32
Slovenia	1914	1564	1730	1893	1602	1822	1677	-12
Spain	5278	5378	5768	6221	6565	6995	7612	44
Sweden		- * *	• • •			•••		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	547	556	611	726	715	724	608	11
Turkey*	2769	2891	2848	3036	3387	3232	3447	24
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales			2845	2652	2639	2532	2455	***
Scotland*	7110	7439	6989	5576	5272	5077	5123	-28
Mean	2462	2621	2765	2731	2758	2299	2329	
Median	J 109	969	1392	1558	1602	1518	1417	
Minimum	56	55	63	67	73	75	74	
Maximum	14312	14786	1 5794	16175	16239	8110	8058	

Table 2.8.1.1 Total number of disposals (rates per 100'000 population)

* See notes on tables 2.B.1.1 and 2.B.1.2

_

Table 2.B.1.2 Types of disposals in 1995

	total number of	of which % of	Proceedings	Proceedings	Cases brought	Other disposals
	cases disposed	proceedings	ended by a	ended by a	before a court	as a percentage
[[of by the	dropped	sanction from	sanction from	as a percentage	of column 1
	prosecuting		the prosecuting	the prosecuting	i aanulos îo	
	authorities per		authorities with	authorities		
	100*000		admission of	without		
	population		guilt (e.g.	admission of		
	μοραικτιου		Strafbefehl) as	guilt as a		!
				Ũ		
			a percentage of	percentage of		
		DAWLODDE	column 1	column 1 P21SPA5	P21CBC5	P210D5
	R21NCT5	P21NCPD5	P21STR5	PZISPAS	36	
Albania*	302	31			45	 I
Austria*	2520	53				
Belgium*		•••			 6	
Bulgaria	3466	4			_	
Croatia	482	17		•••	67	
Cyprus*	162	33			67 68	
Czech Republic	1196	32			15	
Estonia	2612	79			74	
Finland*	1365	31	10	•••	12	
France*	8110	88	2		12	 19
Germany*	4103	46	16	6		
Greece		•••	•••	•••	 78	6
Hungary	861	16	•		100	_
Ireland*	868		•••			•••
Italy*	5163	•••	•••		55	
Latvia*	644	8	***			
Lithuania*			•••	•••		
Malta	664		• • •		 72	
Moldova	390	28			46	
Netherlands	1671	21		22		
Norway*	1249	•••	22		73 21	
Poland*	2735	65	2	•••	21	
Portugal	4074	74			30	 12
Romania	1275	70	•••		56	21
Russia	75	23			28	53
Slovenia	1822	19				
Spain	6995	•••				
Sweden					88	
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	724	12			32	36
Turkey*	3232	20	•••	11	20	50
United Kingdom:	0630	12			78	10
England & Wales	2532	12	 10		67	9
Scotland*	5077			13	49	16
Mean	2299	35	10	13	51	10
Median	1518	28	10	1	6	10
Minimum	75	4	2	6	100	53
Maximum	8110	88	22	22	100	55

* See notes on tables 2.B.1.1 and 2.B.1.2

Notes on table 2.B.1.1 and 2.B.1.2

Albania: The statistics on prosecution are rather approximate. The powers of the prosecuting authority seem to have been restricted since 1 August 1995.

Austria: Cases of (successful) mediation between the victim and the offender are included in "proceedings dropped".

Belgium: The data is incomplete for 1993 and 1994.

Cyprus: Only "serious" offences (as classified by the police) are included.

Finland: The numbers indicated refer to "decisions", not persons or offences (a "case" may concern more than one defendant, or several offences and, therefore, lead to several decisions).

France: The category "proceedings dropped" includes cases of successful mediation as well as those cases where the offender remained unknown (in 1995: 3,106,633 cases with unknown offenders, i.e. 75 % of all cases dropped).

Germany: Unknown offenders are not counted. The penal order (*Strafbefehl*) can be regarded as a sanction by the public prosecutor although it is formally imposed by the court (it is also counted as a "conviction", see chapter 3). Other disposals include decisions with an option of bringing private criminal action.

Ireland: Only indictable offences are counted.

Italy: Only cases where the prosecuting authority started penal action are included, not all those brought to the attention of the prosecutor by the police.

Latvia: The large increase after 1993 may be caused by backlogs, due to the increase in crime during the preceding years. The difference between the total number of proceedings (in 1995: 16122) and the sum of the various disposals (1995: 1305 + 8855 = 10160) is due to (5962) cases being sent back to the police for additional investigation.

Lithuania: The several types of disposals do not add up to the total indicated; this is due to different counting rules.

Norway: Includes only crimes, not misdemeanours. Proceedings ended by a sanction from the prosecuting authority include cases where the offender was under 15, insane, not responsible, or dead, as well as "ticket fines".

Poland: Excludes cases where no proceedings were initiated.

Turkey: The figures for 1990 to 1993 only relate to the Civil Prosecuting Authorities. Figures for 1994 to 1996 include State Security and military prosecutions.

England & Wales: Includes cases where the defendant died, or which could not be processed for other technical reasons.

Scotland: The drop after 1993 may be related to the introduction of "police conditional offers" for certain traffic violations.

2.B.2 Staff

	Number of employees: Total	Number of prosecutors	
	R22NET5	R22NPR5	
Albania*	28.0	17.0	
Austria	5.1	2.5	
Belgium*	33.6	8.5	
Bulgaria	16.3	7.7	
Croatia			
Сургиз	7.6	.7	
Czech Republic	18.7	7.8	
Estonia		8.8	
Finland*	8.8	5.2	
France	***	* * *	
Germany	***		
Greece		2.6	
Hungary*	25.2	12.4	
Ireland	.8	***	
Italy		•••	
Latvia	39.8	26.4	
Lithuania			
Malta*	1.3	1.1	
Moldova*	21.7	3.7	
Netherlands	11.2	2.2	
Norway	** -	9,3	
Poland*		14,2	
Portugal	***	10.7	
Romania	8.3	1.0	
Russia		*-*	
Slovenia*	12.7	7.2	
Spain	6.5	3.3	
Sweden*	14.7	7.9	
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	14.6	5.5	
Furkey	5,3		
United Kingdom:			
England & Wales*	12.0	4.2	
Scotland*	20.6	6.9	
Mean	15	7	
Median	13	7	
Hinimum	1	1	
Maximum	40	26	

Table 2.B.2 Staff of the prosecuting authorities in 1995 (rates per 100'000 population)

Notes on table 2.B.2

Albania: Including 261 officers of the judicial police (with certain investigating powers).

Belgium: Included "juges d'instruction" (examining magistrates) and military prosecutors as well as prosecutors at the Courts of Appeals.

Finland: Due to reshaping of prosecutorial services, figures are given for January, 1998.

Hungary: Included 179 junior and assistant prosecutors.

Malta: Estimates.

Moldova: Included investigators working for the Prosecutor's Office.

Poland: Included 1062 trainees.

Slovenia: Figures relate to December 31, 1994.

Sweden: The figures related to 1996 and are approximations.

England & Wales: Figures relate to December, 1995.

Scotland: Included 80 precognition officers.

2.C TECHNICAL INFORMATION ON TABLES 2, B.1.1 - 2.B.1.2

2.C.1 General remarks

In prosecution statistics, the counting unit is the "case", which can imply more than one defendant, or more than one offence.

Seven countries (Denmark, Greece, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Northern Ireland, Sweden and Switzerland) were not able to provide data for these tables. They are not listed in this section.

Pending cases

The questionnaire did not establish any rule as to how cases pending at the end of a given year were to be counted. In their explanations some countries mentioned that they counted pending cases and explained how this can affect the total number of cases or the coherence between the total and the sum of the various disposals (Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Romania, Turkey).

Unknown offenders

In many countries cases with unknown offenders were excluded. Some countries (such as France) included these cases in the category "proceedings dropped". This lead to a higher total of cases disposed of and a higher percentage of proceedings dropped. Slovenia included unknown offenders in the category "other disposals".

Percentages of types of disposals (table 2.B.1.2)

Because of pending cases, unknown offenders or double counting in some countries the various types of disposals do not add up to 100% of the total number of cases disposed of (see the specific notes on tables 2.B.1.1 and 2.B.1.2).

2.C.2 Offences / cases handled by the prosecuting authorities

For most countries, figures on offences / cases handled by the prosecuting authorities exclude -small traffic offences (e.g. speeding or parking offences)

-offences against police and administrative regulations

-less serious cases disposed of by the police under the responsibility of the prosecutor The exceptions are presented in the following table.

Table 2.C.2 Offences / cases handled by the prosecuting authorities

	small traffic offences (e.g. speeding or parking offences)	offences against police and administrative regulations	less serious cases disposed of by the police under the responsibility of the prosecutor
	D2PAST	D2PAOP	D2PALS
Albania		Included	
Belgium	Included	Included	
Estonia			- + +
Hungary		*	
Ireland		Included	
Romania	Included		
Turkey	Included	Included	Included
United Kingdom: England & Wales		*	

* Notes on table 2.C.2

Hungary: Offences against police regulations are included, but not those against administrative regulations

England & Wales: The data given refer to defendants (not cases). Non-criminal proceedings are excluded. Excluded are also cases of police cautioning before the defendant was charged.

2.C.3 Reasons for dropping proceedings

For most countries, figures concerning the reasons for dropping proceedings include:

-transfer to foreign authority

-no criminal responsibility / suspect not guilty

-lack of evidence

-act not an offence

-no victim complaint where that is required to make prosecution possible

-no public interest (expediency principle)

-proceedings ended with a sanction/measure imposed by the prosecuting authority with/without admission of guilt by defendant

and exclude

-no competence / transfer to another domestic authority The exceptions are presented in the following table.

Table 2.C.3 Prosecution statistics: concerning the reasons for dropping proceedings

Table 2.C.3 Prosecution sta	Transfer to foreign authority	No criminal responsibility / suspect not	Lack of evidence	Act not an offence	No victim complaint where that is required	No public interest (expediency principle)	Proceedings ended with a sanction / measure	No competence / transfer to another
		guilty			ts required to make prosecution possible	principie)	imposed by the prosecuting authority with / without admission of guilt by the defendant	domestic authority
	D2DPTF	D2DPNG	D2DPLE	D2DPNO	D2DPNV	D2DPN1	D2DPSP	D2DPNC
Austria	Excluded						N.A.	Included
Belgium	Excluded						Excluded	
Bulgaria					Excluded		'N.A.	
Croatia							Excluded	
Cyprus								
Czech Republic							Excluded	
Estonia	Excluded					Excluded		
Finland							Excluded	***
Germany							Excluded	
Hungary							Excluded	
Ireland			***				•••	
Italy		***						•••
Latvia	Excluded				Excluded		Excluded	
Malta		*- *			***	**-		***
Moldova	Excluded				Excluded		Excluded	
Netherlands							Excluded	
Norway	Excluded			Excluded			Excluded	
Poland							Excluded	
Portugal	Excluded						Excluded	
Romania	Excluded							
Russia	Excluded				Excluded		Excluded	
Slovenia							Excluded	
Spain							Excluded	
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia					Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	Tan Jundar A
Turkey							Excluded	Included
United Kingdom: England & Wales								Included
Scotland	Excluded				•••			

N.A.: Not applicable

2.C.4 Data recording methods for Prosecution Statistics

Question	Are there	How is a case	How are	How is a	Do the	Have the data
	written rules regulating the way in which the data shown in this table are recorded?	counted if more than one person is involved?	multiple offences counted?	person counted who commits several offences in one year?	police have separate powers to impose sanctions or measures themselves?	recording methods described above been substantially modified between 1990 and 1996?
Possible answers	1: Yes 2: No	1: As one case 2: As two or more cases 3: Uncertain	1: As one offence 2: As two or more offences 3: Uncertain	I: As one case 2: As two or more cases 3: Uncertain	1: Yes 2: No	I: Yes 2: No
	CT21A	CT21B	CT21C	CT21D	CT21EA	CT21GA
Albania*	1	1	1	3	2	1
Austria	L L	I	3	3	2	1
Belgium	2	1	1		2	2
Bulgaria		1	1	2	2	2
Croatia		2	ł	2		2
Cyprus	t	1	2	2	2	2
Czech Republic	1	2	1	2	2	2
Estonia	1	1	1	2	2	2
Finland*		2	3	2	1	1
France	1	3		2	2	2
Germany*	1	1	1	2	2	1
Greece		+#7	***		2	100
Huogary	1	1	**1	2	1	2
freland	1	1	2	2	1	2
Italy	1		1	2	2	2
Latvia	1	t	1	i	2	2
Malta		***		2	2	2
Moldova	1	1	2	1	2	2
Netherlands*	L L	2	1	2	1	2
Norway	1	ł	1	2	1	2
Poland		ł	3	2	2	2
Portugal	1	1	1	2	2	2
Romania	1	I	1	2	2	2
Russia	1	1	1	1	2	2
Slovenia	1	1	1	2	2	2
Spain	I I	1	***		2	2
Turkey	2	2	l	2	2	2
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	1	1			2	2
<i>United Kingdom:</i> England & Wales	1	2	l	2	t	1
Scotland*	1	1	1	2	1	2

Table 2.C.4 Description of data recording methods for Prosecution Statistics

*See Remarks on table 2.C.4.

Remarks on table 2.C.4

Albania: The discretion of the prosecutor has been reduced as from August 1st, 1995.

Finland: Between 1993 and 1995, a computer-based crime reporting/recording system was gradually introduced. This may have led to more comprehensive counts and, thus, increased the numbers compared to the former manual system.

Germany: The figures for 1990 to 1992 refer to the former Federal Republic and West Berlin. The figures for 1993 and 1994 refer to the former Federal Republic including the whole of Berlin. The figures for 1995 and 1996 refer to the reunited Germany.

Netherlands: Police diversion (and transactions) is limited to juvenile offenders.

Scotland: From April 1st, 1993, police can issue conditional offers of fixed penalties or fines in minor road traffic offences

Albania	Public Prosecutor's Office. Statistics and Informatics Office. Tirana Albania. Unpublished.				
Austria	2.B.1: National Bureau of Statistics (Österr. Statistische Zentralamt). Annual Statistics of Administration of Justice.				
	2.B.2: Bundesfinanzgesetz 1995. Stellenplan (State budge legislation. Planned staff posts).				
Belgium	2.B.1: Ministère des affaires économiques, Institut National de Statistique, Statistiques judiciaires, Activités des cours et tribunaux 1990 à 1994.				
	2.B.2: Ministère de la Justice - Service du personnel de l'ordre judiciaire, unpublished.				
Bulgaria	2.B.1: a) "Activities of the Offices of Prosecution 1990", Centra Statistical Office, Sofia, 1991; b) "Act. of the OP 1991", Nat Statistical Institute, Sofia, 1992; c) Office of the Prosec. Gen. of RB Statistics for 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996 (unpublished).				
	2.B.2: Staff pay-roll.				
Croatia	Statistical Report, State Institute for Statistics, Zagreb 1997, 1043/1044, ISSN 1331-2096.				
Cyprus	2.B.1: Criminal Statistics, Department of Statistics and Research Reports for the years 1990-1995.				
	2.B.2: Law Office of the Republic.				
Czech Republic	2.B.1: Ministry of Justice - Department of Statistics: Criminal Statistics Yearbook, published.				
	2.B.2: Ministry of Justice - Prosecutor's Office, unpublished.				
Estonia	2.B.1: Statistical Yearbook of Estonia 1997. Indicators of work of the State Prosecutor's Office, 1994-1996.				
	2.B.2: State Prosecutor's Office. Unpublished data.				
Finland	2.B.1: Yearbook of Justice Statistics / Statistics Finland.				
	2.B.2: Prosecutor General's Office.				
France	Ministère de la Justice, sous-direction de la statistique, statistique des cadres du Parquet				
Germany	Working papers of the prosecution service, published by Statistisches Bundesamt Wieshaden, relevant year.				
Greece	Ministry of Justice, personal communication concerning the number of public prosecutors.				
Hungary	2.B.1: Statistical Department of the Chief Prosecutor's Office. Published.				
	2.B.2: Department of Human resources of the Chief Prosecutor's Office. Unpublished.				
Ireland	Annual Report of An Garda Stochana.				
Italy	Istat statistics, relevant years.				

2.D. Sources of the data used in Chapter 2

Latvia	Statistics of General Prosecutor's Office of Latvia					
Lithuania	2.B.1: Ministry of Justice, Department of Courts.					
	2.B.2: Statistics Department of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania.					
Maita	2.B.1: Police Statistics Office.					
	2.B.2: Estimates 1995, Ministry of Finance, Malta.					
Moldova	2.B.1: Bureau du Procureur Général, rapport statistique annuel.					
	2.B.2: Ministère de l'Intérieur - Service du personnel, Rapport statistique. Bureau du Procureur Général - Service du personnel, Rapport statistique.					
Netherlands	2.B.1: The Netherlands Central Bureau of Statistics.					
	2.B.2: Key figures of the prosecution service 1995/1996, November 1996.					
Norway	2.B.1: Statistics Norway, Division for social welfare statistics.					
_	2.B.2: ST PRP NR 1 (1995-1996).					
Poland	2.B.1: Ministry of Justice, Statistical Information Department.					
	2.B.2: Ministry of Justice, Prosecution Department.					
Portugal	2.B.1: Annual reports by the General Prosecutor's office.					
	2.B.2: Department of Research and Planning, Ministry of Justice.					
Romania	Ministère Public, Parquet auprès de la Cour Suprême de Justice, Bureau des statistiques judiciaires					
Russia	General Prosecutor's office, Russia.					
Slovenia	2.B.1: Statistical office of the Republic of Slovenia / Results of statistical research: criminality, relevant years.					
	2.B.2: Report on the Public Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Slovenia for 1994.					
Spain	2.B.1: Memorias de la Fiscalía General del Estado.					
	2.B.2: Presupuestos Generales del Estado.					
Sweden	Nationalencyklopedin, vol. 20 (1996), p.332.					
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	Public Prosecutor's Office.					
Farkey	2.B.1: a) Adalet istatistilderi. T.C. Adalet Bakanlig, Ankara (Editions 1990-1992); b) Information provided by the Ministry of Justice (unpublished); c) Information provided by the Military Court of Cassation (unpublished); d) Adalet istatistilderi 1995, Basbakamlik Devlet Istatistik Institüsu, Ankara 1997, p. 198.					
	2.B.2: Adalet istatistilderi 1995, Basbakanlik Devlet istatistik Enstitüsu, Ankara 1997, p.8 and p. 198.					
United Kingdom:						
England & Wales	Crown Prosecution Service.					
Scotland	2.B.1: Crown Office.					
	2.B.2: Crown Office, Personnel Division.					

3 CONVICTION STATISTICS

3.A GENERAL COMMENTS

3.A.1 Introduction

1. The tables in this chapter concern persons who have been convicted, i.e. found guilty, according to law, of having committed a criminal offence. Information is presented on the type of offence (1990-1996); the sex, age, and nationality of the offender (1995); the type of sanctions imposed as well as the duration of unsuspended custodial sentences (1995). Twenty-seven countries submitted data on sanctions/measures and 32 on convicted persons. Some countries (e.g. Netherlands) have recently changed their method of data collection causing difficulties with the completion of statistical series; others (e.g. Ireland) have not yet set up such a collection system. An obvious problem in this chapter is related to the major differences in criminal procedures of those countries surveyed. Therefore, although attempts have been made to compare data on sanctions/measures imposed, for some countries this has proved impossible.

3.A.2 Offence definitions

2. It is important to remember in comparisons with police statistics that offence definitions used in this chapter are not always identical to those referred to for crimes recorded by the police. Offence definitions adopted by the various police systems present some uniformity. However, definitions used for recorded sanctions/measures - based on the judicial system of each country and entirely dependent on the offence definition provided in national penal statutes can vary substantially. For this reason, the breakdown of data in this chapter does not follow those for earlier chapters. Thus "burglary", "car theft" and "serious drug trafficking" were not separately identified for many countries but were merely included in the general categories "theft" or "drugs offences". A few countries reported differences between the definitions of offences used by the courts in the conviction statistics and those used by police in the recorded crime statistics. This affected several countries, for example, "robbery" where street robberies (i.e. muggings) was included in the theft category in the Portuguese, Swiss and Danish statistics. Greece, also reported that "theft of a motor vehicle" only included those thefts where there was an intention to use the vehicle (whereas if the intention was to keep the vehicle, the offence was recorded as "theft").

3.A.3 Definition of convictions

3. In the preparation of the questionnaire the group attempted to provide definitions for "convictions" of offenders and subsequent "disposals" compatible hetween most criminal justice systems. The need for such advice was created by the fact that a) offenders in certain jurisdictions are not always convicted by a court and b) sanctions/measures may be imposed

by another authority (Police or Prosecutor). Therefore the suggested definition of "persons convicted" included sanctions/measures imposed by a prosecutor based on an admission of guilt by the defendant (e.g. Strafbefehl in Germany). However, this definition did not include cases where a) a prosecutor imposed sanctions/measures not based on the admission of guilt by the defendant, b) persons cautioned by police and c) where other State authorities imposed a sanction/measure. The high number of offenders (mainly juveniles) who admit their guilt but were subsequently cautioned by the police in England & Wales were therefore excluded. Some countries (e.g. Austria) found that they were not able to supply data on convictions from the prosecutor.

3.A.4 Minimum age of conviction

4. Information collected on convictions and sanctions/measures imposed will be affected by the minimum age at which a conviction can be imposed. For the 33 supplying this information 12 had a minimum age of 14 years, 9 countries between 15 and 17 while 3 countries the age was below 10 years. However although this age will be important many countries (e.g. Scotland) have systems for dealing with minors which exist in parallel to a court system, diverting most minors from the formal criminal justice system.

3.A.5 Validation checks

5. Once the term "convictions" had been defined, it was expected that the number of convictions should be equal to the number of persons on whom sanction/measures had been imposed, either by the courts only or by both courts and prosecutors. Data checks were carried out in order to ensure that, for the information included in the relevant tables, each offender would be counted only once for each offence, even if several sanctions/measures were imposed with respect to that particular offence. Despite the efforts of the group, data for certain countries still showed significant differences between the number of convictions and sanctions/measures; although these may be partly explained by the different counting units used for convictions and sanctions/measures these discrepancies were not fully explained. Countries where these differences were over 10% were excluded from the comparative tables.

6. Initial data checks also showed differences in several countries between the number of persons sentenced to a custodial sentence and the information received on the sentence lengths of such sentences. This reflected three points: a) the inclusion of suspended sentences within the sentence length tables, b) differences in the statistical collection system used and c) variations following appeal in the sentence imposed whose length was taken into consideration. Again, differences of up to 10% were accepted but the data was excluded for those countries where the variation was larger.

3.A.6 Exclusion of tables

7. In line with the general rule adopted that tables would not be included where information was only available on less than ten countries, the number of tables included in this chapter was reduced. Only 4 countries could provide data on "bicycle theft", 5 on "domestic

burglary" and 8 on "serious drug trafficking" convictions. Even fewer countries were in a position to provide relevant sanctions/measures data on such offences. Although these tables were excluded from our analysis, such offences were still included in sub-totals, for example, domestic burglary in "theft" and serious drug trafficking in "drug trafficking".

3.A.7 Methodology

8. This section focuses on the information provided by countries in the process of clarifying the meaning of data included in statistical tables. Therefore, it should be read in conjunction with the tables following this section.

a) Statistical rules

9. All countries (except Turkey and Latvia) applied some form of written rules to regulate the method used to collect data on both convictions and sanctions/measures. This included some form of "principal offence rule" so that an offender convicted of more than one offence at the same time will only be counted once in the statistics. While most countries count the most serious offence, from their comments and descriptions it was not clear for many countries whether they determined the seriousness of the offence based upon a) the nature of the offence or b) the punishment imposed. If more than one perpetrator participated in the commission of an offence, then each perpetrator was counted separately in all countries.

10. There were two different procedures identified with respect to the point at which statistics on court decisions were recorded. Eleven countries replied that information related to the position before the convicted person made an appeal on either the verdict or the sentence. For the remaining 21 information was collected only after any such appeal was completed (Table 3.C.1.1). Variations in the point at which data was collected may have affected the value of indicators in the relevant tables.

11. When an offender is convicted for more than one offence in a year, the majority of countries indicated that each conviction would be counted separately. However, Albania, Moldova, Poland and Slovenia indicated that such convictions would only be counted once in their statistics (Table 3.C.1.1). Assuming that the question has been correctly answered, this suggests that there will be a lower conviction rate in such countries since the same person cannot be counted more than once each year.

12. Political changes that took place in the early 1990's in eastern Europe have lead to revisions or enactment of new Criminal/Penal Codes or Codes of Procedure. Hence, no meaningful trends can be identified for such countries over the period 1990-96. Moreover, Germany reported that data for 1990-94 covered the former West Germany and West Berlin, while 1995 figures covered the former West Germany and the whole of Berlin. For certain other countries (e.g. Belgium in 1993 and Sweden in 1995) changes were reported in the methods of producing criminal statistics.

b) Provision of data on sanctions/measures

13. Many countries had difficulties in providing detailed information on the sanctions/measures given for a particular offence. This resulted from data being collected from three different statistical recording sources (i.e. prosecution, courts and authorities recording non-custodial sanctions). Thus while in some countries (e.g. Bulgaria, Ireland, Italy,

Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Spain) data was available for particular sanctions (i.e. fines or non-custodial or unsuspended sanctions/measures) there was no possibility of calculating the total number of sanctions/measures which had been imposed. In Bulgaria, for example, although figures were available for individual sanctions (unsuspended and suspended) it was not possible to calculate the total number of sanctions. For Italy information was only provided for unsuspended custody. In Germany, totals did not correspond to the sum of the individual sanctions probably due to the imposition of multiple sanctions.

14. It is possible to classify sanctions/measures in all countries into four categories: fines, non-custodial sentences, suspended custodial sentences and unsuspended custodial sentences (see definition in 3.C.3). However, the actual form of each type of disposal, and consequently the components of each category differ substantially from country to country. Few countries have the same non-custodial options e.g. community service was available in only 18 countries. Only 8 countries replied that all options (i.e. community service orders, probation orders, non-custodial measures according to juvenile law and suspending proceedings under certain conditions after conviction) were possible (Albania, England & Wales, Lithuania, Moldova, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Slovenia and Spain). In Switzerland short custodial sentences are executed as community sanctions (Table 3.C.1.1).

15. Suspended custodial sentences normally included some form of supervised release both for adults and juveniles but excluded partially suspended custodial sentences, which are normally included under unsuspended custodial sentences. Northern Ireland and Romania included no form of supervised release and Greece imposed supervised release for juveniles only. Latvia and Turkey indicated that they had no form of either suspended or partially suspended custodial sentence. Unsuspended custodial sentence takes on different meanings from country to country. Five countries (Belgium. Finland, Norway, Scotland and Switzerland) excluded juvenile custody and 11 excluded treatment in a custodial psychiatric or detoxification treatment. Only a small number of countries were in a position to report the average length of unsuspended sentence. For many countries sentence lengths could not be divided up into the time periods required by the questionnaire. For this reason sentence length categories in the tables were much broader than for the questionnaire.

3.A.8 Commentary on data collected

16. The tables included show a detailed breakdown of convictions and sanctions/measures imposed between 1990 and 1996. A full analysis of the data would require more detailed research in each country. The commentary below looks at four offences (Homicide (completed), Rape, Total thefts and Total drugs) drawing on the definitional differences as well as comparison with the trends in the number of recorded offences. These offences were chosen in order in enable as many countries to be included with definitions relatively similar. Completed homicides were selected over total homicides since the closeness between these two numbers for some countries suggest differences in definitions not apparent in the information collected. Unlike police statistics level comparisons between countries are possible and important as they measure differences at a common point in the criminal justice process.

3.A.9 Homicides (excluding attempts) (Tables 3.B.1.2, 3.B.2, 3.B.3.2, 3.B.4.2)

Convictions

17. For the period 1990-96 information was available for convictions for homicides completed (i.e. excluding attempts) in 19 countries. Over this period the rate per head of population for completed homicide convictions rose in all countries except Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Ireland and Portugal. Increases of more than 70% were recorded in Estonia, Scotland and Russia. Comparisons with recorded crime statistics show no clear relationship between the trends in convictions and recorded offences. In Bulgaria recorded completed homicides rose by 95% between 1990 and 1996 while convictions for completed homicides rose by 40%. In Northern Ireland an 8% increase in convictions occurred at a time in which recorded crime fell by 53%. The reasons include the following:

-Variations in clear-up rates;

-Variations in patterns of homicide;

-The number of convictions per offence;

-Cases being only initially recorded in court statistics not in police statistics;

-Delays in cases coming to court.

18. In absolute terms the highest number of convictions for completed homicides in 1996 were recorded in Russia (12 per 100000) and Estonia (9). The lowest rates in Austria (0.4) and Ireland (0.1). For most countries under 6% of convictions for completed homicides in 1995 were for minors (aged imder 18) although this rose in Hungary (8%), Ireland (10%) and Scotland (11%). Such differences could not be explained simply by the minimum age of conviction. Although in most countries few convictions in 1995 were for women, the exceptions were Austria (11%), Denmark (17%) and Hungary (20%).

Sanctions/Measures imposed

19.Information on the sanctions/measures imposed for completed homicides was only available for 13 countries. Imprisonment was imposed for over 90% of convictions in all countries in 1995 except England & Wales where 14% received a non-custodial sentence. The figure for England & Wales reflects convictions for manslaughter due to diminished responsibility where a restriction order would be imposed under the Mental Health Act. In Portugal 8% of convictions were suspended. Such suspended custodial sentences may be incidents of domestic violence where the offender has acted in self-defence without complete justification. For those countries who provided data only Russia imposed the death penalty (140 offenders or 0.8% of all sanctions imposed). The length of imprisonment imposed varied. For some countries life sentences are mandatory (United Kingdom) for murder although not for manslaughter or infanticide. For countries with no or few life sentences the average length imposed for determinate sentences was just over 13 years in Romania, 12 years in Portugal, 10 years Bulgaria, 9 years Switzerland and Hungary. At the end of 1995 the death penalty was still in existence and recorded as being imposed for homicide in 4 countries (Albania, Latvia, Lithuania and Russia).

3.A.10 Rape (Tables 3.B.1.4, 3.B.2, 3.B.3.4, 3.B.4.4)

Convictions

20. Most countries were able to supply information for convictions for rape although not for every year. 27 countries provided data for 1990 and 1996 on rape convictions per head of population, showing rises in 9 countries over this period and falls in 15. Poland showed the

highest increase followed by Estonia. In contrast sharp falls occurred in Croatia, Northern Ireland, Norway and Portugal. Although the relationship with recorded rapes is not exact trends were similar, for example in Estonia.

21. In absolute the highest rates for rape convictions per head of population in 1996 were in Turkey (8 per 100000), Russia (6), Lithuania (5), and Estonia (3) with the lowest rates in Ireland (0.2) and Croatia (0.4). However almost all countries statistics on rape will be affected by the extent to which the victim report these offences to the police. As expected countries showed a low proportion of women convicted for this offence in 1995 (the exception was Northern Ireland 8%), however many countries indicated that up to one fifth of convictions were on minors. In Estonia, Germany and Sweden about 30% of those convicted are aliens and in Switzerland about one half.

Sanctions and measures

22. Although imprisonment is the main sanction for this offence in all countries, several countries also use suspended custodial sentences and non-custodial sanctions. In 1995 about 30% of those convicted received suspended custodial sentences in the Austria, Czech Republic, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Finland, Germany, Moldova, Poland, Slovenia and Switzerland. The average sentence length was about 5 years in most countries although in some countries life sentences may be given (e.g. England & Wales) or other indeterminate sentences. Lower average sentence lengths were found in Norway and Sweden (3 years).

3.A.11 Total thefts (Tables 3.B.1.7, 3.B.2, 3.B.3.7, 3.B.4.7)

Convictions

23. Although countries vary widely in the definition for component parts of total theft (e.g. theft of a motor vehicle, burglary) the definition of total theft is more uniform. However the exclusion of small value thefts by 8 countries and receiving/handling stolen goods by 12 may affect comparisons particularly in the types of sanctions/measures imposed.

24. For some eastern European countries the increase in the number of convictions per bead of population for total thefts may reflect a parallel increase in recorded thefts. Excluding these countries from any comparisons indicates a drop in convictions over the period 1990-96 for the majority of other countries. The main exception was a sharp rise in Portugal.

25. In absolute terms the highest rates in1996 for theft convictions were found in Denmark (600 per 100000 population) and Finland (630 in 1995) followed by Scotland (420), Russia (325) and Sweden (310). Rates below 50 were recorded in Albania, Greece (in 1995) and Poland. Information on the definition of offences does not clearly indicate a reason for this wide variation and further research is clearly needed to look into these differences. In Austria, Denmark, Sweden and Germany one quarter or more of convictions in 1995 were women, and over 20% were minors in Croatia, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Slovenia, Switzerland, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and England & Wales. One half or over of convictions were for aliens in Estonia and Switzerland.

Sanctions and measures

26. There was a wide variation in the types of sanctions/measures imposed with 60% of those convicted sentenced to unsuspended custody in Albania and Greece. In contrast many other countries theft convictions mainly resulted in a fine, for example Austria (60%), Denmark (73%), Finland (87%) and Germany (60%). For the majority sentences imposed were normally short (less than 6 months). The main exception was Portugal with only 15% under 12 months and some eastern European countries(for example, Moldova 7%, Latvia and Lithuania 8%). In France 2 offenders were sentenced to life for theft, 1 in England & Wales and 2 in Lithuania, mainly for burglary offences.

3.A.12 Drugs offences (total) (Tables 3.B.1.10, 3.B.2, 3.B.3.10, 3.B.4.10) *Convictions*

28 Due to differences in enforcement policy there are wide variations between countries in the type of offences for which drug convictions are given. For some countries drug convictions will mainly mean drug trafficking whereas in others simple drugs possession will be included. The information collected shows changes over time in the extent to which drugs offences are criminalised and in the extent to which drugs have extended into the eastern European countries in the 1990's. Hungary, Poland and Russia have all seen sharp rises in drug convictions (about 500% from 1990 to 1995) although similar rises were also measured in Northern Ireland. Denmark and Slovenia were virtually unchanged over this period (although Slovenia rose sharply in 1996).

29. In absolute terms the highest levels of convictions for drugs offences were recorded in Denmark (160 per 100000 population) and Scotland (120). Rates of fewer than 10 were recorded in most eastern European countries. For other countries the lowest levels were recorded in Turkey (6), Spain (20 in 1995) and Cyprus (13 in 1995). Although in most countries about 10% and under were minors, slightly higher figures were recorded in the Czech Republic (15%) and Estonia (13%). In most countries fewer than 15% were women, the main exceptions was Poland (50%).

Sanctions and measures

30. The variation in the types of offences included within this category is reflected in differences in the severity of sentences imposed. In "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" 96% of those convicted for drug offences were sentenced to imprisonment while in Poland it was 5%. There were wide spread differences between countries in the sanctions/measures imposed, with the fine the most frequently used sentence in some countries, non-custodial sentences in others and suspended sentences in others. In addition there was often a high use of imprisonment as mentioned above. It is clear that although such statistics provide an interesting comparison of the offences included and the countries view on their severity they cannot themselves provide the only basis of comparison. Similarly wide variations in the sentence lengths for custodial sanctions given with Greece recording 11 life sentences to Norway where 67% of sentences were less than 6 months and Denmark (70%).

3.B TABLES

3.B.1 Persons convicted per 100'000 population

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R311HOT0	R311HOT1	R311HQT2	R311HOT3	R311HOT4	R311HOT5	R311HOT6	PC311HOT
Albania	4.5	3.8	3.9	3.5	6.5		9.7	116
Austria	.6	.7	.9	1.1	.9	.7	.7	1
Belgium*	1.0	.8	_9	1.1	t.3			
Bulgaria	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.7	2.7	39
Croatia	5.6	11.8	5.2	4.5	4.8	2.7	2.7	-51
Cyprus	.9	.6	1.8	.4	.6	.0		
Czech Republic	.7	6	.7	1.0	1.0	1.3	2.0	178
Denmark	1.8	1.2	1.6	1.8	1.5	1.7	1.7	-4
Estonia	3.4	4.8	4.8	5.8	9.8	13.6	10.9	217
Finland*	3.3	4.1	4.0	3.5	3.9	3.3	,	
France*	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.3			1.3	-12
Germany*	.9	.9	1.0	0.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	24
Greece	.4	.3	.5	.4	.5	.8		
Hungary	2.3	2.2	3.0	2.8	3,4	2.8	3.5	49
Ireland	.2	.2	.2	.1	.3	.3	.2	-2
Italy	.8	.9	E.L	1.4	1.1	1.3	1.0	26
Latvia	4.3	3.2	5.0	6.2	6.0	7.4	3.9	-10
Lithuania	3.9	3.7	4.1	6.0	9.0	11.2	8.9	128
Luxembourg								
Malta	1.1	1.1	1.7	.5	3.5			
Moldova	3.5	4.1	4.8	5.8	5.4	7.3		
Netherlands	3,4	7.6	6.7	4.5	4.9	5.8	6.2	83
Norway	1.0	.9	.9	.9	1.0	.9	.7	-32
Poland	.9	1.4	1,4	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.9	121
Portugal	2.9	4.1	5.8	3,9	3.9	3.4	3.2	8
Romania	4.9	6.7	7.5	6.1	6,8	6. 9	7.5	52
Russia	6.9	7.5	8.4	10.9	12.6	13.0	12.5	80
Slovenia	1.6	2.3	1.7	2.5	1.5	1.9	1.9	15
Spain		.9	.9	.9	1.0	1.0		
Sweden	1.5	1.1	1.4	1.8	1.1	1.4	1.5	4
Switzerland*	.7	.9	1.0	1.3	1,0	1.0		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	.6	.7	.6	.3	.7	.6	.5	-21
Turkey				7.3	8.2	8.4	8.4	
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	22
Northern Ireland	2.8	3.0	2.8	7.8	3.4	4.7	1.4	-49
Scotland	2.2	2.1	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.6	3.1	39
Mean	2.2	2.6	2.7	3.0	3.4	3.6	3.7	
Median	1.6	1.3	1.7	1.8	2,0	1.9	2.0	
Minimum	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.2	
Maximum	6.9	11.8	8.4	10.9	12.6	13.6	12.5	

Table 3.B.1.1 INTENTIONAL HOMICIDE: TOTAL (Persons convicted per 100'000 population	Table 3.B.1.1 INTENTIONAL	HOMICIDE: TOTAL	(Persons convicted	per 100'000 population)
---	---------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	-------------------------

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R311HOC0	R311HOCI	R311HOC2	R311HOC3	R3J1HOC4	R311HQC5	R311HOC6	PC311HOC
Albania								
Austria	.5	,5	.7	.9	.7	.5	.4	-32
Belgium*						• • •		
Bulgaria	1.6	1.5	1,5	1.7	2.0	2.3	2.2	40
Croatia	2.4	1.5	3.0	2.7	2,9	1.5	1.6	-31
Сургаз	.7	.1	1.4	.4	.4	.0		
Czech Republic								
Denmark	.8	.6	.9	.9	.7	1.0	I.2	53
Estonia	3.1	4.5	4.6		8.7	12.1	9.0	195
Finland*	1.7	2.3	2.3	1.8	2.2	1.6		• • •
France*								
Germany*								
Greece	.3	.3	.3	.4	.4	.6		***
Hungary	1.6	1.3	2.0	1.8	2.4	2.1	2.4	47
Ireland	.2	.1	.2	.1	.3	.3	.1	-19
Italy	.7	.6	.8	.9	.7	.9	.7	4
Latvia					• • •			
Lithuania								
Luxembourg								
Malta	1.1	1.1	1.7	.5	3.5	** *		
Moldova				- • •	•••			
Netherlands		•••			•••			
Norway								
Poland	• • •							
Portugal	2.0	2.4	3.7	2.4	2.4	1.9	1.9	-6
Romania		•••			***	4.5	4.9	
Russia	6.3	6.8	7.8	10.3	11.8	12.2	11.7	85
Slovenia					••••			
Spain								- 4 #
Sweden								
Switzerland*	.4	.5	.7	.7	.5	.6		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia								
Turkey					***			
United Kingdom:			***	* * *	***			
England & Wales	.8	.9	.9	.9	.9	.9	1.0	30
Northern Ireland	1.2	1.0	1.6	2.8	2.2	1,5	1.3	8
Scotland	1.3	1.2	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.7	2.2	75
Mean	1.5	1.5	2.0	1.8	2.5	2.6	2.9	
Median	1.2	1.1	1.5	0.9	1.7	1.5	1.8	
Minimum	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.1	
Maximum	6.3	6.8	7.8	10.3	11.8	12.2	11.7	

Table 3.B.1.2 INTENTIONAL HOMICIDE: COMPLETED (Persons convicted per 100'000 population)

Table 3.B.1.3 ASSAULT (Persons convicted per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 911-96
	R311AS0	R311AS1	R311AS2	R311AS3	R311AS4	R311AS5	R311AS6	PC311AS
Albania	12	6	4	6	7		12	1
Austria	127	143	145	142	127	124	114	-10
Belgium*	31	43	27	43	56	•••	+	
Bulgaria	5	6	5	3	4	5	5	7
Croatia	47	38	22	90	24	20	15	-68
Cyprus	6	5	5	4	4	5		
Czech Republic	14	16	17	17	24	22	25	83
Denmark	85	89	95	113	144	[18	109	28
Estonia	8	7	7	9	13	17	15	80
Finland*	179	160	170	161	155	150		** =
France*	68	68	71	71			68	-1
Germany*	46	45	44	45	48	51	55	19
Greece	38	29	30	44	27	32		
Hungary	29	33	41	44	51	61	54	87
Ireland	14	9	6	5	5	3	3	-76
Italy	2	3	4	5	5	5	6	265
Latvia	15	13	13	15	16	20	17	11
Lithuania	4	5	4	4	5	6	5	20
Luxembourg			•••		***			
Malta	•••	•-•		• • • •	***			
Moldova	15	19	14	16	18	18	[
Netherlands	35	30	27	29	33	35	36	4
Norway	26	28	27	35	.38	36	37	44
Poland	8	15	16	18	18	18	23	169
Portugal	33	26	33	34	25	27	31	-6
Romania	2	4	4	3	4	9	10	321
Russia	32	32	31	41	50	55	58	83
Slovenia	36	34	27	23	27	15	19	-47
Spain	- * *	6	7	8	7	8		
Sweden	82	85	85	95	100	106	93	13
Switzerland*	12	12	12	15	14	13		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	61	59	48	41	43	55	42	-30
furkey				79	87	89	84	
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	100	89	82	73	70	53	55	-45
orthern Ireland	49	43	43	38	38	39	45	~8
icotland	280	260	252	247	239	249	258	-8
	47	44	43	48	46	47	48	
Aedian	31	29	27	34	27	27	36	
linimum	2	3	4	3	4	3	3	
Maximum	280	260	252	247	239	249	258	

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R311RA0	R311RA1	R311RA2	R3HRA3	R311RA4	R311RA5	R311RA6	PC311RA
Albania	1.8	.8	1.8	.9	1.5		1.4	-19
Austria	1,5	1.6	1.7	2.2	1.9	1.7	1.5	4
Belgium*	3.2	3.6	4.1	2.8	4.1		• • •	
Bulgaria	2.8	2.1	2.1	1.2	2.1	1.6	2.0	-31
Croatia	2.4	1.8	1,3	1.0	1.1	.6	.4	-82
Сургиз	1.	.0	.6	.3	.0	.0		
Czech Republic	1.8	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.8	1.5	-18
Denmark	3.5	3.3	3.7	4.0	3.6	3.7	2.8	-20
Estonia	2.2	2.0	1.2	1.8	2.7	4.1	3.1	43
Finland*	.9	i.2	1.1	1,3	1.3	1.0		
France*	1.3	1.6	1.6	1.8			2.1	65
Germany*	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.5	2
Greece	.3	.3	.5	.2	,3	.4		
Hungary	2.5	2.1	2.3	1.8	2.6	2.3	1.9	-23
Ireland	.6	.8	.8	.8	1.0	.5	.2	-65
Italy	.8	1.3	1.7	1.9	1.8	t.7	2.2	174
Latvia	3.8	3.6	5.4	2.7	2.4	2.8	2.1	-45
Lithuania		4.7	3.2	3.9	4.5	3.9	4.5	
Luxembourg				* * *		• • •		
Malta	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0			
Moldova	4.2	4.6	3.6	4.8	5.2	3.7		
Netherlands	1.4	1.9	.1	1.3	1.8	2.1	1.9	39
Norway	1.6	1.7	1.2	1.8	1.3	.8	.7	-58
Poland	1.7	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.8	69
Portugal	2.1	.8	1.8	1.2	1.5	1.3	1.0	-54
Romania	3.4	5.5	5.8	3.9	3.5	4.5	4.3	25
Russia	9.6	8.9	7.7	7.1	7.6	7.0	6.1	-36
Slovenia	4.0	3.7	4.1	3.4	2.2	2.1	2.5	-37
Spain	- • •	.6	.7	.8	.7	.6		
Sweden	2.0	1.7	1.9	2.1	1.7	1.5	1.1	-44
Switzerland*	1.2	.8	1.0	1.3	1.1	1.0		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	2.7	2.5	2.0	1.4	2.1	1.9	2.4	-12
Furkey	***	***		7.4	7.4	8.4	7.7	
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	1.1	1.1	1.0	.9	.9	1.1	4.1	4
Northern Ireland	2.3	1.4	1.3	.8	.9	1.5	.9	-59
Scotland	.9	.6	.7	.9	.7	.6	.8	-11
Меал	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.2	
Median	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.9	
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	
Maximum	9.6	8.9	7.7	7.4	7.6	8.4	7.7	

Table 3.B.1.4 RAPE (Persons convicted per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R311ROT0	R311ROT)	R311ROT2	R311ROT3	R311ROT4	R311ROT5	R311ROT6	PC311ROT
Albania	1	l	3	3	2		- 4	196
Austria	6	7	7	7	8	6	6	-9
Belgium*		***	* * *	19	23			
Bulgaria	3	4	4	4	5	7	8	138
Croatia	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	-12
Сургиз	1	I.	1	0	1	t	···	
Czech Republic	5	8	7	9	10	12	14	176
Denmark	13	15	16	15	14	14	14	8
Estonia	21	20	23	34	52	61	64	211
Finland*	9	10	13	10	10	9	• • •	
France*	12	13	15	15			11	-13
Germany*	8	9	10	11	11	11	13	56
Greece	0	1	1	I	1	2		* * 4
Hungary	11	12	13	13	15	15	13	19
Ireland	13	12	14	15	17	15	15	17
Italy	7	9	9	10	10	10	11	58
Latvia	25	29	35	30	15	17	10	-58
Lithuania		4	5	7	12	18	23	** *
Luxembourg								
Malta								
Moldova	26	18	П	20	25	24		
Netherlands	13	15	16	14	20	22	22	71
Norway	6	5	5	5	5	4	4	-30
Poland	9	12	12	13	13	14	18	101
Portugal	4	5	8	8	13	16	15	241
Romania	4	9	12	10	11	14	14	206
Russia	26	28	35	48	53	51	53	105
Slovenia	2	2	2	4	4	2	3	23
Spain		81	82	93	91	92		
Sweden	7	7	8	9	6	6	6	-12
Switzerland*	5	5	6	6	6	4		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	I	1	ι	1	2	4	2	109
Furkey				2	3	3	2	
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	9	9	10	10	10	10	11	21
Northern Ireland	14	10	13	10	11	12	10	-28
Scotland	13	13	15	15	14	13	14	10
Mean	9	12	13	14	15	16	14	
Median	8	9	10	10	11	12	11	
Minimum	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	
Maximum	26	81	82	93	91	92	64	

Table 3.B.1.5 ROBBERY; TOTAL (Persons convicted per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R311ROA0	R311ROA1	R311ROA2	RHIROAS	R311ROA4	RHIROAS	R311ROA6	PC311ROA
Albania							.2	
Austria	* - 1	• • •	••	•••				
Belgium*	**-		- * 1	- • •	* - *	•••		
Bulgaria	- • •	- * *			• • •	• - •		
Croatia	• • •						- • •	
Cyprus		• • •					• • •	
Czech Republic					** *		•••	
Denmark			• • •			• • • •		
Estonia			***	***		- • •		
Finland*		* • •						
France*	1.4	1.3	t.1	1.2		•-•	1.0	-31
Germany*	2.5	2.9	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.6	42
Greece						• • •	• • •	
Hungary								,
Ireland	4.6	4.8	5.0	6.5	5.6	4.0	4.7	2
Italy			* - *	•••				
Latvia								
Lithuania					• • •			
Luxembourg								
Malta								
Moldova	3.3	4.0	2.5	4.9	6.2	5.8		
Netherlands	•••							•••
Norway	1.5	1.5	1,6	1.6	1.6	1.4		***
Poland	1.0	1.8	1.9	2.1	2.2	2.5		
Portugal								
Romania	÷					.3	.0	
Russia	***			,		***		
Slovenia	***		- + 4		•••			
Spain		12.9	15.4	17.4	16.1	16.7		
Sweden								
Switzerland*	1.0	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.2	.5		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	1.	.2	.4	.3	.3	1.0	.6	464
Furkey	•••			1.2	1,3	1.5	1.0	
United Kingdom:							-	
England & Wales	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.0	-17
Northern Ireland	.1	.1	4.7	5.4	6.2	6.9	3.5	> 1000
Scotland						•••		
Mean	1.7	2.9	3.5	3,9	4.1	3.7	1.7	
Median	1.3	1.5	1.9	1.8	2.2	2.0	1.0	
Minimum	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	
Maximum	4.6	12.9	15.4	17.4	16.1	16.7	4.7	

Table 3.B.1.6 ARMED ROBBERY (Persons convicted per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R311THT0	R31(THT1	R311THT2	R311THT3	R311THT4	R311THT5	R311THT6	PC311THT
Albania	36	34	51	43	42		46	27
Austria	189	200	198	181	166	163	158	-17
Belgium*	56	70	56	84	107	• • • •		
Bulgaria	43	55	61	39	55	72	103	141
Croatia	101	73	57	82	82	66	54	-47
Cyprus	71	26	34	25	21	19		
Czech Republic	35	97	111	133	171	170	170	389
Denmark	615	614	671	692	676	642	602	-2
Estonia	64	78	216	284	298	320	351	447
Finland*	577	636	680	758	680	627		
France*	207	203	212	198			166	-20
Germany*	240	240	251	273	249	229	235	-2
Greece	32	32	31	27	26	31	•••	
Hungary	191	267	303	287	289	329	338	77
freland	299	288	294	274	290	252	215	-28
ftaly	37	57	57	60	57	52	63	71
Latvia	97	122	199	315	219	179	202	108
Lithuania		135	231	323	308	312	244	
Luxembourg	+							
Malta	4	2	1	2				
Moldova	77	117	143	165	191	183		
Netherlands	149	149	141	140	167	178	176	18
Norway	134	126	114	121	112	104	105	-22
Poland	33	46	42	40	44	50	38	16
Portugal	33	65	84	81	77	81	61	86
Romania	76	119	148	166	201	214	218	187
Russia	107	139	185	240	199	308	326	206
Slovenia	210	183	179	154	134	64	62	-71
Spain	***	9	7	12	12	13		
Sweden	393	411	402	418	369	374	315	-20
Switzerland*	126	139	128	117	111	79		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	60	68	65	75	92	84	69	16
Turkey		***		59	70	79	78	
United Kingdom:								
England & Wates	306	304	286	266	255	248	245	-20
Northern Ireland	215	217	199	204	190	195	172	-20
Scotland	538	537	537	492	460	433	422	-22
Mean	167	172	187	195	194	198	194	
Median	104	124	145	154	167	178	172	
Minimum	4	2	1	2	12	13	38	
Maximum	615	636	680	758	680	642	602	

Table 3.B.1.7 THEFT: TOTAL (Persons convicted per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R311THV0	R311THV1	R311THV2	R31THV3	R31ITHV4	R311THV5	R311THV6	PC3IITHV
Albania								
Austria		- • -	•••					
Belgium*	- * •		** -	•••		•••	, ·	
Bulgaria		•			+ + +			
Croatia	8.4	6.2	3,9	3.9	3.9	2.5	2.3	-72
Сургиз					• - •			
Czech Republic								
Denmark	54.9	49.8	48.5	49.1	56.3	56.3	56.5	3
Estonia				•-•				
Finland*			+ 4 4	•••				
France*				4 # -		•••		
Germany*	,			- * *				••
Greece	.2	.2	.2	.3	.1	.4		
Hungary								
reland	.9	1.0	.9	.9	.4	.9	.8	-14
Italy								
Latvia			***		- • •			
Lithuania				**-				
Luxembourg						•••		
Malta			- • •					
Moldova					•••			•••
Netherlands								
Norway	13.6	12.1	10.9	10.7	9.6	10.5	10.5	-23
Poland	484							
Portugal								•••
Romania						•••		
Russia				•••		•••		
Slovenia	17.2	14.4	10.8	9.7	6.9	5.7	6.2	-64
Spain		10.7	10.6	12.1	12.4	13.1		
Sweden	36.4	33.8	32.7	3 0.3	25.3	28.3	22.8	-37
Switzerland*								
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	5.9	6.4	6.6	4.1	4.1	6.1	5.5	-5
furkey		• • •		0.	.1		.0	
United Kingdom:				-				
Ingland & Wales	8.1	8.2	9.5	14.9	15.5	15.3	14.2	75
Northern Ireland	28,1	28.0	28.1	29,4	29.5	33.8	26.5	-6
Scotland	47.2	49.6	52,0	47.2	48.9	47.1	45.9	-3
Aean	20.1	18.4	17.9	16.4	16.4	18.3	17,4	
Median	13.6	11.4	10.7	10.7	9.6	8.11	10.5	
Minimum	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.0	
Maximum	54.9	49.8	52.0	49.1	56.3	56.3	56.5	

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R311BUT0	R311BUT1	R311BUT2	R311BUT3	R311BUT4	R311BUTS	R311BUT6	PC31IBUT
Albania			1					1.7
Austria	37	36	35	34	30	28	28	-26
Belgium*		···						
Bulgaria					246	241	252	
Croatia	22	22	19	24	25	24	15	-33
Cyprus	15	16	17	14	16	14		
Czech Republic			***					
Denmark	116	111	112	103	96	86	84	-28
Estonia			•••					
Finland*								
France*	***							
Germany*	36	34	35	38	38	37	36	-1
Greece						• - *		
Hungary					202	197	205	
Ireland	120	128	134	121	139	106	94	-22
Italy					***			
Latvia								
Lithuanía			- * *					
Luxembourg								
Maita	1	0		- • •				
Moldova	44	41	124	145	158	146		
Netherlands								
Norway	93	89	78	81	72	64	62	-33
Poland	71	88	87	86	87	85	113	58
Portugal								
Romania								
Russia								
Slovenia	27	28	35	28	29	14	16	-38
Spain								
Sweden			***			•••		
Switzerland*		4**					•••	
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	42	49	67	91	81	77	63	49
Furkey						• • •		
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	86	90	86	78	74	68	62	-28
Northern Ireland	86	76	72	70	61	59	50	-42
Scotland	123	118	115	103	99	87	75	-39
Mean	61	62	72	73	91	83	82	
Median	44	49	75	80	77	72	63	
Minimum	1	0	17	14	16	14	15	
Maximum	123	128	134	145	246	241	252	

Table 3.B.1.9 BURGLARY: TOTAL (Persons convicted per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90~96
	R311DOT0	R311DOT1	R311DOT2	R311DOT3	R311DOT4	R311DOT5	R311DOT6	PC311DOT
Albania	+++			0	0		6	
Austria	15	19	22	34	41	40	43	190
Belgium*				47	67			
Bulgaria	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	688
Croatia	2	2	1	2	3	3	7	272
Cyprus	10	8	6	9	10	13		
Czech Republic		0	0	i	1	2	3	
Denmark	155	182	195	211	178	158	163	5
Estonia	1	0	1	0	I	1	4	698
Finland*	14	19	29	64	67	45		
France*	36	34	38	39			40	12
Germany*	39	43	44	44	45	47	55	39
Greece	9	ιo	11	11	8	15		
Hungary	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	660
Ireland	45	73	79	77	87	57	58	29
Italy	15	27	33	31	27	29	36	144
Latvia	1	1	1	2	2	4	4	205
Lithuania		I.	2	3	5	5	6	
Luxembourg	•••		***					***
Malta	* * *	+ 4 -		•••	•••			
Moldova	1	2	2	3	5	5		- * -
Netherlands	18			21	27	29	32	75
Norway	73	78	77	83	75	94	102	40
Poland	Ĩ	1	3	6	5	5	5	643
Portugal	10	11	16	24	23	27	33	219
Romania					0	1	1	* - *
Russia	5	6	7	13	19	26	31	558
Slovenia	2	2	2	1	1	2	5	147
Spain		16	19	21	21	19		
Sweden	55	56	56	50	63	70	66	22
Switzerland*	61	68	74	86	86	72		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	2	2	2	2	2	4	5	198
Turkey			•••	2	4	5	5	
<i>United Kingdom:</i> England & Wales	48	46	44	43	54	61	66	36
Northern Ireland	6	10	17	27	31	42	41	540
Scotland	60	75	81	92	106	109	121	101
Mean	25	27	30	32	32	32	35	· · ·
Median	10	10	16	21	19	19	31	
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Maximum	155	182	195	211	178	158	163	

Table 3.B.1.10 DRUG OFFENCES: TOTAL (Persons convicted per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96	
	R311DTT0	R31(DTT)	R311DTT2	R3HDTT3	R311DTT4	R311DTT5	R311DTT6	PC311DT	
Albania									
Austria							•••		
Belgium*			***	42.2	59.2				
Bulgaria	• •	•••							
Croatia					4 + *		- • •		
Cyprus		+ + =							
Czech Republic		.2	,4	.7	1.1	1.3	2.7		
Denmark			* 4 -		* ~ *				
Estonia		.0	.3	.3	.3	.2	1.6		
Finland*		•••				•••			
France*	10.3	10.3	11.6	11.2		**-	14.7	43	
Germany*									
Greece	2.2	2.2	3.2	3.2	1.2	5.1			
Hungary		- + *	• - •						
Ireland		•••		•••					
Italy		***		•••					
Latvia									
Lithuania		.0	.1	.2	.6	.4	.5		
Luxembourg				***					
Malta									
Moldova		•••		* * *					
Netherlands				•••					
Norway	37.4	42.5	40.6	47.6	41.0	54.2	62,0	66	
Poland	.0	.0	.1	.]	.1	.1			
Portugal	3.2	4.1	6.8	7.9	9.4	11.8	10.5	231	
Romania	••••				.5	1.0	1.4		
Russia		•••							
Slovenia	1.1	1.0	1.0	.7	.8	1.7	4.3	299	
Spain			•••			•••			
Sweden				** -		***			
Switzerland*	14.5	18.3	22.6	26.7	27.0	23,0			
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia					.,.				
Furkey			- * *	.9	1.7	2.4	2.6		
United Kingdom:	,,,,				.,,				
England & Wales				14.4	16.6	20.1	21.9		
Northern Ireland	.8	.8	1.8	6.9	5.3	12.0	16.4	> 1000	
Scotland	10.1	11.8	13.4	17.8	20.3	23.0	30.0	197	
Mean	8.8	7.6	8.5	12.0	12.3	11.2	14.0		
Median	3.2	1.6	2.5	6.9	1.7	3.8	7.4		
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.5		
Maximum	37.4	42.5	40.6	47.6	59.2	54.2	62.0		

Table 3.B.1.11 DRUG TRAFFICKING: TOTAL (Persons convicted per 100'000 population)

	1990	1991	199 2	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R311DTS0	R311DTS1	R311DTS2	R311DTS3	R311DTS4	R311DTS5	R311DTS6	PC311DTS
Albania		,						
Austria	5.0	6.7	8.2	12.3	15.7	14.3	13.2	165
Belgium*	••••				* - 1		- + +	
Bulgaria		- * -	- # +	***	- + -	+ + -		
Croatia			- • /				• • •	
Сургия				F + 1				•
Czech Republic	• • •	+- +			5 - 5		***	
Denmark	10.1	10.0	10.1	10.6	10.4	9.7	11.1	10
Estonia		.0	.3	.2	.1	.1	1.4	
Finland*								
France*	- * *			- * *	• • •			
Germany*	2.7	3.4	3.3	3.9	4.7	4.9	5.2	94
Greece	***	• •			+ * r			
Нипдагу		- • -	*4 -		***			
Ireland						•••		
Italy	.5	.8	.7	.6	1.2	.7		
Latvia				•••				•••
Lithuania		.0	.1	.1	.3	.5	1.1	
Luxembourg						- • -		184
Malta	**>							
Moldova					• • •			
Netherlands			***		•••			
Norway	6.2	7.2	6.4	6.9	7.2	6.9	6.9	13
Poland								
Portugal								***
Romania							***	
Russia				•••		•		
Slovenia	.0	.0	.0	.2	.0	.3	.6	
Spain		***	***					
Sweden	2.8	3.7	3.6	2.8	3.5	3.3	4,4	59
Switzerland*	7.2	9.4	11.6	13.5	12.3	9.2		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	,				- • •			
Turkey		*						• • •
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales			* * *	5,6	5.9	6.8	8.3	
Northern Ireland		•••			•••			
Scotland		•••			•••			
Mean	4.3	4.1	4.4	5.2	5.6	5.1	5.8	
Median	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.9	4.7	4.9	5.2	
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.6	
Maximum	10.1	10.0	11.6	13.5	15.7	14.3	13.2	

Notes on tables 3.B.1.1 to 3.B.1.12

Belgium: Decisions involving the hospitalisation of mentally ill offenders or the deferral (suspension) of the pronouncement of a sentence are not included in the figures for 1990-1993.

Finland: Changes in recording convictions may have affected counts of multiple offences.

France:

a) The figures for 1994 and 1995 are not indicated because of amnesties occurring in those years. Convictions may now be undercounted, due to changes in recording rules after 1993.

b) In cases of assault (and contrary to police statistics, see table 1.B.1.4, convictions are also counted if the victim was unable to work for up to 8 days.

Germany: Figures for 1990-1994 relate to the former Federal Republic and West Berlin. The figures for 1995 and 1996 relate to the former Federal Republic and the whole of Berlin.

Switzerland: Persons under 18 years of age are not included.

3.B.2 Percentage of females, persons under 18 years of age, and aliens among convicted persons in 1995

	Intentional homicide: total	Intentional homicide: completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery: total	Armed robbery	Theft	Theft of motor vehicle	Bicycle theft	Burglary: total	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: total	Drug trafficking: total	Serious drug trafficking
	Рэтанодж	P312HOCW	PJIZASW	P312RA₩	P312ROTW	P312RDAW	P312THTW	PHIZTHVW	P312THBW	P312BUTW	P312BUDW	P312DOTW	P312DTT₩	P312DTSW
Albania*	3		7	0	0	0	2					2		
Austria	9	11	7	1	10	- • •	28			5		14		14
Belgium*	5		3	1	6		8					7	7	
Bulgaria	6	6	5	0	4		6					0		
Croatia	6	***	12		2		8			4		6	• • •	
Сургиз			3		0	•••	7	,		3		12	• • •	
Czech Republic	7		5	0	6	•••	7				***	11	10	
Denmark	16	17	6	1	10		25	7	7	4	6	14	• • •	19
Estonia	8	8	6	* = 4			7					0	0	0
Finland				* - •		•••							• • •	
France*	9		8	1	6	5	12		- * *		•••	9	8	
Germany	7		7	ł	5	4	25			3	•••	10	•••	8
Greece	0	0	10	0	3		10	0			••-	3	3	• -
Hungary	18	20	9	3	9		10		•••	20		14		•••-
Ireland	•••	10	8		3	0	15	0	5	3	4	* * *		••-
Italy	4	3	10	1	5		17			* * *		6		
Latvia	14		11		3		9			••	•••	18	•••	
Lithuania	12		9	0	4		9			.,	9	21	57	11

Table 3.B.2.1 Percentage of females among convicted persons in 1995

	Intentional homicide: total	Intentional homicide: completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery: total	Armed robbery	Theft	Theft of motor vehicle	Bicycle theft	Burglary: total	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: total	Drug trafficking: total	Serious drug trafficking
Luxembourg		•••												
Maita														
Moldova	11		9	1	4	6	11				1**	16		
Netherlands	***								•••					
Norway	5		•••	0	8	6	9	5		6	• -	16	15	10
Poland	12		5	0	3	3	7			2		47	5	••
Portugal	6	6	15	2	4	- * ·	8		• • •	***		11	14	
Romenia	4	2	5	0	4	13	9			•••	• • •	5	5	
Russia	12		7	1	7		12					9		
Slovenia	3		6	2	4		13	3	•••	1		16	12	0
Spain	8		6	1	3		18	4	* * *			19		
Sweden	6		9	0	4		28	3		•••		16		14
Switzerland*	4	3	8	0	9	6	21				••	13	10	10
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	18	•••			3	5	4	2		1		1		
Turkey	•••			•••								•••		
<i>United Kingdom:</i> England & Wales	9	9	9	2	8	2	17	3	2	3	3	10	12	12
Northern Ireland	Э	0	5	8	5	4	18	1	0	3	4	6	4	
Scotland	3	4	11	0	5	•••	15	2	•••	2		9	13	
Mean	8	7	8	1	5	4	13	3	4	- 4	5	11	12	10
Median	7	6	7	1	4	4	10	3	3	3	4	10	10	11
Minimum	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	0
Maximum	18	20	15	8	10	13	28	7	7	20	9	47	57	19

	Intentional homicide: total	intentional homicide: completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery: total	Armed robbery	Theft	Theft of motor vehicle	Bicycle theft	Burglary: total	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: total	Drug trafficking: total	Serious drug trafficking
	2312HOTM	P312HOCM	P312ASM	P312RAM	P312ROTM	P312ROAM	P312THTM	P312THVM	P3 12THBM	P312BUTM	P312BUDM	P312DOTM	P312DTTM	P3T2DTSM
Albania*	4		4	17	24	0	23	- • •	•••		< * -	i		
Austria	9	5	6	13	33		10	- ••		30		7	1 - 4	6
Belgium*	0		0	0	0		0			•••	4 + 4	0	0	*
Bulgaria	4	4	4	15	17	•••	8			20		0	• • •	*
Croatia	1		5	11	22		21	3		Ţ	***	6		••
Cyprus			0		0		2			2		0		,
Czech Republic	11		8	12	25		19					15	15	
Denmark	2	0	9	10	16		11	24	16	13	9	3	***	ł
Estonia	5	б	7	13			25		- * *			13	33	
Finland											• • -	*		•••
France*	7	4.1.0	7	16	18	6	14		••			4	3	**-
Germany	4		14	6	30	27	12		•••	22		5	* 1 1	2
Greece	3	2	2	21	18	** -	23	16	- • •			2	0	
Hungary	8	8	9	22	26	* * •	22					3		
Ireland		10	19	5	19	11	20	15	23	24	17		** /	•••
Italy	5	5	3	2	8		8			• • •		2	***	• • •
Latvia	4		3	14	20	* * *	16			** *		l		
Lithuania	7		3	18	14		16			•••	17	2	7	6

Table 3.B.2.2 Percentage of persons under 18 years of age among convicted persons in 1995

	Intentional homicide: total	intentional homicide: completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery; total	Armed robbery	Theft	Thefl of motor vehicle	Bicycle theft	Burglary: total	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: total	Drug trafficking: total	Serious drug trafficking
Luxembourg			• • •	• • •					•••			* * *	- • •	
Malta			•••			• • •			• • •					
Moldova	17		16	5	20	16	19	• • •				9		
Netherlands										•••				* * *
Norway	13	•••	*1 *	17	15	10	12	22		11		5	4	1
Poland	7		5	8	16	13	9	••		17	***	1	3	
Portugal	2	3	2	5	11		9					1	1	•••
Romania	4	3	2	11	20	14	16	* * •		•••		4	4	
Russia	5	•••	3	20	25		15	* * *				6	* * *	
Slovenia	5		9	7	28		25	30	**-	27		5	6	0
Spain	1		1	2	2		3	4		* * *		1		
Sweden	6		20	3	30		25	37			* * *	3		1
Switzerland*			•••									• • •		* - 4
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	***		5	14	33	21	24	31		39		1		
Turkey	1		1	1	2		4					0	0	
United Kingdom: England & Wales	4	4	17	8	39	13	21	37	42	26	27	4	3	2
Northern Ireland	0	0	9	4	19	13	18	6	64	28	32	4	E	
Scotland	11	11	8	13	17		15	33		19		5	3	4
Mean	5	5	7	10	19	13	15	22	36	20	20	4	6	2
Median	5	4	5	11	19	13	16	23	32	21	17	3	3	2
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	1	9	0	0	0
Maximum	17	11	20	22	39	27	25	37	64	39	32	15	33	6

	Intentional homicide: total	Intentional homicide: completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery: total	Armed robbery	Theft	Thefl of motor vehicle	Bicycle theft	Burglary; total	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: total	Drug trafficking: total	Serious drug trafficking
	P312HOTA	P312HOCA	P3I2ASA	P312RAÁ	P312ROTA	P312ROAA	P312THTA	P312THVA	P312THBA	P312BUTA	P312BUDA	P312DOTA	P312DTTA	P312DTSA
Albania*													• · ·	
Austria	18	19	21	24	32		28			25		20	* • •	30
Belgium*												***		
Bulgaria						•••						•••	• •	
Croatia													* * *	* * -
Сургаз			17		29		29			19		57		
Czech Republic			***						••••					
Denmark														
Estonia	60	61	50	60	• - •		50					80	33	• •
Finland									***		• • •			••
	16		1.4		1.0				***		• • •		20	
France*	16	- * *	14	9	15	15	14		* * *		• • •	21	30	
Germany	34		28	33	39	41	30		***	27	••	31	* * *	34
Greece	***	* • -			* * *				** -			5		
Hungary	1	0	I.	2	4		2				* * *	28		
Ireland		***				***	•••			* * *				
Italy	10		9		15		18		***	•••		25		
Latvia			.,.			114							- 1 >	1
Lithuania			144				•••	•••			***			

Table 3.B.2.3 Percentage of aliens among convicted persons in 1995

	Intentional homicide: total	Intentional homicide: completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery; total	Armed robbery	Theft	Theft of motor vehicle	Bicycle theft	Burglary: total	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: total	Drug trafficking: total	Serious drug trafficking
Luxembourg				•••				-17		•••				* * *
Maita									•••	• • •		• • •		
Moldova	,													
Netherlands				•••					•••					
Norway	26			25	4	19	5	2		4		11	13	25
Poland	1		0	1	2	5	0		- 1 *	0		1	19	
Portugal	3	5	2	3	1		2			*		8	15	
Romania					•••		• • •		• • •		• • •			
Russia	î	***	0	1	2		1		•••		***	3		- 6.4
Slovenia	3		1	7	4		5	4		10		11	12	20
Spain														
Sweden	32	***	17	29	23		20	11	•••	,		18		38
Switzerland*	46	53	56	56	51	56	50			•••		43	70	79
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia					- • •				• · ·		***	• - •		
Turkey	•••				•••	• • •	,					•••		- + -
United Kingdom: England & Wales			**•					• • •	•••	•••		•••	• • •	
Northern Ireland	•••	• • •	•••	•••	•••							• • •		** -
Scotland							•••	•••						*••
Mean	19	28	17	21	17	27	18	6		14		24	27	38
Median	16	19	14	16	15	19	16	4		15		20	19	32
Mininum	1	0	0	1	1	5	0	2		0		1	12	20
Maximum	60	61	56	60	51	56	50	11		27		80	70	79

Notes on tables 3.B.2.1 to 3.B.2.3

Albania: Figures relate to 1996.

Belgium: Figures do not contain decisions involving the hospitalisation of mentally ill offenders or the deferral (suspension) of the pronouncement of a sentence. The very low proportion of persons under 18 years of age among those convicted is due to the fact that minors are, normally, dealt with under specific protective regulations.

France: Figures relate to 1996. Convictions of minors are undercounted, especially in relation to theft and assault.

Switzerland: Persons under 18 years of age are not included.

3.B.3 Sanctions and measures imposed in 1995

Table 3.B.3.1 INTENTIO	Total sanctions and measures per 100'000 pop.	% of Fines	% of Non- custodial sauctions and measures	% of Suspended custodial sanctions and measures	% of Unsuspended custodial seutences	Death penalty sentences (absolute oumbers)	
	R321HOTT	P321HOTF	P321HOTN	P321HOTS	P321HOTU	V321HOTD	
Albania*	9.9	5	0	1	94	I	
Austria*	.7	0	0	0	100	- * *	
Belgium*	1,3				•••		
Bulgaria	•••		0			0	
Croatia	2.7	0	0	3	97	* • •	
Cyprus	.0			***	* * *	* ~ *	
Czech Republic	1.4	0	9	0	91		
Depmark	.6	0	0	0	100		
Estonia	13.6	**	1	8	92	0	
Finland	3.3	*		5	95	**-	
France*	1.3	0	0	5	95	•••	
Germany*	1.1	I.	0	10	89	* * *	
Greece	.8	0	i	L	97		
Hungary	2.8	0	0	10	90		
ireland							
Italy						***	
Latvia	6.8	0	4		94	4	
Lithuania	11.2						
Luxembourg	•••				•••		
Maita						**-	
Moldova	7.9	0	11	10	80	0	
Netherlands							
Norway	.9	0	0	5	95	***	
Poland	1.7	0	4.8.1-	8	92	0	
Portugal	3.4	1	0	20	79	- * *	
Romania*	6.9		i	0	99	- * *	
Russia	12.9		0	5	94	143	
Slovenia	1.9	0	8	8	84		
Spain		* * *					
Sweden*	1.4	0	4	0	96		
Switzerland*	1,0	0		7	93		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	,5		10	10	80		
Turkey	8.4						
United Kingdom; England & Wales*	1.0	0	14	1	85		
Northern Ireland	4.7	0	0	3	97		
Scotland*	2.6	0	10	•••	90	***	

- LADIE 3.D.3.1 INTENTIONAL MOMENTE IVEN FOR ALGUMUM AND MERANGES IN F	Table 3.B.3.1	INTENTIONAL HOMICIDE: TOTAL (Sanctions and measures in	1995)
--	---------------	--	-------

	Total sanctions and measures per 100'000 pop.	% of Fines	% of Non- custodial sanctions and measures	% of Suspended custodial sanctions and measures	% of Unsuspended custodial sentences	Death penalty sentences (absolute numbers)
	R321HOCT	P321HOCF	P321HOCN	P321HOCS	P321HOCU	V321HOCD
Albania*						
Austria*	.5	0	0	0	100	
Belgium*	• • •				- * *	+ ~ +
Bulgaria			0	•••		0
Croatia				** -		
Cyprus	.0	•••	***			
Czech Republic						* * *
Denmark	.5	0	0	0	100	
Estopia	12.3		•••		93	0
Finland	1.6			0	100	- * *
France*			4 # 6		- * *	***
Gеглвару*	**-	•••	***			** -
Greece	.6	0	2	0	98	
Hungary	2.1	0	0	6	94	
ireland	*-*		***	- * *		***
Italy						
Latvia		***	** +	***		
Lithuania					•••	
Luxembourg		* * *	***	* 4 *		* * *
Malta				* • •		*
Moldova	***		***	** *	•••	•••
Netherlands						
Norway	***					
Poland	•••					0
Portugal	1.9	0	0	7	93	
Romania*	4.5		-	0	98	
Russia	12.1		0	5	94	140
Slovenia	•••					
Spain					•••	
Sweden*	** -					**-
Switzerland*		0			98	
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	-					•••
Turkey			***			***
United Kingdom:	• • •	* * *			•••	• • •
England & Wales*	.9	0	13	1	86	
Northern Ireland	1.5	0	0	4	96	
Scotland*	1.7	0	8		92	***

Table 3.B.3.2 INTENTIONAL HOMICIDE: COMPLETED (Sanctions and measures in 1995)

	Total sanctions and measures per 100'000 pop.	% of Fines	% of Non- custodial sanctions aud measures	% of Suspended custodial sanctions and measures	% of Unsuspended custodial sentences
	R321AST	P321ASF	P32IASN	P321ASS	P321ASU
Albania*	13	51	1	3	54
Austria*	123	80	2	10	8
Belgium*	48	1.4.4			
Bulgaria	* **	•••		•••	
Croatia	19	10	3	78	9
Сургаз	5		34	20	34
Czech Republic	22	9	2	75	14
Denmark	79	7	7	26	60
Estonia	17	2	0	54	43
Finland	150	75	2	14	9
France*	68	26	12	42	20
Germany*	53	55	23	15	6
Greece	32	0	ĩ	32	66
Hungary	58	28	30	31	11
Ireland				• • -	
Italy					***
Latvia	19	12	38	***	49
Lithuania	6	•••			
Luxembourg				*	***
Malta	+ * 8	***	- B +		
Moldova	18	•••			•••
Netherlands			***		
Norway	36	58	3	21	18
Poland	18	11	2	75	11
Portugal	27	60	- 1	30	8
Romania*	9		10	52	38
Russia	31	0	9	24	67
Slovenia	15	3	14	74	10
Spain	***	***			
Sweden*	106	29	24	19	28
Switzerland*	13	22		62	17
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	50	41	1	41	18
Turkey	89			**	
United Kingdom:	67	• • • •	•••	***	
England & Wales*	53	14	58	2	27
Northern Ireland	39	22	23	34	21
Scotland*	249	57	29	****	13

Table 3.B.3.3 ASSAULT (Sanctions and measures in 1995)

	Total sanctions and measures per 100,000 pop.	% of Fines	% of Non- custodial sanctions and measures	% of Suspended custodial sanctions and measures	% of Unsuspended custodial sentences		
	R321RAT	P321RAF	P321RAN	P321RAS	P321RAU		
Albania*	1.5	15	2	17	81		
Austria*	1.7	0	0	29	71		
Belgium*	3.9	• • •		5 * r			
Bulgaria	•••	0	0		•••		
Croatia	.5	0	0	22	78		
Cyprus	.0				•••		
Czech Republic	1.9	1	01	31	60		
Denmark	1.2	2	8	13	78		
Estonia	4.1		0	18	82		
Finland	1.0	0	2	37	61		
France*	2.1	0	1	6	93		
Germany*	1.5	0	2	38	59		
Greece	.4	0	19	6	74		
Hungary	2.3	0	2	18	80		
treland							
Italy				•••			
Latvia	2.7	0	19		81		
Lithuania	3.9						
Luxembourg		** -			•••		
Malta							
Moldova	4.1						
Netherlands				***	•		
Norway	.8	0	8	3	89		
Poland	2,5			33	67		
Portugal	1.3	0	I	23	76		
Romania*	4.5		3	1	95		
Russia	7.0		0	12	87		
Slovenia	2.1	0	10	40	50		
Spain	***			***			
Sweden*	1.5	0	6	1	93		
Switzerland*	1.0	0		31	69		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	1.6			28	72		
Turkey	12.8						
United Kingdom:							
England & Wales*	1.1	2	10	1	87		
Northern Ireland	1.5	0	0	0	100		
Scotland*	.6	0	3		97		

Table 3.B.3.4 RAPE (Sanctions and measures in 1995)

	Total sanctions and measures per 100'000 pop.	% of Fines	% of Non- custodial sanctions and measures	% of Suspended custodial sanctions and measures	% of Unsuspended custodia1 sentences
	R321ROTT	P321ROTF	P321ROTN	P321ROTS	P321ROTU
Albania*	4				
Austria*	6	E	1	25	73
Belgium*	22	•••			
Bulgaria		- + 4	- > +	•••	··-
Croatia	2	0	0	23	77
Cyprus	1	0	14	0	86
Czech Republic	12	1	3	30	66
Denmark	10	0	2	81	79
Estonia	61	13	0	40	47
Finland	9	1	4	29	66
France*	11	1	9	25	65
Germany*	12]	24	37	39
Greece	2	0	11	12	76
Hungary	14	0	4	18	78
Ireland				• -	***
Italy	k ir +	4.6.4		* * *	***
Lotvia	17	0	22		78
Lithuania	18	•••		* * *	
Luxembourg	***			***	- • •
Malta	• • •				
Moldova	18				
Netherlands			***		
Norway	4	0	9	8	84
Poland	14		-	22	78
Portugal	16	2		30	68
Romania*	14	1		5	88
Russia	51	0	3	35	61
Slovenia	2	0	28	11	61
Spain					
Sweden*	6	0	36		
Switzerland*	4	1		4 45	60 55
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	4 2	'	***		55
		•••	***	•••	100
Turkey United Kingdoms	3				•••
United Kingdom: England & Wales*	10	I	36	0	63
Northern Ireland	12	0	15	23	62
Scotland*	13	8	27		65

Table 3.B.3.5 ROBBERY: TOTAL (Sanctions and measures in 1995)

	Total sanctions and measures per 100'000 pop.	% of Fines	% of Non- custodial sanctions and measures	% of Suspended custodial sanctions and measures	% of Unsuspended custodial sentences
	R321ROAT	P321ROAF	P321ROAN	P321ROAS	P321ROAU
Albania*	.2	0	0	0	100
Austria*	* 1 *				- * *
Belgium*		•••			
Bulgaria			*		
Croatia			4		•••
Cyprus	4	** *	/		
Czech Republic	+ - *		1		•
Denmark			- + -	***	
Estonia	** •				
Finland		•···			• • •
France*	1.0	0	0	3	97
Germany*	3.4	0	17	32	51
Greece					- • •
Hungary	* * *		*		
Ireland	***				•••
Italy	* * 4			** *	ø + 1
Latvia	* 4 *				••
Lithuania					
Luxembourg			***	•••	***
Malta	- * *	• • •			
Moldova				- * *	
Netberlands				•••	
Norway	1.4	0	2	0	98
Poland	2.5			6	94
Portugal					
Romania*	.3	4	11	28	57
Russia	•••	***	* * *		
Slovenia	•••		•••	***	
Spain					• • •
Sweden*	- * *		4.9.0		
Switzerland*	.5	0	•	38	62
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	.8			** -	100
Turkey		***	- 4 6		
United Kingdom: England & Wales*	1.0	0	11	0	89
Northern Ireland	6.9	0	14	21	65
Scotland*	***	- • •		•••	

Table 3.B.3.6 ARMED ROBBERY (Sanctions and measures in 1995)

	Total sanctions and measures per 100'000 pop.	% of Fines	% of Non- custodial sanctions and measures	% of Suspended custodial sanctions and measures	% of Unsuspended custodial sentences
	R321THTT	P321THTF	P321THTN	P321THTS	P321THTU
Albania*	47	34	2	3	60
Austria*	162	60	3	19	19
Belgium*	107		***		
Bulgaria			***		
Croatia	66	1	0	81	18
Cyprus	19	35	29	23	13
Czech Republic	168	8	1	62	29
Denmark	556	73	6	11	11
Estonia	320	31	1	48	19
Finland	627	87	1	6	6
France*	167	10	17	4 t	32
Germany*	234	60	18	13	8
Greece	31	0	20	16	64
Huogary	288	33	33	17	17
Ireland		* * *			
Italy	5 1 +		***		
Latvia	154	6	55	4 6 4	39
Lithuania	312	* * *			
Luxembourg				- * *	
Malta	÷**		***		
Moldova	185				***
Netherlands		***		•••	
Norway	104	22	10	26	42
Poland	50	49	12	26	13
Portugal	81	18	2	39	40
Romania*	214	4	11	37	47
Russia	308	10	5	50	34
Slovenia	64	6	28	51	15
Spain		•••			
Sweden*	374	48	33	10	10
Switzerland*	79	2		64	34
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	64	2	1	60	37
Turkey	79				
United Kingdom: England & Wales*	249	24	56	0	20
Northern Ireland	195	24	39	19	18
Scotland*	433	41	32		27

Table 3.B.3.7 THEFT: TOTAL (Sanctions and measures in 1995)

	Total sanctions and measures per t00'000 pop.	% of Fines	% of Non- custodial sanctions and measures	% of Suspended custodial sanctions and measures	% of Unsuspended custodial sentences
	R321THVT	P321THVF	P321THVN	P321THVS	P321THVU
Albania*					
Austria*	- * *		- * *		
Belgium*			***	• • •	
Bulgaria					
Croatia	2.5	7	0	81	12
Сургиз	* * *	•••			
Czech Republic			6 F F	*4+	
Denmark	45.2	62	9	10	19
Estonia	- * *				
Finland		** -		• * •	
France*		4 * *		* * *	- + Þ
Germany*		* * 1			
Greece*	.4	0	16	16	67
Hungary	•••		•••	* - *	
Ireland				•••	
Italy			•••	***	
Latvia	15.9	t	36		63
Lithuania	• - •				
Luxembourg					
Malta				•••	
Moldova		•••			
Netherlands					
Norway	10.5	21	8	27	44
Poland			***	•	
Portugal					• • •
Romania*					
Russia					•••
Slovenia	5.7	4	30	57	10
Spain					
Sweden*	28.3	9	59	11	20
Switzerland*					
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	4.2		***	53	47
Turkey					
United Kingdom:					
England & Wales*	15.4	5	56	0	38
Northern Ireland	33.8	19	33	19	29
Scotland*	47.1	28	43		30

Table 3.B.3.8 THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE (Sanctions and measures in 1995)

	Fotal sanctions and measures per 100'000 pop.	% of Fines	% of Non- custodial sanctions and measures	% of Suspended custodial sanctions and measures	% of Unsuspended custodiat sentences
	R321BUTT	P321BUTF	P321BUTN	P321BUTS	P321BUTU
Albania*					
Austria*	28	9	8	43	40
Belgium*		***		4 6 6	* * *
Bulgaria	232	35	10	18	37
Croatia	23	0	0	73	27
Cyprus	14	11	18	27	44
Czech Republic	***		***		
Denmark	70	4	15	42	39
Estonia				•••	***
Finland				···-	•• -
France*		* * *	•••		
Germany*	39	13	32	33	22
Greece			***	***	
Hungary	190	35	10	18	37
Ireland			•••		
Italy				** -	
Latvia	90	3	57		40
Lithuania			***		•••
Luxembourg			•••		
Malta				•	
Moldova	146	***	•••	•••	
Netherlands		. * *			
Norway	64	8	13	27	52
Poland	85			64	36
Portugal					***
Romania*				***	
Russia	4 4 *			**-	
Slovenia	14	0	26	34	39
Spain	• • •			***	
Sweden*			- + 7	•••	
Switzerland*					
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	47	••••	0	39	61
Turkey				***	
United Kingdom:					
England & Wales*	68	6	55	0	38
Northern Ireland	59	9	39	17	35
Scotland*	87	20	36		44

Table 3.8.3.9 BURGLARY: TOTAL (Sanctions and measures in 1995)

	Total sanctions and measures per 100'000 pop.	% of Fines	% of Non- custodial sanctions and measures	% of Suspended custodial sanctions and measures	% of Unsuspended custodial sentences
	R321DOTT	P321DOTF	P321DOTN	P321DOTS	P321DOTU
Albania*	6	6	11	32	52
Austria*	40	39	2	24	35
Belgium*	56	**)			
Bulgaria		***	0		
Croatia	3	0	0	59	41
Сургия	13	28	8	35	29
Czech Republic	2	5	7	53	33
Denmark	112	76	4	5	15
Estonia	1	40	0	33	27
Finland	45	71	2	9	18
France*	41	11	Ó	38	45
Germany*	48	38	14	31	18
Greece	15	0	2	20	78
Hungary	1	16	16	29	39
Ireland		** -			
italy	***		***	* 1 *	***
Latvia	3	5	31	** *	64
Lithuania	5	* * *			
Luxembourg			-**		
Malta	4+4				
Moldova	5				
Netherlands		•••	• • •		
Norway	94	46	3	26	25
Poland	5	79	2	14	5
Portugal	27	23	3	18	56
Romania*	1		18	38	45
Russia	23	1	16	39	43
Slovenia	2	0	5	39	55
Spain	-				
Sweden*	70	45	32	2	21
Switzerland*	72	10		53	37
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	4	•••	4		96
Tarkey	5				
United Kingdom:	2	***	***	•••	
England & Wales*	61	49	33	t	17
Northern Ireland	42	52	13	16	18
Scotland*	109	71	16		13

Table 3.B.3.10 DRUG OFFENCES: TOTAL (Sanctions and measures in 1995)

	Total sanctions and measures per 100'000 pop.	% of Fines	% of Non- custodial sanctions and measures	% of Suspended custodial sauctions and measures	% of Unsuspended custodial sentences
	R321DTTT	P321DTTF	P321DTTN	P321DTTS	P321DTTU
Albania*				• - •	
Austria*	39.6	39	2	24	35
Belgium*	49.6	•	+ * -		
Bulgaria			* 4 -		• • •
Croatia	•••	***			
Cyprus	• • •		***		
Czech Republic	1.4	5	5	55	34
Denmark				***	
Estonia	.2	33	0	33	33
Finland		+ F *	•••		
Ггалсе*	14.8	3	3	34	59
Germany*					
Greece	5.1	0	0	11	89
Hungary	•••			** *	
Ireland			••-		* - *
Italy			•••		
Latvia	.3	0	0	** *	100
Lithuania	.4		•••		
Laxembourg	•••				
Malta					
Moldova			•••	4 * *	***
Netherlands					
Norway	54.2	18	5	39	38
Poland	.1	16	0	46	38
Portugal	11.8	I	0	12	87
Romania*	1.0		18	38	45
Russia					
Slovenia	1.7	0	6	33	61
Spain		***		** 1	***
Sweden*				** *	+
Switzerland*	23.0	6		56	39
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia		***	**-	* * *	*= *
Turkey	***	•••		***	***
United Kingdom:					
England & Wales*	20.1	20	33	2	44
Northern Ireland	12.0	12	11	29	48
Scotiand*	23.0	24	28	***	48

Table 3.B.3.11 DRUG TRAFFICKING: TOTAL (Sanctions and measures in 1995)

	Total sanctions and measures per 100'000 pop.	% of Fines	% of Non- custodial sauctions and measures	% of Suspended custodial sanctions and measures	% of Unsuspended custodial sentences
	R321DTST	P321DTSF	P321DTSN	P321DTSS	P321DTSU
Albania*					
Austria*	14.3	0	0	21	79
Belgium*				* * *	
Bulgaria					•••
Croatia	4 * -	•••-			
Сургиз			•••		•••
Czech Republic			***		
Denmark	6,4	1	3	10	87
Estonia	.1	0	0	100	Ő
Finland	• •	* * -		- • •	
France*	**-	•••	••••		- * *
Germany*	5.0	l	5	53	41
Greece	- * *			***	
Hungary	***		• • •	•••	***
Ireland		•••	* > *	***	
Italy			***		
Latvia		* * *	* # *		
Lithuania	.5		~ * *		
Luxembourg					
Malta	***		***		
Moldova			***		
Netherlands				***	
Norway	6.9	0	7	3	90
Poland	•••				+ - +
Portugal		***			
Romania*	***				•••
Russia		•••		- • >	
Slovenia	.3	0	0	0	100
Spain					
Sweden*	3.3	0	3	0	97
Switzerland*	9.2	0		38	62
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia		,	** -	***	
Turkey	• • •	***	***		•••
United Kingdom: England & Wales*	6.8	10	16	2	72
Northern Ireland		•••			***
Scotland*		***	***		•

Table 3.B.J.12 SERIOUS DRUG TRAFFICKING (Sanctions and measures in 1995)

Notes on tables 3.B.3.1 to 3.B.3.12

Albania: Figures relate to 1996.

Austria: Totals do not match table 3.B.1.1 because of persons convicted (found guilty) but not sentenced.

Belgium: Figures relate to 1994.

France:

a) Figures relate to 1996.

b) Non-custodial sanctions and measures include educational measures, community service and other alternative sanctions, as well as cases where no sanction was imposed.

Germany:

a) The figures for 1990-1994 relate to the former Federal Republic and West Berlin, those for 1995-1996 to the former Federal Republic and the whole of Berlin.

b) The total of sanctions does not match table 3.B.1.1 because in some cases, more than one sanction per person / conviction is possible.

Greece: Figures given in table 3.B.3.8. ("Theft of motor vehicle") relate to the illegal "use" of a car (i.e. without the intent to keep) contrary to table 1.B.1.9 (police statistics).

Sweden: Suspended sentences include the suspension of proceedings under certain conditions.

Switzerland: Persons under 18 years of age are not included.

United Kingdom:

England & Wales: Totals do not match table 3.B.1.1 because of delays between conviction (guilty verdict) and sentencing.

Scotland: Non-custodial sanctions and measures include *Insane & Hospital Orders*, Community Service Orders, Probation, Admonishment or Caution, and Absolute Discharge.

3.B.4 Unsuspended custodial sanctions imposed in 1995

	total unsuspended custodial sanctions in this table (absolute numbers) 2322HOTT	of which % under 6 months	of which % 6 and less than 12 months P322HOTB	of which % <u>Subtotal</u> : under 12 months P322HQT1	of which % 12 and less than 24 months	of which % 24 and less than 60 months P322HOTD	of which % <u>Subtotal:</u> 12 and less than 60 months P322HOTS	of which % 60 and less than 120 months	of which % 120 months and <u>over</u> P322HOTF	of which % Subtotal: 60 months and over	average length in months 2322HOTG	life (absolute numbers)	indeter- minate (absolute numbers) 2322HOTI
Albania	298			11		·	20			64	ļ		14
Austria*	73	0	0	0			4		•••	62		1	14
Belgium			* 1 =						**				
Bulgaria*	227	0	1	1	15	15	30	22	47	68	···. 114	0	
Croatia	122	1	20	21	16	20	36	34	8	43			***
Cyprus*	0		***									0	
Czech Republic	134		* * *	1			14			85		0	0
Denmark	32	0	0	0	3	6	9	59	31	91		0	
Estonia*	182		•••	0			21	52	27	79	94	0	• •
Finland							144	+ 4 5					••
France*	710	0	1	t I			13	30	53	83	128	23	
Germany*	784	0	2	2	1	30	31	30	11	41		100	105
Greece*	77	4	1	5			18			51	}	19	105
Hungary	264	0	2	2	6	27	33	38	26	63	95	7	'
Ireland								+11					
Italy	720	0	0	0	4	17	21	22	52	 74		 39	4 5 1
Latvia*	171			0			29			71	84		
Lithuania*			••••				411	* * * *					•••

Table 3.B.4.1 INTENTIONAL HOMICIDE: TOTAL (Unsuspended custodial sanctions)

	total	of	oſ	of which	of which	qf	of which	of which	oſ	of which	average	life	indeter-
	unsuspended	which	which	%	%	which	%	%	which	%	length	(absolute	minate
	custodial		%	Subtotal:	12 and	%	<u>Subtotal</u> :	60 and	%	Subtotal:	іп	numbers)	(absolute
	sanctions	under 6	6 and	under 12	less	24 and	12 and	less than	120	60	months		numbers)
	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months			
	(absolute		than 12		months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	numbers)		months		ļ	months	months		over				
Luxembourg	•••											•••	
Malta												* * 4	• • •
Moldova			•••										• •
Netherlands			• • •										
Norway	31	0	0	0	13	10	23	45	32	77	110		
Poland	589				4	24	28	39	33	72	·		
Portugal	259	0	1	1	5	25	31	20	48	68	115		0
Romania*											144		
Russia	17899		0		1	20	21	61	17	79	89		4
Stovenía	31	0	3	3	0	58	58	29	10	39		0	Û
Spain				,,,					•••				• • •
Sweden*	119	0	0	0	6	28	34	29	1	30	76	13	30
Switzerland*	69	0	1	1	0	20	20	30	20	51	98	2	17
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100		•••	
Turkey											{	•••	,
United Kingdom: England & Wales	436	0	2	2	4	22	26	16	4	21	68	222	
Northern Ireland									- • •				
Scotland	120	0	I	1	2	14	16	36	9	45	77	41	5

			`	<u> </u>			<i></i>						
	tota!	٦٥	of	of which	of which	ło	of which	of which	of	of which	average	life	indeter-
	unsuspended	which	which	%	%	which	%	%	which	%	length	(absolute	minate
	custodial	%	%	Subtotal:	12 and	%	Subtotal:	60 and	%	Subtotal:	in	numbers)	(absolute
	sanctions	under 6	6 and	under 12	less	24 and	12 and	less than	120	60	months		numbers
	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months			
	(absolute		than 12		months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	numbers)		months			months	months		over				
	Z322HOCT	P322HÓCA	P322HOCB	P322HOCI	P322HÖCC	P322HOCD	P322HOC5	P322HOCE	P322HOCF	P322HOC6	2322HOCG	Z322HOCH	Z322HOCI
Albania											, , .	,	
Austria*	51	0	0	0			6		** -	61		10	7
Belgium		•••				• • •							
Bulgaria*	189	0	2	2	14	13	28	16	54	71	123	0	
Croatia													
Cyprus*	0											0	
Czech Republic						•••							
Denmark	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	36	100		0	
Estonia*	168			0			15	55	30	85	98	0	
Finland												•••	
France*												•••	
Germany*	.,.											- * *	
Greece*	60	3	2	5			10			53		19	0
Hungary	203	0	1	1	5	18	23	40	32	72	105	7	
Ireland							•••						
Italy		•••											
Latvia*												•••	
Lithuania*									,			* 1 \$	

Table 3.B.4.2 INTENTIONAL HOMICIDE: COMPLETED (Unsuspended custodial sanctions)

	total unsuspended	of which	of which	of which %	of which %	of which	of which %	of which %	of which	of which %	average length	life (absolute	indeter- minate
	custodial	witten %	which %	Subtotal:	70 12 and	%	Zubtotal:	60 and	winen %	Subtotal:	in	numbers)	(absolute
	sanctions	under 6	6 and	under 12	less	24 and	12 and	less than	120	60	months	democro)	numbers)
	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months			
	(absolute		than 12		months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	numbers)		months			months	months		over		ļ		
Luxembourg			•••										
Maita		,											
Moldova									•••			•••	* * *
Netherlands	,]								···
Norway				,.,									+
Poland						• • -							
Portugal	170	0	0	0	2	13	15	16	69	85	145		· ,
Romania*									* * *		160		
Russia	17208		0		1	20	21	62	17	79	91		
Slovenia												F # *	- + +
Spain													
- Sweden*												- * *	
Switzerland*	39	0	3	3	0	13	13	36	28	64	109	2	6
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia									► + I				
Turkey													*1.
United Kingdom: England & Wales	393	0	2	2	5	24	28	13	1	15	58	216	* - 4
Northern Ireland													
Scotland	82	0	1	1	0	15	15	27	2	29	69	40	5

Table 3.B.4.3 ASSAULT	(Unsuspended	custodial	sanctions)
-----------------------	--------------	-----------	------------

	total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which % under 6	of which % 6 and	of which % <u>Subtotal</u> : under 12	of which % 12 and less	of which % 24 and	of which % <u>Subtotal</u> : 12 and	of which % 60 and less than	of which % 120	of which % <u>Subtotal</u> : 60	average length in months	life (absolute numbers)	indeter- minate (absolute numbers)
	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months			
	(absolute		than 12		months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	numbers)		months	- D260 / 01	Dankog	months	months	D220405	over	77772	2202400	7288.011	
	Z322AST	P322ASA	P322ASB	P322AS1	P322ASC	P322ASD	P322AS5	P322ASE	P322ASF	P322AS6	Z322ASG	Z322ASH	Z322ASI
Albania	197			52			44			4		0	0
Austria*	693	78	11	89		•••	8			1		0	12
Belgium		•••				• • •		,	• • •				*
Bulgaria*												•••	
Croatia	81	59	23	83	6	5	11	6	0	6			
Cyprus*	12	75				• • •			** 1	0	13	0	**-
Czech Republic	315			36		• • •	51		***	13	,	0	0
Denmark	2395	93	5	98	2	1	2	0	0	0		0	· • •
Estonia*													••
Finland											1	• - *	• •
France*	7795	58	24	82			17	1	0	i	7	1	•••
Germany*	2397	16	40	56	20	17	37	2	0	2		0	112
Greece*	2205	89	6	95		•••	5			0		0	L
Hungary	677	22	32	54	22	21	43	3	0	3	20	0	
Ireland				.,.								• • •	* * *
Italy	2407	81	11	92	6	2	8	0	0	0		0	
Latvia*	234			1			70			29	50		
Lithuania*													

	total	of	of	of which	of which	of	of which	of which	of	of which	average	life	indeter-
	unsuspended	which	which	%	%	which	%	%	which	%	length	(absolute	minate
	custodial	%	%	Subtotal:	12 and	%	Subtotal:	60 and	%	Subtotal:	in	numbers)	(absolute
	sanctions	under 6	6 and	under 12	less	24 and	12 and	less than	120	60	months		numbers)
	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months			
	(absolute		than 12		months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	numbers)		months			months	months		over				
Luxembourg			•••			•••						•••	• •
Malta	•••								* * 1	,		•••	• - •
Moldova					l								
Netherlands									•••				
Norway												- • •	
Poland	812	2	30	32	54	13	67	1	0	1 I			
Portugal	188	11	42	53	27	17	44	2	2	3	18		0
Romania*											27		•.
Russia	31088		7		13	44	57	35	2	36	53	• • •	* 1 •
Siovenia	28	54	29	82	11	7	18	0	0	0		0	0
Spain													
Sweden*	2586	71	12	83	12	2	14	0	0	0	5		74
Switzerland*	152	59	9	68	5	п	16	1	0	1	15	0	23
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	176	88	12	99	1	0	1	0	0	0			• •
Turkey					į		· · ·						
United Kingdom: England & Wales	7335	45	20	65	18	15	33	2	0	2	15	13	
Northern Ireland				,					* * *				
Scotland	1716	58	20	78	9	9	18	4	0	4	10	0	0

Table 3.B.4.4 RAPE (Unsuspended custodial sanctions)

	total	of	٥ſ	of which	of which	lo	of which	of which	of	of which	average	life	indeter-
	unsuspended	which	which	%	%	which	%	%	which	%	length	(absolute	minate
	custodial	%	%	Subtotal:	12 and	%	Subtotal:	60 and	%	Subtotal:	in	numbers)	(absolute
	sanctions	under 6	6 and	under 12	less	24 and	12 and	less than	120	60	months		numbers)
	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months			
	(absolute		than 12		months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	numbers)	P322RAA	months P322RAB	1222D 4 1	P322RAC	months P322RAD	months P322RA5	P322RAE	over P322RAF	P322RA6	Z322RAG	Z322RAH	Z322RAI
	Z322RAT	P322KAA	P322KAB	P322RA1	P322RAC	P322RAD		P344KAE	PJZZKAF		Z3ZZRAG		
Albania	40		•••	30			43	,		28		0	0
Austria*	75	0	8	8		•••	68		••	15		0	7
Belgium												• • •	••
Bulgaria*												•••	
Croatia	18		22	22	44	28	72	6	0	6			
Cyprus*	0											0	
Czech Republic	118			4			75			20		0	0
Denmark	46	17	33	50	35	15	50	0	0	0		0	- • •
Estonia*												• • •	•••
Finland						• • •							- • •
France*	1154	0	2	2	,		14	36	48	83	110	4	
Germany*	643	0	2	2	10	63	74	19	Į	19		0	33
Greece*	35	11	6	17			40		• - •	37		1	1
Hungary	190	0	4	4	20	55	75	21	1	21	47	0	• • •
Ireland									•••				
Italy	993	5	18	23	50	23	73	3	0	4		0	
Latvia*	54			0			43			57	66		
Lithuania*													.,

	total	oľ	of	of which %	of which %	of which	of which %	of which %	of which	of which %	average	life (abarluta	indeter-
	unsuspended	which %	which %	5ubtotal:	12 and	which %	⁷⁰ Subtotal:	60 and	witten %	Subtotal:	length iл	(absolute numbers)	minate (absolute
	custodial sanctions	under 6	5 and	under 12	less	-70 24 and	12 and	less than	120	<u>54010141</u> .	months	aunitoera)	(ausointe numbers)
	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months	montus		numbersy
	(absolute	Inon(iis	than 12	montas	months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	(absolute numbers)	1	months			months	months	montus	over				
Luxembourg	indiaiders)		montils			interior	invitus						
Malta													
Moldova											,	• • -	
Netherlands												•••	
Norway	30	10	17	27	53	17	70	3	0	3	34		* * *
Poland	650	0	I,		44	50	94	5	0	5			
Portugal	96	0	0	0	8	35	44	43	14	56	71		
Romania*											70		
Russia	9001				3	49	52	45		47	63		••
Slovenia	21	5	24	29	33	38	71	0	0	0			0
	21		24	29	33	38		0	v	0	····	0	U
Spain			•••										
Sweden*	124	2	6	8	29	49	78	2	0	2	30		15
Switzerland*	50	2	4	6	10	54	64	14	2	16	44	0	7
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	23	22	26	48	13	39	52	0	0	0		•••	* 4.1
Turkey				·		- * *			•••				
United Kingdom: England & Wales	494	0	1	1	3	32	36	53	7	60	78	13	
Northern Ireland						•••							
Scotland	31	0	0	0	0	32	32	65	3	68	71	0	0

Table 3.B.4.5 ROBBERY: TOTAL (Unsuspended custodial sanctions)

	total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which % under 6	of which % 6 and	of which % <u>Subtotal</u> : under 12	of which % 12 and less	of which % 24 and	of which % <u>Subtotal</u> : 12 and	of whicb % 60 and less than	of which % 120	of which % <u>Subtotal</u> : 60	average lengtb in months	life (absolute numbers)	indeter- minate (absolute numbers)
	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months			
	(absolute		than 12		months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	Z322ROTT	P322ROTA	months P322ROTB	P322ROT1	P322ROTC	P322ROTD	P322ROT5	P322ROTE	OVER P322ROTF	P322R0T6	ZJ22ROTG	2322ROTH	ZJ22ROTI
Albania								•,•					
Austria*	250	3	12	15			61		***	19		0	12
Belgium			***		•••			•••				•	•••
Bulgerie*								,	* * *			** *	•••
Croatia	69	17	29	46	33	20	54	0	0	0			• • •
Cyprus*	6	0	***							33	52	0	
Czech Republic	816		- + 1	4			80	•••		16		0	0
Denmark	409	23	29	53	31	16	47	1	0	1		0	
Estonia*													
Finland			•									* • •	
France*	4063	30	28	58			31	7	4	11	21	5	
Germany*	3131	0	11	11	25	47	72	14	I	15		0	61
Greece*	154	1	t	3			58			29		1	15
Hungary	1166	1	4	5	24	59	83	12	0	12	40	0	
Ireland												(17	
Italy	5652	4	17	21	53	24	76	3	0	3		0	
Latvia*	317			2			52			46	78		
Lithuania*												***	

	total	of	of	of which	of which	of	of which	of which	of	of which	average	tife	indeter-
	unsuspended	which	which	%	%	which	%	%	which	%	length	(absolute	minate
	custodial	%	%	Subtotal:	12 and	%	Subtotal:	60 and	%	Subtotal:	in	numbers)	(absolute
	sanctions	under 6	6 and	under 12	less	24 and	12 and	less than	120	60	months		numbers)
	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months			
	(absolute		than 12		months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	numbers)		months			months	months		over				
Luxembourg									•••			• •	
Malta	,					•••		•••	* -				.,
Moldova						•••							- • •
Netherlands						•••							
Norway	123	15	18	33	67	0	67	0	0	0	28		
Poland	4296		0	0	19	74	94	6	0	6			* *
Portugal	1067	1	1	2	20	45	64	26	7	34	55		
Romania*			.,.						• • •		47		
Russia	45474		4		9	55	64	31	1	32	52		
Slovenia	28	0	43	43	39	14	54	4	0	4		0	0
Spain			• • •			,,,						***	
Sweden*	338	16	9	25	44	26	70	2	0	2	23		10
Switzerland*	165	12	11	22	8	32	40	4	l	5	28	0	54
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	47	2	26	28	38	32	70	2	0	2			
Turkey						***						••	
United Kingdom: England & Wales	3259	12	11	23	22	41	62	13	2	15	38	2	
Northern Ireland													
Scotland	433	16	17	33	15	24	39	24	3	28	35	0	0

	total unsuspended custodial sanctions in this table (absolute numbers) Z322TRTT	of which % under 6 months P322THTA	of which % 6 and less than 12 months P322THTB	of which % <u>Subtotal</u> : under 12 months	of which % 12 and less than 24 months P322THTC	of which % 24 and less than 60 months P322THTD	of which % Subtotal: 12 and less than 60 months P322THT5	of which % 60 and less than 120 months	of which % t20 months and over	of which % Subtotal: 60 months and over	average iength in months Z322THTG	life (absolute numbers) Z322THTH	indeter- minate (absolute numbers)
Albania	983			87			13			ĺ			
Austria*	1708	39	32	71			27			0		0	20
Belgium						• • •			* * *				
Bulgeria*													
Croatia	516	40	25	65	25	10	35		• • •			· * *	•••
Cyprus*	18	89			,			•••	,	0	3	0	
Czech Republic	5063			71		* * *	28		,.,	1		0	0
Denmark	3084	88	10	98	2	0	2	0	0	0		0	
Estonia*												* * *	
Finland			•••									•••	
France*	30754	59	26	85			14	0	0	0	6	2	
Germany*	12862	26	40	66	23	11	34	0	0	0		0	38
Greece*	2083	43	21	64	,	• • •	29			4		0	81
Hungary	4946	38	32	70	23	7	30	0	0	0	12	0	
Ireland						* 1 4						• • •	
Italy	22976	76	20	96	4	0	4	0	0	0		0	
Latvia*	1498			8			82		- * *	9	37		- • •
Lithuania*						•••						- • •	

Table 3.B.4.6 THEFT: TOTAL (Unsuspended custodial sanctions)

	total	of	of	of which	of which	of	of which	of which	of	of which	average	life	indeter-
	unsuspended	which	which	%	%	which	%e	%	which	%	length	(absolute	minate
	custodial	%	%	Subtote]:	12 and	%	<u>Subtotal</u> :	60 and	0/0	Subtotal:	in	numbers)	(absolute
	sanctions	under 6	6 and	under 12	less	24 and	12 and	less than	120	60	months		numbers)
1	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months			
	(absolute		than 12		months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	numbers)	<u> </u>	months		<u> </u>	months	months		over	<u> </u>			
Luxembourg									• • •	•••			
Malta							.,.		• • •				
Moldova												• • •	* - *
Netherlands						-17					1	• - •	
Norway	2111	66	27	93	7	0	7	0	0	0	20		- ()
Poland	2560	5	28	33	63	5	67	0				•••	<i></i>
Portugal	2928	5	11	16	44	28	72	10	1	11	29	• • •	3
Romania*											20	• • •	
Russia	157262		7		35	56	90	3			30		
Slovenia	190	46	27	73	16	10	26	1	0	1		0	0
Spain			**1										
Sweden*	3201	63	26	89	8	1	9	0	0	0	5	•••	66
Switzerland*	1931	66	9	76	5	4	9	0	0	0	5	0	295
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	471	77	18	95	3	2	5	0	0	0			
Turkey									• • • •				
United Kingdom: England & Wales	25354	61	18	79	16	5	21	0	0	0	9	1	
Northern Ireland													
Scotland	6044	70	24	94	4	2	6	0	0	0	5	0	0

	total unsuspended custodial sanctions in this table (absolute numbers) Z3228UIT	of which % under 6 months	of which % 6 and less than 12 months P322BUTB	of which % <u>Subtotal</u> : under 12 months	of which % 12 and less than 24 months P322BUTC	of which % 24 and less than 60 months P322BUTD	of which % Subtotai: 12 and less than 60 months P322BUTS	of which % 60 and less than 120 months P322BUTE	of which % 120 months and over P322BUTF	of which % Subtotal: 60 months and over Pi22BUT6	average length in months	life (absolute numbers) Z322BUTH	indeter- minste (absolute numbers)
Albania													
Austria*	700	23	48	71		•••	28		* • •	0		0	9
Belgium													
Bulgaria*								· · ·					
Croatia			···			•••							•••
Cyprus*	46	24					,		- + 4	0	9	Û	- * -
Czech Republic			***										
Denmark	1452	83	14	97	2	1	3	0	0	0		0	
Estonia*													
Finland									* * 4				
France*													
Germany*	5846	7	43	49	34	16	50	0	0	0		0	21
Greece*													
Hungary												4	
Ireland								,					
Italy			•••										
Latvie*													
Lithuanie*												•••	

Table 3.B.4.7 BURGLARY: TOTAL (Unsuspended custodial sanctions)

	total	of	of	of which	of which	oſ	of which	of which	of	of which	average	life	indeter-
	unsuspended	which	which	%	%	which	%	%	which	%	length	(absolute	minate
	custodial	%	%	Subtotal:	12 and	%	Subtotal:	60 and	%	Subtotal:	in	numbers)	(absolute
	sanctions	under 6	6 and	under 12	less	24 and	12 and	less than	120	60	months		numbers)
	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months			
	(absolute		than 12		months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	numbers)		months			months	months		over				
Luxembourg								•••	- , .				
Malta						•••		•••	• • •				• •
Moldova				,		•••			••				
Netherlands				0		•••						•••	
Norway	1435	58	33	91	9	0	9	0	0	0	9		
Poland	11932		3	3	77	20	97	0	0	0	{	.,	
Portugal										·			
Romania*												,	
Russia													
Slovenia	106	31	35	66	23	10	33	1	0	1		0	0
Spain													
Sweden*						• • •							
Switzerland*										,		***	- • •
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	561	42	34	76	18	6	24	0	0	0			
Turkey									•••				
United Kingdom: England & Wales	13443	46	23	68	24	8	31	0	0	0	12	1	
Northern Ireland				0									
Scotland	1961	61	28	89	7	5	11	0	0	0	6	0	0

	total unsuspended custodial sanctions in this table (absolute numbers) Z322DOTT	of which % under 6 months	of which % 6 and less than 12 months P322D078	of which % Subtotal: under 12 months	of which % 12 and less than 24 months	of which % 24 and less than 60 months	of which % Subtotal: 12 and less than 60 months P322D0T5	of which % 60 and less than 120 months	of which % 120 months and over	of which % Subtotal: 60 months and over P322D0T6	average length in months	Jife (absolute numbers)	indeter- minate (absolute numbers) 2322D071
Albania													
Austria*	1008	23	25	48			51			1		0	1
Belgium													
Bulgaria*													.,
Croatia	65	26	23	49	34	17	51	0	0	0		**	
Cyprus*	26	58	•••			•••				4	12	0	
Czech Republic	57			40			58			2		0	0
Denmark	858	70	9	79	8	10	18	3	0	3		0	
Estonia*	4		•••	100			0	0	0	0	8		
Finland	,		***						** 1			•	۰.
France*	10725	30	20	50			43	6	0	7	18	0	
Germany*	5722	11	22	33	23	38	61	5	E	5		0	6
Greece*	1223	40	12	51			35			12		11	1
Hungary	48	0	6	6	23	58	81	10	2	13	42	0	
Ireland													
Italy	16352	23	35	58	24	12	36	6	1	6		0	
Latvia*	51			29			63			8	28		*
Lithuania*						.,							

Table 3.B.4.8 DRUG OFFENCES: TOTAL (Unsuspended custodial sanctions)

	total	oľ	lo	of which	of which	of	of which	of which	of	of which	average	life	indeter-
	unsuspended	which	which	%	%	which	%	№	which	%	length	(absolute	minate
	custodial	%	%	<u>Subtotal</u> :	12 and	%	Subtotal:	60 and	%	Subtotal:	in	numbers)	(absolute
	sanctions	under 6	6 and	under 12	less	24 and	12 and	less than	120	60	months		numbers)
	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months			
	(absolute		than 12		months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	numbers)		months			months	months		over				
Luxembourg						• • •	« » *		•-			••	••
Malta												,	
Moldova									4 + -	•••		** *	
Netherlands									•••				
Norway	1011	67	9	76	15	5	20	3	1	4	53		* 1
Poland	100	11	21	32	56	12	68	0	0	0			- • •
Portugal	1455	5	3	8	20	26	46	42	4	46	53		1
Romania*						•••			• • •		50		•
Russia	14903		39		31	24	56	5	0	5	20	· · ·	- + 1
Slovenia	21	19	24	43	33	24	57	0	0	0		0	0
Spein													
Sweden*	1311	48	17	66	12	13	25	5	0	5	16		59
Switzerland*	1894	38	6	44	7	21	28	3	0	3	17	0	473
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	74	38	8	46	23	31	54	0	0	0			
Turkey												1 6 4	
United Kingdom: England & Wales	5270	24	19	43	21	26	48	8	2	9	28	0	
Northern Ireland													
Scotiand	709	30	21	52	16	22	38	9	1	10	20	0	0

	total unsuspended custodial sanctions in this table (absolute numbers) Z322DTTT	of which % under 6 months	of which % 6 and less than 12 months P322DTTB	of which % Subtotal: under 12 months	of which % 12 and less than 24 months	of which % 24 and less than 60 months P322DTD	of which % Subtotal: 12 and less than 60 months P322DTTS	of which % 60 and less than 120 months	of which % 120 months and over P322DTTF	of which % Subtotal: 60 months and over	average iength in months Z322DTTG	life (absolute numbers) Z322DTTH	indeter- minate (absolute numbers) 2322DTTI
Albania													
Austria*													
Belgium									• • •			- • •	
Bulgaria*	8	0	13	13	75	13	88	0	0	0	24		
Croatia				,			•••				• • • •	••	
Сургиз*					,	***						- • •	
Czech Republic	50			34		•••	64			2		0	0
Denmark			* * *	**1		* • -							
Estonia*	1			100			0	0	0	0	8		
Finland													
France*	5074	19	20	39			53	8	ł	8	22	0	
Germany*												***	
Greece*	472	10	6	15			55			28		8	I
Hungary												-	
Ireland								1	4.4.4				**
Italy	**1			•••		•••						* • • •	
Latvia*												•••	••
						• • •	,		• • •				*
Líthuania*													

Table 3.B.4.9 DRUG TRAFFICKING: TOTAL (Unsuspended custodial sanctions)

	total	of	of	of which	of which	of	of which	of which	of	of which	average	lìfe	indeter-
	unsuspended	which	which	%	%	which	%	%	which	%	length	(absolute	minate
	custodial	%	%	Subtotal:	12 and	%	Subtotal:	60 and	%	Subtotal:	in	numbers)	(absolute
	sanctions	under 6	6 and	under 12	less	24 and	12 and	iess than	120	60	months		numbers)
	in this table	months	less	months	than 24	less	less than	120	months	months			
	(absolute		than 12		months	than 60	60	months	and	and over			
	numbers)	L	months			months	months		очег				
Luxembourg								•••			- 7 -		
Malte						•••							• • •
Moldova						,							••
Netherlands													
Norway	920	64	10	73	17	5	22	4	1	5	48		** -
Poland	17	6	18	24	65	12	76	0					
Portugal	1006	0	1	1	11	24	35	58	6	63	67		1
Romania*											50		
Russia													
Slovenia	20	15	25	40	35	25	60	0	0	0		0	0
Spain				,									
Sweden*								,	• • •				
Switzerland*	637	28	5	33	9	43	52	7	0	7	26	0	49
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia													
Turkey													÷ - 1
United Kingdom: England & Wales	4599	18	20	37	23	29	52	9	2		31	0	• •
Northern Ireland													* .
Scotland	570	18	24	42	19	26	46	11	1	12	24	0	0

Notes on tables 3.B.4.1 to 3.B.4.9

Austria: The figures given for indeterminate prison sentences contain combinations of fixed prison sentences and indeterminate sentences (either suspended or unsuspended); They also contain conditional sentences, which are indeterminate by their very nature.

Bulgaria: Figures relate to 1996.

Cyprus: Other length = 6 to 60 months (not included in these tables).

Estonia: Under 12 months = 3 months and less than 12 months. 60 and less than 120 months = over 60 months until 120 months (incl.). 120 months and over = over 120 months.

France: Figures relate to 1996.

Germany: Figures relate to sentences of more than 6 months and up to 12 months. The category "indeterminate sanctions/measures" refers to specific measures which are ordered either in addition to a prison sentence or instead of a prison sentence (Maßregeln der Sicherung und Besserung; Sicherheitsverwahrung und Unterbringung in einem psychiatrischen Krankenhaus). For this reason some double-counting may have occurred.

Greece: 60 months and over = 60 months and less than 240 months.

Latvia: 60 months and over = 5 to 15 years.

Lithuania: 120 months and over = 12 to 20 years. Other length = 96 to 120 months (not included in these tables). No figures available for 24 to 96 months.

Romania: Other length = 12 to 120 months (not included in these tables).

Sweden: The brackets are 25-60 months, 61-120 months, 121 and over.

Switzerland: Persons under 18 years of age are not included.

3.C TECHNICAL INFORMATION ON CHAPTER 3

The totals given in tables 3.B.3.1-3.B.3.12 do not always match the totals indicated in tables 3.B.4.1-3.B.4.9. As a rule, the Group agreed to only include differences of up to 10%.

3.C.0 Technical comments

1) What is recorded?

Conviction statistics usually contain decisions taken by the courts, or, as is the case in a minority of countries, by public prosecutors where defendants have accepted their guilt (e.g. German "Strafbefehl"). This type of decision comes close to the "guilty plea" in the American system. Such decisions are counted as convictions and are thus included in the conviction tables. This was the case in Denmark, Finland, Germany, Norway, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey. No country considers sanctions imposed by the police or an administrative authority as convictions, at least not in connection with the categories of offences dealt with in the conviction tables.

2) Differences between Chapters 1 and 3 with regard to offence definitions

The offence definitions, which underlie Chapter 1 reflect the definitions which are used in national police statistics. They are usually inspired by a criminological point of view, i.e. they are based on concepts which come close to the everyday life experience of police officers and the public, such as "burglary", "armed robbery", or "motor vehicle theft".

As regards *convictions*, the offence definitions used by the various countries obviously depend on their respective legal traditions and criminal codes. For this reason, "burglary" or "motor vehicle" theft may be punishable as "theft" in many countries, and thus appear in the conviction statistics under the heading "theft", only because "burglary" or "motor vehicle theft" do not exist as specific legal concepts. Along the same lines, "assault leading to death" may, depending on the offender's intent, be counted as "assault" rather than as "homicide" (unlike in Chapter 1).

For these specific reasons (i.e. the non-existence of certain legal concepts in certain countries), several countries were not in a position to provide figures for all the tables/items in Chapter 3.

The following comments highlight specific differences between the *legal definitions* used in Chapter 3 and those used in police statistics (Chapter 1).

- Albania: Rape includes sexual intercourse with minors even without force.

- Deumark: Robbery does not include muggings (bag snatching) which is considered as theft. The figures also reflect acquittals.

- Estonia: In table 3.B.4.5 robbery does not include theft with minor violence or minor threats. In table 3.B.4.6 figures do not reflect the temporary use of a motor vehicle without authorisation.

- France: The definition of assault is broader than the one used in Chapter 1.

- Greece: Figures given in table 3.B.3.8. (Theft of motor vehicle) relate to the illegal "use" of a car (i.e. without the intent to keep) contrary to table 1.B.2.18 (police statistics).

- Germany: The figures given for burglary refer to "aggravated theft". Armed robbery includes other forms of dangerous robbery, such as gang robbery.

- Portugal: Mugging ("bag-snatching") is not in all cases considered as robbery.

- Switzerland: Robbery does not include mugging ("bag-snatching").

- England & Wales: Drug offences include simple possession, cultivation and transportation of drugs, which are excluded from the police statistics.

3.C.1 Data recording methods in connection with tables 3.B.1.1 -3.B.1.12 and 3.B.2.1 - 3.B.2.3

3.B.2.1 - 3.	B.2.3					
Question	Do the offence definitions used in this table differ from those in the "definitions" section?	Are there written rules regulating the way in which the data shown in this table are collected?	At what stage of the process does the data refer to?	ls a principal offence rulc applied?	How are multiple offences counted?	How is a person counted who is dealt with for more than one offence in the same year?
Possible answers	I: Yes 2: No	1: Yes 2: No	I: Before appeals 2: After appeals	1: Yes 2: No 3: Uncertain	1: As one offence 2: As two or more offences 3: Uncertain	1: As one person 2: As two or more persons
	CT312AA	CT312B	CT312C	CT312DA	CT312E	CT312F
Albania Austria Belgium* Bulgaria Croatia Cyprus Czech Republic Denmark Estonia Finland France* Germany Greece Hungary Ireiand Italy* Latvia Lithuania* Luxembourg Malta Moldova Netherlands Norway Poland Portugal Romania* Russia Slovenia Spain Sweden* Switzerland The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	$ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\$		2 2 2 2 2 1 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	I I 2 * I I I I I I I I I I I I I	$ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\$	
Turkey <i>United Kingdom:</i> England & Wales Northern Ireland Scotland	2 1 2 2	2 1 1 1	1 1 1 2	1	1 1 1 1	2 2 2 2

 Table 3.C.1.1
 Description of data recording methods in connection with tables 3.B.1.1 -3.B.1.12 and 3.B.2.1 - 3.B.2.3

* See notes on table 3.C.I.I

Notes on table 3.C.1.1

Belgium: Reorganisation of data collection (new body created) in 1993.

France: Following changes of data collection procedures beginning in 1993, convictions of minors are undercounted, especially in relation to theft and assault.

Lithuania: Offence definitions changed in 1994 (effective as of January 1st, 1995).

Romania: Unspecified changes in data collection procedures.

Sweden: Production of statistics moved in 1995 from Statistics Sweden to the National Crime Prevention Council.

3.C.2 Age brackets and definition of aliens used in tables 3.B.2.2 and 3.B.2.3

3.C.2.1 Age brackets used in table 3.B.2.2

All countries count minors as persons who are not yet 18 years old. The only exception is Austria which included 18 years old.

The lower age limit varies widely among countries as far as criminal responsibility is concerned. Persons below the age of criminal responsibility will not be convicted and therefore not counted in conviction statistics (whatever "civil" or administrative treatment or sanction they will actually receive). This was not necessarily the case for police statistics where persons below the age of criminal responsibility were sometimes included (for details see table 1.C.2.2).

For the offences considered here, the following age limits were indicated.

Table 3.C.1.2	Minimum age for consideration in conviction statistics in 1995
Albania	14
Austria	14
Belgium	16
Bulgaria	14
Croatia	14
Cyprus	7
Czech Republic	15
Denmark	15
Estonia	13
Finland	15
France	13
Germany	14
Greece	13
Hungary	14
freland	7
Italy	14
Latvia	14
Lithuania	14
Luxembourg	14
Moldova	14
Netherlands	12
Norway	15
Poland	13
Portugal	16
Romania	14
Russia	14
Slovenia	14
Spain	12
Sweden	15
Switzerland	18
Turkey	11
United Kingdom:	
England & Wales Northern Ireland	10 10
Northern Ireland	10

3.C.2.2. Definition of aliens: See paragraph 1.C.2.3.

Scotland

8

3.C.3 General remarks on tables 3.B.3.1 - 3.B.3.12 and 3.B.4.1 - 3.B.4.9

In some countries, totals did not match with totals in table 3.B.1.1 due to delays between conviction (guilty verdict) and sentencing, differences in recording, or convictions without imposing of a sanction or measure.

3.C.3.1 Non-custodial sanctions and measures

Concerning non-custodial sanctions and measures, figures for most countries include

- community service orders
- probation orders
- non-custodial measures according to juvenile (criminal) law
- suspension of proceedings under certain conditions after a conviction

The exceptions are presented in the following table.

Table 3.C.3.1 Non-custodial sanctions and measures in 1995

	community service orders	probation orders	non-custodial measures according to juvenile (criminal) law	suspension of proceedings under certain conditions after a conviction
	D321NCCS	D32INCPO	D321NCJL	D321NCSP
Austria	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	
Belgium	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
Bulgaria			Excluded	+24
Croatia	+47			•••
Cyprus				***
Czech Republic	Excluded			
Denmark	Excluded		Excluded	
Estonia	Excluded	Excluded		
Finland		Excluded	Excluded	
France				
Germany	Excluded	Excluded		Excluded
Greece	Excluded	Excluded		
Hungary				4 84
treland	-**	***	***	***
Italy	***		***	
Latvia	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
Malta		•••	***	+ 4 4
Netherlands	~**		***	+=+
Norway		Excluded	Excluded	
Poland			Excluded	
Portugal				
Romania	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
Russia	•••	484		
Switzerland	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
Turkey	Excluded	Excluded		

3.C.3.2 Suspended custodial sanctions and measures

Concerning suspended custodial sanctions and measures, figures for most countries include

- suspended prison sentences connected with supervision / probation

- suspended custodial measures according to juvenile (criminal) law

and *exclude*

- partially suspended custodial sentences

The exceptions are presented in the following table.

Table 3.C.3.2 Suspended custodial sanctions and measures in 1995

	suspended prison sentences connected with supervision / probation	suspended custodial measures according to juvenile (criminal) law	partially suspended custodial sentences
	D321SCSS	D321SCJL	D321SCPS
Belgium		Excluded	
Croatia			- • *
Cyprus			
Denmark		Excluded	
Finland		Excluded	
Greece	Excluded		
Hungary		***	
Ireland	-	***	***
italy			***
Latvia	Excluded	Excluded	
Lithuania			Included
Malta	* * *	***	
Netherlands	***	***	***
Norway		Excluded	
Poland		Excluded	
Portugal			
Romania	Excluded		
Slovenia		Excluded	
Spain			
Sweden ²⁵	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
Switzerland	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia		Excluded	Included
Turkey	Excluded	Excluded	
United Kingdom:			
Northern Ireland	Excluded		
Scotland	715		

²⁵Sweden: However, conditional sentences ("villkorlig dom") are included here.

3.C.3.3 Unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures

Concerning unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures, figures for most countries include

- unsuspended custodial sentences according to juvenile (criminal) law
- treatment in a custodial setting (e.g. psychiatric / drug treatment)
- ~ partially suspended custodial sentences

The exceptions are presented in the following table.

	unsuspended custodial sentences according to juvenile (criminal) law	treatment in a custodial setting (e.g. psychiatric / drug treatment)	partially suspended custodial sentences
	D321UCJL	D321UCTC	D321UCPS
Belgium	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
Bulgaria			- * *
Croatia			
Cyprus			***
Denmark	Excluded	Excluded	
Estonía		Excluded	
Finland	Excluded		Excluded
France		Excluded	
Germany		Excluded	Excinded
Hungary		***	***
Ireland	** *	-*-	***
Italy	+#-		
Latvia		Excluded	Excluded
Lithuania		Excluded	
Malta	***		
Moldova			Excluded
Netherlands	*-	***	
Norway	Excluded	Excluded	
Poland	*84	484	•••
Portugal	+ 4 +		***
Romania		Excluded	
Russia		171	***
Slovenia			Excluded
Sweden			Excluded
Switzerland	Excluded		Excluded
United Kingdom:			
England & Wales		Excluded	Excluded
Scotland	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded

Table 3.C.3.3 Unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures in 1995

3.C.4 Data recording methods in connection with tables 3.B.3.1 - 3.B.3.12 and 3.B.4.1 - 3.B.4.9

Table 3.C.4	Description of data recording methods in connection with tables 3.B.3.1 - 3.B.3.12 and 3.B.4.1 -
	3,8,4.9

Orientia	Do the	Are there	At what	ls a	Does this	lf yes, by	Is there a
Question	offence	written rules	stage of the	principal	table include	whom?	legai
	definitions	regulating	process does	sanction	sanctions or		concept of
	used in this	the way in	the data	rule	measures		suspended
	table differ	which the	refer to?	applied?	imposed by		custodial sentence in
	from those	data shown			other authorities		your
	in the "definitions	in this table are			than the		country?
	" section?	collected?			courts?		
Possible answers	1: Yes	1: Yes	I: Before	1: Yes	1: Yes	1:	1: Yes
i usaiote unavers	2: No	2: No	appeals	2: No	2: No	Prosecution	2: No
	3:		2: After			authorities	
	Uncertain	072210	appeals CT321C	CT312DA	CT321EA	2: Police CT321EB	CT321FA
	CT321AA	CT321B					1
Albania			2 2	1	2 2		1
Austria	1	1	<i>-</i>	· ·			
Belgium		•••		•••			1
Bulgaria	2	1	2	1	2		1
Croatia	2	1	2	1	2		l .
Cyprus	2	1	1	t	2		1
Czech Republic	2	1	2	1	2		1
Denmark	1	1	1	t	1	1	I
Estonia		1	2	1	2		I.
Finland	2		I	2	2		t
	1	1	2	1	2		1
France		T	2	-	2		1
Germany	1	1	2	1	2		1
Greece	2		2	2	2		1
Hungary	2		2	2		•••	
Ireland				•	2		1
Italy	2	1	2		2	•••	
Latvia	1	2	1	2	2		1
Lithuania	2	1		2	2		•
Luxembourg						***	***
Malta							
Moldova	2		2	2	2		l
Netherlands	2	1	1	I	2		1
Norway	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Poland	3		2	1	2		1
Portugal	1		1	1	2		1
Romania	2	1	2	1	2	•••	1
Russia	2	1	2	1	2		1
Slovenia	2	1	2	1	2		L L
Spain							•••
Sweden	2	1	1	1	1	1	2
Switzerland	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
The F.Y.R.O.Macedonia	2	1 1	2	1	2		1
	2	2	2	1	2		1
Turkey	l				J .		
United Kingdom:	2	[.	1	t	2		1
England & Wales		1	1		2		1
Northern Ireland		1 I			2		2
Scotland	2			E			-

D.3 Sources of the data used in Chapter 3

Albania	Ministry of Justice. Statistics Office. Tirana, Albania. Unpublished.
Austria	National Bureau of Statistics (Österr. Statist. Zentralamt). Annual Conviction Statistics (Gerichtliche Kriminalstatistik).
Belgium	3.B.1.1: a) De 1990 à 1994: Ministère des affaires économiques, Institut National de Statistique, Statistiques judiciaires, statistique criminelle de la Belgique, 1990, 1991, 1992; b) 1993: Ministère de la Justice, point d'appui "Criminalité, police administrative et administration de la justice pénale", 1995: c) 1994: Ministère de la Justice, Service de la politique criminelle, Point d'appui statistique, 1996.
	3.B.1.2: Ministère de la Justice - Service de la politique criminelle; Point d'appui statistique; Données statistiques en matière de condamnations, suspensions, internements - 1994, 1996.
Bulgaria	National Statistics Institute. Division of Legal Statistics: "Crimes and convicted persons", Sofia, relevant years.
	Additional sources for tables 3.B.1/3.B.2.1: a) Ministry of Justice. Published; b) Data of persons convicted for burglary: General Prosecutor's Office. Unpublished.
	Additional source for tables 3.B.1: "Tables of crimes and convicted persons in 1996" (unpublished).
Croatia	Statistical Report, State Institute for Statistics, Zagreb 1997: 1043/1044, ISSN 1331-2096.
Cyprus	3.B.1/3.B.2.1: Compiled from different tables of "Criminal Statistics" Department of Statistics and Research, relevant years.
	Additional source for table 3.B.1.2: Unpublished data.
	3.B.2.2: Ministry of Finance, Department of Statistics and Research, Criminal Statistics, Unpublished data
Czech Republic	Ministry of Justice - Department of Statistics: Criminal Statistics Yearbook, published
Denmark	Criminal statistics published by the Danish National Bureau of Statistics (Danmarks Statistik).
Estonia	Ministry of Justice. Department of the Courts. Courts statistics. Unpublished
	Additional source for table 3.B.1.1, years 1993-1996: Statistical Yearbooks of Estonia, 1994-1997. Number of sentenced persons (final sentence) by crimes and principal penalty imposed, 1996.
Finland	Yearbook of Justice Statistics, relevant year / Statistics Finland
France	Ministère de la Justice – Sous-direction de la statistique - Statistique du casier judiciaire.
Germany	Strafverfolgungsstatistik, Arbeitsunterlage, Statistisches Bundesamt Wiesbaden, relevant year

Greece	3.B.1.1: National Statistical Service of Greece, Justice Statistics Years 1990-1994. For 1995: personal communication. Data for 1996 were not available.
	3.B.1.2: Personal communication
	3.B.2: Ministry of Justice, Courts' Statistics.
Hungary	Ministry of Justice.
Ireland	Annual report of An Garda Stochana
Italy	Istat penal statistics, relevant years.
Latvia	a) 1990-1994: Account of the number of persons convicted by the criminal courts of the Republic of Latvia, collected by the Ministry of Justice.
	b) 1995-1996: Report of the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Latvia on convicted persons, relevant years.
Lithuania	Report by the Courts' Department of the Ministry of Justice on statistical data, relevant years.
Luxembourg	No data on convictions were provided
Malta	3.B.1.1: Abstract: Annual review of main statistical data on demography, labour, industry and other economic, financial and social subjects (relevant years).
	3.B.2.1: Personal correspondence with Principal Assistant Registrar for the Director General, Courts of Malta.
Moldova	Ministère de la Justice - Direction judiciaire, Rapport statistique.
Netherlands	The Netherlands Central Bureau of Statistics
Norway	Statistics Norway, Division for Social and Welfare Statistics.
Poland	3.B.1.1: Police Headquarters Statistical Information Bureau. Data processed by the Institute of Justice (national correspondent).
	3.B.1.2/3.B.2: Ministry of Justice Statistical Information Department. Data processed by the Institute of Justice.
Portugal	Department of Research and Planning, Ministry of Justice.
Romania	3.B.1.1/3.B.2: a) Données statistiques du Ministère de la Justice, Service de l'organisation, de la synthèse et des statistiques judiciaires; b) Annuaire statistique de Roumanie, 1996.
	3.B.1.2: Données statistiques du Ministère de la Justice de Roumanie, service de l'organisation, de la synthèse et des statistiques judiciaires.
Russia	Supreme Court, Russia.
Slovenja	Statistical office of the Republic of Slovenia.
Spain	Estadísticas Judiciales de España. Madrid. Instituto Nacional de Estadística, relevant years.
Sweden	Official Statistics of Sweden published by: Statistics Sweden (until 1992) & the National Crime Prevention Council (since 1993) [Number of aliens: Estimates for 1995].

Switzerland	Office fédéral de la statistique, Section du droit et de la justice: Unpublished.				
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia.				
Turkey	General Directorate of Criminal Records and Statistics of the Ministry of Justice, unpublished.				
United Kingdom:					
England & Wales	Crime and Criminal Justice Unit, Home Office.				
Northern Ireland	Royal Ulster Constabulary.				
Scotland	Scottish Office Home Department - Civil & Criminal Justice Statistics Unit.				

4 CORRECTIONAL STATISTICS

4.A GENERAL COMMENTS

1. Chapter 4 presents data on detention rates, number and capacity of penal institutions, expenditure related to the prison service and persons serving non-custodial sanctions and measures. It also reviews the information available on recidivism.

2. Table 4.B.1 indicates the detention rate for all countries for which such data is available (1990 – 1997). This data stems from the *Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (SPACE)* collection. More detailed information on the SPACE system, its methodology and coverage is presented in section 4.C. The data presented hereafter shows wide variations in detention rates throughout Europe, with considerable differences between the 'new' and most of the 'old' member States of the Council of Europe. The highest detention rate in Europe can be found in Russia; very similar to that of the United States of America.

3. The other data presented comes almost exclusively from the Sourcebook questionnaire except for data on total prison capacity as contained in the first column of table 4.B.2.1 ("Number and capacity of penal institutions"). Tables 4.B.2.2 and 4.B.2.3 present data on the operational and capital costs relating to the prison service. This data too shows considerable variation throughout Europe, in particular as concerns the total capacity of prison systems, the size of penal institutions and the cost of corrections. However, it should be borne in mind that expenditure related to the prison service is not a very clear indicator. Depending on the countries concerned, it might reflect that imprisonment and the extension of the prison estate are important priorities of penal policy – but it might also simply point to great differences between countries as regards general living costs and the level of remuneration of correctional staff.

4. Table 4.B.3.1 provides information on trends in the number of persons serving a community sanction or measure (1990–1996). Details concerning the type of sanction/measure are contained in table 4.B.3.2 (1995 only). The data show not only wide variations across the countries, but also interesting trends. Generally speaking, the rate of persons serving a non-custodial sentence has increased less over the years considered than rates of detention (see tables 4.B.1 and 4.B.3.1), suggesting *inter alia* that the services entrusted with the implementation of community sanctions and measures may have developed less rapidly than the prison systems in most European countries.

5. At an earlier stage of its work, the Group also planned to present detailed quantitative information as produced by recidivisin research throughout Europe. This objective, however, had to be abandoned, due to the many technical and methodological problems involved in this task. It was therefore agreed to present a brief account of some of the main methodological issues and to point out common features in the results which were available from reconviction studies. The main results are as follows.

Recidivism

6. Fifteen of the 36 countries covered by the Sourcebook quoted one or more studies on recidivism and 25 studies were reported in all. Most countries measure the extent to which offenders are reconvicted: some do this by defining the concept of a recidivist within their Penal Code and simply count such people; some countries rely on research studies to estimate reconviction rates of offenders; other countries have built up large databases of offender histories, which enable reconviction rates and criminal careers to be studied on a regular basis.

7. However, there is little standardisation between countries in the methodology used. In general, results are – among other things – dependent on

- how large the studied sample or population is
- the characteristics of the offenders (are all offenders chosen or only special subgroups according to gender, age, prior convictions, type of offence, type of sanction etc.)
- the length of the follow-up period, and
- the definition of the event, which constitutes "recidivism" / "reconviction" (e.g. all offences or only special offences / sanctions meet the criterion of reconviction).

8. Indeed, choosing different offender characteristics, follow-up periods and recidivism criterions, it is possible to synthetically increase or decrease recidivism rates. Therefore, care should be taken in interpreting reconviction rates, even within one country, and special care should be taken when comparing rates across countries. Neither should it be forgotten that reconviction rates are in fact "rates of recapture" whilst recidivism rates may vary with the efficiency of the different criminal justice systems.

9. Nevertheless, there are some common features in the results which are available, although reconviction rates vary considerably in their magnitude between the countries:

- a. Past criminal history is the most important predictor of reconviction rates, with the highest rates being for offenders with the longest criminal history.
- b. Male reconviction rates are higher than those for females; however, this is mostly explained by differences in criminal history and age.
- c. Younger persons tend to have a higher reconviction risk than older persons.
- d. Reconviction rates are highest in the first year after the initial conviction / release.
- e. There is no simple relationship between the seriousness of the offence and reconviction.
- f. There is also no simple relationship between the first conviction offence and subsequent offences.
- g. There is no simple relationship between the type of sentence and the reconviction rate.

4.B TABLES

Table 4.B.1 Detention rate per 100 000 population on 1 September : 1990 - 1997

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	<u>1995</u>	<u>19</u> 96	1997	% chang 90-97
Ibania				•••			•		
Austria	82	87	88	91	85	76	84	86	5
Belgium	66	60	71	72	65	76	76	82	24
Bulgaria		68	102	99		103	126	142	1
Croatia	***	* * *	•••		***	***	45	47	
Cyprus	38		32	30	25	26	35	40	5
Czech Republic			129	165	182	188	202	209	
Denmark	63		66	71	72	66	61	62	-2
Estonia								300	
Finland	62	63	65	62	59	59	58	56	-10
France	82	84	84	86	90	89	90	90	10
Germany	82	79		81	83	81	83	90	10
Greece		49	59	68	71		51	54	
Hungary		146		132	128	122	129	136	
celand	41	39	38	39	38	44		43	5
reland		60	62	60	59	59	62	68	
taiy	57	56	80	89	90	87	85	86	51
_etvia				•••			405	407	
ithuania	•••			275	342	356	323	356	
uxembourg	94	 90	91	107	109	115	104		
Malta	- ,					52	62	•••	
Aoldova		• • •	•••	***	• - •		263	**1	
Vomova Vetherlands			48	51	55		205 75	 87	98
	44					56	52		-5
lorway	56	59		60 160	62			53	
Poland				160	163		148	148	
Portugal	87	82	93	111	101		140	145	67
lomenia		- • •	195	200	•••	206	194	197	
Russia	***		•••	***		694	713		•••
lovekia			123	136	139	147	144	138	•
lovenia		**•	•••	• • •	•••	33	31	39	•••
pain	85	92	90	115	106	102	•••	113	33
weden	58	S S	63	66	66	66	65	59	2
witzerland	77	85	77	81	•••	81	85	88	14
he F.Y.R.O. Macedonia			•••	•••		54	50	49	
arkey	82	44	•••	52	72	90	87	94	15
Ikraine	•••	•••				392	425	415	•••
ntied Kingdom:									
Ingland Wales	90	91	91	89	96	99	107	120	33
forthern Ireland	109	106	114	118	117	106	•••	95	-13
cotland		95	105	115	109	110	101	119	•••
lean	71	77	89	106	107	146	163	135	
fedian	77	82	90	98	99	99	103	95	
finimum	38	39	38	39	38	33	31	39	
1aximum	109	146	195	275	342	694	713	415	

Source: SPACE

4.B.2

Table 4.B.2.1	Number and capacity of penal institutions on 1 September 1995

	Total	Rate	Total	of which							
	prison	per	number	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
	capacity	100.000	of penal	Fewer	50 to	100 to	250 to	500 to	750 to	More	
	(namber	pop.	institu	than	99	249	499	749	999	than	
	of	b.eb.	tions	50	places	places	places	places	places	1000	
			LIGHS	places	pined	pierce	pinces	pinees	praces	places	
	places) T4ITDEF	R41TDEF	T41TNPi	P41F50	P41F99	P41F249	P41F499	P418749	P41F999	P41M1000	
Albania	1200	37	7	0	14	57	29	0	0	0	
Austria	7690	95	29		10	55	28	3	3	0	
Belgium	6481	64	30	10	17	43	30				
Bulgaria	13000	155	14		7	0	7	21	43	21	
Croatia	3905	83	22	0	50	32	9	5	5	0	
Cyprus	240	33	1	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	
Czech Republic	18183	176	30	0	0	13	30	30	13	13	
Denmark	3803	73	61	70	8	20	2	0	0	0	
Estonia	3820	259	11	36	18	9	18	9	0	9	
Finland	4095	80	41	37	32	24	7	0	0	0	
France	48804	84	183	12	26	23	23	- 11	2	2	
Germany	70773	87									
Greece	4332	41	28	14	21	39	25	0	0	0	
Hungary	11352	110	32	0	22	28	25	13	6	6	
Ireland	2210	62	12	0	33	50	8	8	0	0	
Italy	40562	71	200	20	21	41	14	4	1	1	
Latvia	9760	390	15	0	0	27	7	33	20	13	
Lithuapia	13400	366	13	0	0	8	15	23	8	46	
Luxembourg	473	116						- * *			
Malta	220	59	1	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	
Moldova	12990	291	20	0	0	30	40	5	5	20	
Netherlands	11698	76	59	8	32	29	24	7	0	0	
Norway	2738	63	43	53	26	19	2	0	0	0	
Poland	65173	169	151	1	6	25	36	16	11	6	
Portugal	8999	91	51	37	22	12	16	14			
Romania	30600	136	32			6	9	38	13	34	
Russia	976693	659			* * =						
Slovenia	1112	56	13	46	31	15	8				
Spain	30668	78	75	0	l	21	33	20	7	17	
Sweden	6192	70	79	46	39	14	1				
Switzerland	6120	85	187	79	12	7	2	0	0	0	
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	2753	140							- • •		
Turkey	73609	120	607	58	18	8	8	7	0	0	
United Kingdom:											
England & Wales	50708	98	131	0	2	33	37	24	3	2	
Northern Ireland	2199	137	5	0	0	20	40	40	0	0	
Scotland	5655	111	22	9	14	45	18	9	5	0	
Mean	43117	134	69								
Median	7086	89	30								
Minimum	220	33	1								
Maximum	976693	659	607								

Notes on table 4.B.2.1

Denmark: 1) Number and capacity of penal institutions on 31 December 1996 (instead of 1 September 1995); 2) Some "double-counting" may have occurred.

France: Operational capacity. France and overseas territories. Data relates to 1 January 1995.

Poland: Data relates to 31 August 1995.

Slovenia: The Slovenian prison estate comprises 6 penal institutions. 1 juvenile correctional facility and 6 dislocated facilities.

Sweden: Official capacity. Some double-counting may have occurred.

Switzerland: Data relates to March 1995.

popula								% change
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	90-96
	X42OC0	X42OC1	X420C2	X420C3	X420C4	X420C5	X42OC6	PC42OC
Albania				***	** *		15	
Austria	1586	1767	1895	2103	2633	2782	2736	72
Belgium	91	112	104	115	141	191	182	99
Bulgaria	37	53	85	102	68	82	22	-39
Сгоатіа	* + *			* * -		148		***
Cyprus	392	523	520	555	608	614	639	63
Czech Republic			F 4 #	544	689	888	1039	
Denmark		2842	2902	3276	3432	3584	3 599	• • •
Estonía		•••		316	527	691		••••
Finland	2020	2334	2023	1951	2023		2153	7
France	996	1231	1268	1310	1448	1530	1615	62
Germany		+	** -	•				- + >
Greece	350	335	297	291	280	310	350	0
Hungary	396	466	562	684	591	478	\$45	38
Ireland	2401	2820	2 92 5	3008	3269	3209	3780	57
Italy								
Latvia								
Lithuania	+ 4 -		- * *	• • •	* 1 *	343	484	
Luxembourg	+ # +	* • •	• • •					
Maita		213	186	350	460	642	791	
Moldova				15	63	71	103	
Netherlands	2308		2656	3225	3741	4257	4530	96
Norway	2153	2519	242 8	2549	2727	2803	3078	43
Poland	444	391	457	444	467	466	467	5
Portugal	510	629	726	754	799	982	1119	120
Romania		56	54	91	133	119	134	
Russian Fed.	* - *	***				***		
Slovenia			464	546	632	793	823	
Spain	212	276	266	334	376	331	339	60
Sweden				**1	- • •			•••
Switzerland		3943	4106	4784	5025	5629	5241	•••
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia		***						• • •
Turkey	38	35	27	30	18	19	27	-30
<i>United Kingdom:</i> England & Wales	2460	2954	2714	3151	3153	3046	3624	47
Northern Ireland	9993	10519	9726	11027	10768	10227	11589	16
Scotland	3333	379 9	3374	3806	3781	3350	4132	24
Mean	1651	1801	1729	1745	1840	1762	1969	
Median	753	629	726	620	660	691	823	
Minimum	37	35	27	15	18	19	15	
Maximum	9993	10519	9726	11027	10768	10227	11589	

 Table 4.B.2.2
 Expenditure related to the prison service: Operating costs in 1'000 ECU (Rates per 100'000)

 population)

popula	tion)							
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	X42CC0	X42CC1	X42CC2	X42CC3	X42CC4	X42CC5	X42CC6	PC42CC
Albania						•••-	14	
Austria	• • •		* * *	•••			• • •	
Belgium	26	25	23	25	55	35	54	104
Bulgaria	82	53	87	105	71	85	23	-72
Croatia			* * *			89		
Cyprus	17	9	20	17	13	17	31	79
Czech Republic		• - •	•••	131	248	210	257	
Denmark		48	45	74	157	84	41	•
Estonia	• • •					81	•••	•••
Finland	518	452	430	309	333	373	267	⊸48
France	134	156	178	123	145	89	ш	-17
Germany	* ► •							
Greece	46	41	36	40	39	40	52	13
Нивдагу	37	31	37	27	88	35	47	2 9
ireland	219	226	244	187	281	246	536	145
Italy		•••	+ 4 4			•••		• - •
Latvia					***	51	43	
Lithuania						50	47	
Luxembourg			•••					
Malta	•••	11	8	38	150	204	348	
Moldova				5	1	l	2	
Netherlands	** 1	•••						
Norway	357	199	386	272	185	367	527	48
Poland	20	15	10	18	21	23	33	70
Portugal	67	90	94	85	1 64	112	154	129
Romania	***	9	6	19	40	45	31	
Russian Fed.								
Slovenia			465	546	644	819	847	
Spain	147	210	61	84	15	16	14	-91
Sweden								
Switzerland		557	809	792	815	1088	754	**-
Fbe F.Y.R.O. Macedonia								
Furkey	6	7	3	3	4	2	4	-21
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	1258	1161	791	734	784	752	574	-54
Northern freland	581	427	408	407	437	338	454	-22
Scotland	361	371	330	309	390	355	596	65
Mean	242	205	213	189	221	208	225	
Median	108	72	87	85	150	85	53	
Minimum	6	7	3	3	1	L	2	
Maximum	1258	1161	809	792	815	1088	847	

 Table 4.8.2.3
 Expenditure related to the prison service: Capital costs in 1'000 ECU (Rates per 100'000 population)

Notes on tables 4.B.2.2 and 4.B.2.3

Austria: Capitals costs: Approximately 500 Million ATS a year (buildings and refurbishment), no precise data available.

Belgium: A new budget system was introduced in 1995.

Denmark: Costs include probation and parole services.

France: Investment costs: the amount indicated corresponds to official appropriations. 1990 and 1991: budgetary resources, as from 1992: total of expenditure.

Greece: Operating costs do not include salaries of prison staff.

Slovenia: Operating costs for 1990-1994 only include material expenditures and salaries; training of correctional workers; equipment of inmates; training, armament and special equipment of prison guards are included as from 1995.

England & Wales: Data only available by financial year, i.e. April to March.

Northern Ireland: Data only available by financial year, i.e. April to March.

Scotland: Data only available by financial year, i.e. April to March.

4.B.3 Non-custodial sanctions and measures with supervision or care of an agent of the correctional services

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	% change 90-96
	R431T0	R431T1	R431T2	R431T3	R431T4	R431T5	R431T6	PC431T
Albania	56	28	46	29	34	12	10	-83
Austria					• • •	38	40	
Belgium	38	38	37	41	41	50	60	59
Bulgaria	- • •			•••	* - *			
Croatia		- **	• • •		** -		•••	
Сургиз	13	15	20	19	17	8	8	-40
Czech Republic	•••					•••		
Denmark	59	53	54	57	55	54	55	-5
Estopia				***	***			
Finland				- • •				
France	161	188	195	192	177	188	1 89	17
Germany	•••	~ •			•••		•••	
Greece	8	9	L	6	5	* - *	- + -	
Hungary	38	19	18	22	25	29	34	-11
Ireland	93	92	92	91	9 9	104	127	37
Italy					***			
Latvia								
Lithuania	136	181	222	267	310	229	311	130
Luxembourg			***					
Malta					2	16	17	
Moldova	259	299	221	260	344	405	302	17
Netherlands	- • •	* * *			***		•••	
Norway	36	41	43	42	38	36	37	2
Poland								
Portugal	5	6	9	11	11	12	13	164
Romania								
Russia						***		
Slovenia								
Spain			•••					
Sweden	91	93	92	86	90	95	90	-1
Switzerland	***	2	7	11	15	12	16	•••
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia				• • •				
Turkey			•••		•••			
United Kingdom:								
England & Wales	170	176	175	172	187	207	207	21
Northern Ireland	***	r * *		257	268	303	322	
Scotland	•••	•••			4.8.7	•••		
Mean	83	83	83	98	101	106	108	
Median	57	41	46	50	41	50	55	
Minimum	5	2	7	6	2	8	8	
Maximum	259	299	222	267	344	405	322	

Table 4.B.3.1 Total number of persons serving a non-custodial sanction or measure per 100'000 population

Table 4.B.3.2	Types of non-custo	dial sanctions and me	asures in 1995

	Total	-	of which	percentage of	
	number of persons serving non- custodial sentences per 100'000	Suspended sentences (with supervision)	Community service orders	Probation	Other non-custodia} sentences with supervision or care of the correctional services
	population R431T5	P431SS5	P431CS5	P431PR5	P4310T5
Albania	12			14311103	
Austria	38	77		9	14
Belgium	50	63	4		33
Bulgaria				14-	
Croatia		* 4 *	• * •	- • •	•••
		* * *	***		
Cyprus	8			001	*
Czech Republic			•••	* * 4	
Denmark	54	52	16	***	32
Estonia		• • •	***	***	
Finland	• • •				* * *
France	188	80	17	- • •	2
Germany					
Greece		***			
Hungary	29	57	9	33	
freland	104		24	38	39
Italy					***
Latvia					***
Lithuania	229	82	18		
Luxembourg					***
Malta	16	0		100	
Moldova	405	7		37	56
Netherlands					
Norway	36	44	21	4 * *	35
Poland				•••	
Portugal	12	66	I	13	20
Romania			4 * *	***	***
Russia			***	***	
Slovenia	[***			
Spain			•••		•••
Sweden	95		8	78	14
Switzerland	12	* * *	100		ø + 1-
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia		•••	***		***
Turkey			•		- * *
United Kingdom:		-			_
England & Wales	207	0	34	51	22
Northern Ireland	303	49	15	34	2
Scotland		•••	•••	•••	•••

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	of which % on parole or conditionally released	1996	% chunge 90-96
	R432T0	R432T1	R432T2	R432T3	R432T4	R432T5	P432PP5	R432T6	PC432T
Albania		.,.		,					
Austria			* = =			21	64	21	
Belgium	16	19	19	18	16	18	90	17	8
Bulgaria				•••		- • •			
Croatia	***							• • •	
Cyprus		•••							
Czech Republic									
Denmark	15	20	21	21	25	24	97	22	50
Estonia	5	8	5	7	[2	15	100	13	168
Finland	- •								
France	10	11	9	8	8	9	100	9	-12
Germany			** •						
Сгеесе				,					
Hungary	69	37	28	29	39	42	38	40	-42
ireland	1	2	2	2	3	3	100	2	57
Italy	6	6	9	15	18	21		24	278
Latvia	9	14	8	10	43	53		44	381
Lithuania	5	5	4	24	38	42	100	67	> 1000
Luxembourg									
Malta									
Moldova	***	•••	**-	*		• • •		- • •	***
Netherlands						- • •	***	• • •	
Norway	 36	41	43	42	38	36	34	37	2
Poland							_		
	28	 29	28	 30	33	 34	 79	28	
Portugal	20	29							
Romania Russia	•••	•••		•••		•••	* * *		
		•••				•••			•••
Slovenia Succession	* * *						***	•••	
Spain See des		47			40			 48	
Sweden	46		49	49	48	48	100		3 -8
Switzerland	29	28	26	28	29	27	100	27	-0
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	•••	•••		***					
Turkey	•••							•••	
United Kingdom: England & Wales	107	101	96	98	100	105	30	108	1
Northern Ireland	•••			•••					
Scotland									
Mean	27	26	25	27	32	33		34	
Median	15	20	20	23	31	27		27	
Minimum	1	2	2	2	3	3		2	
Maximum	107	101	96	98	100	105		108	

 Table 4.B.3.3
 Number of persons under the supervision or care of an agent of the correctional services per 100'000

 population

4.C.1 Comments on table 4.B.1

4.C.1.1The "SPACE" system

The Council of Europe has been periodically collecting data on prison populations since the 6th Conference of Directors of Prison Administration, which was held in Strasbourg in 1983. The, initially, very simple questionnaire sent to member states has been considerably enriched over time, in particular by introducing flow data. The statistics gathered have been publisbed at regular intervals in the *Prison Information Bulletin of the Council of Europe* (as from December 1992: *Penological Information Bulletin)*. In 1989 the collection system was given the name *Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (SPACE)*. Since that date it has consisted of two parts. SPACE I relates to prison populations (stock statistics, committal flows, length of imprisonment), incidents (deaths, in particular suicides, and escapes) and, since 1996, prison staff. SPACE II relates to community sanctions and measures. This part of the system has recently been completely overhauled by the Council for Penological Cooperation, so that it better reflects the diversity of such sanctions and measures throughout Europe.

Thanks to SPACE we now bave at our disposal a significant number of chronological series, which are useful at both an international and a national level. First, there are the various trends which occur in most of the countries covered. It is important to be aware, for example, that growing prison populations are to be observed in most countries, but that the rate of growth can vary markedly from state to state. More interestingly, in many Council of Europe member States, growth has been found to be due to an increase in the duration of imprisonment rather than in numbers imprisoned. It is belpful to know that a shared problem has the same ingredients elsewhere; this should prompt the states concerned to work together more closely in the difficult search for solutions. Moreover, when common trends are highlighted it is natural to take an interest in the exceptions to them and identify countries which merit special attention.²⁶

4.C.1.2Concepts and definitions²⁷

Table 4.B.1 ("Detention rate per 100000 population") is based on the total number of prisoners per country, i.e. all inmates of penal institutions, which may be "closed", "semi-open" or "open" (semi-detention centres and work farms, for instance). These may be people being detained as a preventive measure (pending trial for example) or people serving a prison sentence. Inmates of young offender institutions are also taken into account.

 ²⁶ Tournier P., The collection of crime and criminal justice statistics in the context of the Council of Europe, report to the 12th Conference of Directors of Prison Administration, CDAP (97) 4, 1997.
 ²⁷ Tournier P., Prison population inflation and overcrowding: terminology and methods, Council of Europe, Council for Penological Co-operation, Strasbourg, PC-CP (96) 9, 1996.

The detention rate refers to the number of prisoners at a specified date in relation to the number of inhabitants at the same date. This is a stock index, which is usually expressed per 100000 population. In theory, this rate reflects the proportion of prisoners in the country's total population, but in actual fact the population shown in the numerator is not fully included in the population shown in the denominator. The latter is usually based on general censuses or population statistics kept by the countries concerned. As a result, certain categories of foreigners present in the prisons such as illegal immigrants, tourists and seasonal workers may not be counted in the denominator of the detention rate.

For an analysis of these data, readers are referred to the report on prison overcrowding and prison population inflation prepared by the Council for Penological Co-operation with the assistance of MM André Kuhn (Switzerland), Pierre Tournier (France) and Roy Walmsley (United Kingdom) under the auspices of the European Committee on Crime Problems.

4.C.2 Comments on information provided in table 4.B.3.1 and 4.B.3.2

Albania: The figures cover the number of persons sentenced to probation, community service or an educational measure (work; school; admission to a young offenders institution). They include persons under a suspended custodial sentence, but not those under a medical measure.

Austria:

1) All data exclude the province of Styrie, where the probation service is not under the authority of the "Verein für Bewährungshilfe und Soziale Arbeit".

2) No data on community service orders available (community service is only in use in the court district Linz).

Cyprus: Prohation is only an option in connection with a suspended sentence (with supervision).

Denmark: The data refer to the end of each year. Probation is not a sanction in Denmark.

France:

1) Suspended sentence with supervision (Sursis avec mise à l'épreuve): The offenders are dealt with by the probation service (Comités de probation et d'assistance aux libérés – CPAL).

2) Community service (*Travail d'intérêt général – TIG*) exists both as a principal sentence and as a condition attached to a suspended sentence. The latter is not counted as a suspended sentence with supervision.

3) Other non-custodial sanctions/measures: prohibition to reside in a certain area; conditional pardon; adjournement; prise en charge des militaires du contingent.

Greece:

1) Due to austerity measures in the public sector no "probation officers working with adult offenders" have been recruited.

2) Other non-custodial sentences involving the supervision or care of the correctional services: Figures refer to persons under the supervision of a "supervisor of minors" (probation officer).

3) The decrease between 1992 and 1994 is due to the decrease in the number of "supervisors" due to austerity measures.

Ireland: Other non-custodial sentences include those on supervision on deferment of sentence. Together with any reports the courts have ordered.

Portugal:

1) For 1991 to 1994, data given under "Community service order" refer to community service order and probation.

2) Data in the table are up to 31 December of each year.

Sweden: "Reference period": yearly average.

Switzerland:

1) Suspended sentence with supervision and probation do not exist.

2) Community service was introduced in 1990. The first data available relate to 1991. The figures indicate the number of community service orders implemented per year without cases where the order was not completed.

England & Wales:

1) Each person is counted only once in the total even if they were subject to several types of supervision at the year end.

2) The Criminal Justice Act 1991, introduced in October 1992, brought in a new order — a combination order — which had grown to 16500 by 1 January 1996. Included under "other", it is partly a Community Service Order and partly a probation order.

Northern Ireland:

1) Suspended sentences: Shows number of these disposals made in the year concerned.

2) Figures are for 31 March each year for other categories.

4.C.3 Comments on information provided in table 4.B.3.3

Austria:

 See comments on table 4.B.3.1.
 "Other persons under supervision" include: -provisional probation (§§ 197, 507 StPO etc.)
 -voluntary probation

Croatia: Conditional release with supervision was introduced in criminal law in 1977, but the service entrusted with the supervision of conditionally released offenders was never set up. For this reason conditional release with supervision is not being used in practice.

Denmark:

1) Figures relate to different dates in December of each year.

2) Persons under treatment for alcohol abuse as an alternative to a sentence for drunken driving: 1991=770; 1992=874; 1993=983; 1994=1041; 1995=1084; 1996=1036.

France:

1) Persons serving other non-custodial sentences involving the supervision or care of an agent of the correctional services: not applicable

2) Persons on parole: conditional release is decided on by the minister of justice (sentences of more than 5 years) or by the judge responsible for the execution of sentences (*juge d'application des peines*) for sentences of 5 years or less.

Greece: Parole or conditional release exists since 1991 in the Penal Code. Due to austerity measures in the public sector no probation/parole officers for dealing with adult offenders have been recruited. This does not apply to probation/parole officers dealing with young offenders.

Ireland: The majority of the persons on parole or conditional release are persons convicted of very serious offences, e.g. murder, and may be on long term supervision by the probation service.

Italy: Data in table refers to supervisions arranged during the year of reference.

Latvia: The remarkable increase after the year 1993 is linked to the total volume of crime –more persons were released on parole due to an increasing number of offenders who had to be admitted to penal institutions.

Norway: Figures include those subject to "severity sentence" supervision. Nearly all of those have served a period in prison and may be recalled in case of breach of conditions.

Portugal: At 31 December of each year.

Sweden: "Reference period": yearly average.

Switzerland: The data correspond to the number of conditionally released persons per year. No data on persons serving other non-custodial sentences involving the supervision or care of an agent of the correctional services is available.

Turkey: There is no supervision or care by agents of correctional services for conditionally released persons.

4.D Sources of the data in Chapter 4

Albania	4.B.2.1: Ministry of Justice. General Directorate of Prisons. Tirana Albania. Unpublished.
	4.B.2.2: Ministry of Justice. General Directorate of Prisons. Budge Department. Tirana, Albania. Unpublished.
	4.B.3: Ministry of Justice. Statistics Office. Tirana, Albania Unpublished.
Austria	4.B.2.1: Monthly report, Ministry of Justice.
	4.B.2.2: Jahreserfolg Kap. 30 (Justiz).
	4.B.3: VBSA (Verein für Bewährungshilfe und Soziale Arbeit). Division for Research, Documentation and International Agenda (unpublished data).
Belgium	4.B.2.1: Ministère de la Justice - Administration des établissements pénitentiaires - Personnel du Directeur général.
	4.B.2.2: Ministère de la Justice - Administration des établissements pénitentiaires- Service budget, achats et comptabilité.
	4.B.3: Ministère de la Justice - Administration des établissements pénitentiaires - Service social d'Exécution des Décisions Judiciaires.
Bulgaria	Central Administration of Penal Institutions.
Croatia	4.B.2: Ministry of Justice. Department for Execution of Penal Sanctions.
	4.B.3: Ministry of Justice. Department for Execution of Penal Sanctions.
Сургиз	4.B.2: Ministry of Justice and Public Order, Prison Department.
	4.B.3.1-2: Annual Report of the Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance Years 1990-1996.
	4.B.3.3: Ministry of Justice and Public Order.
Czech Republic	4.B.2.1: Ministry of Justice, Prison Service of the Czech Republic, Department of Logistics, Statistics of prisoners, unpublished.
	4.B.2.2: Ministry of Justice, Prison Service of the Czech Republic, Department of Economics, unpublished.
Denmark	4.B.2.1: The National Correctional Administration. Printed statistics.
	4.B.2.2: Statistics of the prisons and probation department. (Annual report 1996).
	4.B.3: Annual report of the department of corrections, 1990-1996.
Estonia	4.B.2.1: Prison Board. Statistics on penal institutions. Unpublished.
	4.B.2.2: Ministry of Finance. Budget Reports 1994-1995. Published.
	4.B.3.1-2: Prison Board.
	4.B.3.3: Prison Board. Statistics on convicted persons. Unpublished.

.

Finland	4.B.2.1: Cross-sectional survey made on September 1st 1995.
	4.B.2.2: Administrative account of the Prison Department, Ministr of Justice.
	4.B.3: Statistics of the Association for Probation and Aftercar (which is a semi-official association under public law, with the mai purpose of being in charge of the implementation of communit sanctions).
France	4.B.2.1: Ministère de la Justice - Direction de l'administratio pénitentiaire / SCER1. Statistique mensuelle de la population pénale.
	4.B.2.2: Rapport annuel d'activité de l'administration pénitentiair (année 1990 à 1996).
	4.B.3.: Ministère de la Justice - Direction de l'Administration pénitentiaire - SCERI. Statistique des CPAL.
Germany	 4.B.3.1-2: a) Probation service statistics, published by the Federa Statistical Office, Wiesbaden (Fachserie 10, Reihe 5); 1990 and 1991 b) Statistical Yearbook 1998, published by the Federal Statistica Office Wiesbaden.
	4.B.3.3: Probation service statistics, published by the Federa Statistical Office, Wiesbaden (Fachserie 10, Reihe 5), relevant year.
Greece	4.B.2: Ministry of Justice, personal communication (unpublished data).
	4.B.3: National Statistical Service, Statistics of Courts, Years 1990 1994.
Hungary	4.B.2: National Prison Administration. Unpublished.
	4.B.3: Ministry of Justice. Published.
Ireland	4.B.2.1 / 4.B.3: Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform.
	4.B.2.2: Prisons Division, Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform.
Italy	4.B.2: White book of the Department of Penal Administration Ministry of Justice - July 1992.
	4.B.3: Istat statistics (1990 and 1991: table 19.7; 1992 to 1996: table 12.7).
Latvia	4.B.2.1: Order N 48 of 21.02.1996, Ministry of Interior. This order sets the capacity of penal institutions.
	4.B.2.2: Expenditures as provided for by the state budget.
	4.B.3: Accounts of the Prison Department.
Lithuania	Prison department of Lithuania, Ministry of Interior Affairs.
Luxembourg	
Malta	4.B.2: Corradino Correctional Facility Statistics Officer.
	4.B.3: Statistical records of the Probation Services Action Team Personal Correspondence from Dr. Kevin Aquilina, Principa
	Assistant Registrar Law courts of Malta. Correspondence with

Moldova	4.B.2. Ministère de la Justice - Département des établissements pénitentiaires.
	4.B.3: Ministère de la Justice – Département des établissements pénitentiaires, Rapport statistique.
Netherlands	4.B.2.1: National Agency of Correctional Institutions.
	4.B.2.2: Financial key-figures: National Agency of Correctiona Institutions.
	4.B.3: The Dutch Probation and the Childcare Protection Board.
Norway	4.B.2.1: Kompis-KIA.
	4.B.2.2: St. meld nr.3 1990-91; 1991-92; 1992-93; 1993-94; 1994-95; 1995-96; 1996-97.
	4.B.3: KifStat.
Poland	4.B.2.1: Central Prison Authority, Statistical Department.
	4.B.2.2: Central Prison Authority. Economical Department.
Portugal	4.B.2.1: Prison Department. Data collected "ad hoc".
	4.B.2.2: Department of Research and Planning, Ministry of Justice and Prison Department (data concerning "Operating costs" 1990- 1994 collected "ad hoc").
	4.B.3: Department of Research and Planning, Ministry of Justice.
Romania	4.B.2.1: Direction de stratégie humaine et réforme de la Direction Générale des Prisons du Ministère de la Justice.
	4.B.2.2: Direction traitement et sécurité de la Direction Générale des Prisons du Ministère de la Justice.
Russia	
Slovenia	 4.B.2.1: Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Slovenia Administration for the Enforcement of Criminal Sanctions - Common starting points for the determination of the optimum capacity of penal institutions and standards for space and staff. (Internal materials). 4.B.2.2: Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Slovenia. Annual
	Report of the administration for the Enforcement of Criminal Sanctions.
Spain	
Sweden	4.B.2.1: The National Correctional Administration. Printed statistics
	4.B.2.2: Kriminalvardens Officiella Statistik 1996, p. 24 (tab. 2.4.).
	4.B.3: Kriminalvardens Officiella Statistik, p. 31 (tab. 3.5.).
Switzerland	4.B.2.1 / 4.B.3: Office fédéral de la statistique, Section droit el justice, unpublished.
	4.B.2.2: Administration fédérale des finances (Ed.), Finances publiques en Suisse, Berne: Office fédéral de la statistique, relevant years.
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia	4.B.2.1 / 4.B.3.3: Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia.
	4.B.2.2: Law on the budget of the Republic of Macedonia.

Turkey	Ministry of Justice, unpublished.						
United Kingdom:							
England & Wales	4. B.2: H M Prison Service.						
	4.B.3: Offenders and Correction Unit, Home Office.						
Northern Ireland	4.B.2.1: Northern Ireland prison annual report, 1994-95, apx. 2.						
	4.B.2.2: Northern Ireland prison service annual reports for financial year shown.						
	4.B.3: a) A commentary on Northern Ireland crime statistics 1996; b) Probation Board for Northern Ireland.						
Scotland	Scottish Prison Service.						

5. SURVEY DATA

5.A GENERAL COMMENTS

5.A.1 Introduction

1. Additional information on the level of crime and offending behaviour can be obtained from the alternative source of surveys, in which a sample of the population is asked about their experiences. Several types of surveys exist. The so-called *victimisation surveys* which are based on interviews of a representative cross-section of the general population are well-known. Specific surveys have also been conducted with a view to ascertaining to what extent businesses and other organisations have become «victims» of crime. A rather different approach underlies *surveys of self-reported delinquency*, where the respondents - mostly juveniles - are asked to provide information on their own criminal or deviant behaviour.²⁸

2. Such surveys have been carried out, over the last 10 years, in a number of member States of the Council of Europe, mostly by universities and national or local authorities. However, as the scope, offence definitions, interview techniques, sampling methods etc. of these surveys differ widely, reliable international comparisons are at least as difficult to achieve as comparisons of official crime data.

3. There is one source, though, which can be regarded as a sufficiently reliable basis for international comparisons. It is the International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) which, up until now, has been carried out three times, covering the years 1988, 1991 and 1995/1996 (cf. Mayhew & Van Dijk, 1997). In this survey, standardised questionnaires and data collection methods have been used with a view to obtaining comparable results for the participating countries. In this chapter, a selection of the main results will be presented. First, however, some important aspects of the methodology used by the ICVS will be discussed.

5.A.2 International Crime Victim Survey: methodology

4. The ICVS is a project in which governmental and academic organisations co-operate. The questionnaire and methodology were originally designed by a small working group (van Dijk, Mayhew, Killias 1990). A reformed working group reviewed both the

²⁸ The International Business Crime Survey (Dijk, J.J.M. van & G.J. Terlouw, An international perspective of the business community as victims of fraud and crime, In: Security Journal 7 (1996), pp. 157-167, and The International Self-Report of Delinquency Study (Junger-Tas, J., G.J. Terlouw & M.W. Klein (ed.), Delinquent Behavior among young people in the western world; first results of the international self-report delinquency study, Den Haag, 1994, RDC / Ministry of Justice.) covered only a very limited number of European countries, and are, therefore, not included in this Sourcebook.

questionnaire and the methodology used after each 'sweep' of the survey and took into account the practical experience gathered.

5. A great number of countries all over the world participated in (one or more) sweeps of the survey. The methodology nsed by the different countries varied to some extent. Basically, Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing was used to approach a random sample of at least 1,000 individuals in each country. In countries where telephone ownership was not widespread, face-to-face interviews were conducted. In a number of countries, smaller samples of the population were interviewed (sometimes drawn from certain parts of the country only), mainly for financial and practical reasons. In several countries only individuals from the capital or another major nrban area were included in the sample; in some cases, this sample was complemented by an additional sample from one or more rural areas.

6. In the tables the 'geographical' reference point is made clear by presenting three columns for each offence. The figures indicated in the first column («national») are representative at national level. The figures in the second column («urban») are representative of all urban areas (if figures are given in the first column), or one major urban area only (if no figures are given in the first column). The figure in the third column («rural») are representative of all rural areas (if figures are given in the first column). Note that the breakdown between «urban» and «rural» is based on information provided by the respondents (see technical information).

5.A.3. International Crime Victim Survey: results

7. Tables 5.B.1, 5.B.2 and 5.B.3 present some results of the survey. The figures represent the average victimisation rates over the three sweeps of the survey. They were computed by summing up the yearly victimisation rates for each of the sweeps (and for a given country, and then dividing the sum by the number of sweeps (for details, see the technical information). This procedure was used to ensure a high level of comparability, in particular, in relation to countries which did not participate in each of the three sweeps. Under each of the data tables, the relevant part of the screening question i.e. the question about victimisation over the past five years is given (for complete wording, see technical information).

8. The tables show that in many countries victimisation rates differ considerably between urban and rural areas. Overall, they are higher in urban than in rural areas, but not in all countries and not for all offences. Comparing countries does not produce a consistent picture over all offences, with the exception of Estonia, where victimisation rates tend to be high for all types of offences. In general, countries differ much less with regard to victimisation rates than in relation to police data, which suggests that the latter reflect not only the actual volume of crime but also differences in recording crime.

5.B TABLES

	Assault a	nd threat		Rape (women only)				
		te average	d over 3	yearly rate averaged over 3				
	sweeps (19	988, 1991 a	ind 1995)*	sweeps (1988, 1991 and 1995)				
sample**	national	urban	rural	national	urban	rural		
Albania		3.2	2.4		2.6	0.0		
Austria	2.1	2.8	1.8	1.3	2.5	0.8		
Belgium	1.9	0.9	2.0	0.6	1.6	0.5		
Bulgaria		4.9			0.4			
Croatia		3.3	J		0			
Cyprus								
Czech Republic	3.0	3.2	2.9	1.9	3.4	1.5		
Denmark								
Estonia	5.4	7.5	4.0	1.4	2.2	0.9		
Finland	4.0	5.4	3.5	0.8	0.3	1.7		
France	2.8	3.5	2.6	0.4	0.7	0.3		
Germany	3.1	4.0	2.7	1.0	1.6	0.8		
Greece						ļ		
Hungary		I.7			0.0			
Ireland								
Italy	0.8	1.2	0.6	0.7	2.0	0.2		
Latvia		2.6	2.1		0.2	1.0		
Lithuania	3.0	3.3	2.7	0.8	1.4	0.3		
Luxembourg								
Malta	3.3	2.9	3.8	0.1	0.2	0.0		
Moldova								
Netherlands	3.8	6.3	3.1	0.6	1.0	0.5		
Norway	3.0	3.6	2.8	0.5	3.3	0.0		
Poland	3.9	4.9	3.4	1.0	1.7	0.7		
Portugal								
Romania		6.3	3.9		0.2	5.4		
Russia		5.3			2.2			
Slovakia	3.5	2.9	3.7	0.8	0.5	0.8		
Slovenia	4.6	4.0	4.4	1.2	2.2	0.6		
Spain	3.1	2.6	1.6	0.5	0.3	0.4		
Sweden	3.4	4.7	3.0	0.8	1.7	0.6		
Switzerland	2.1	0.4	2.3	0.7	0.2	0.7		
The F.Y.R.O. Macedonia		2.4			0.5			
Turkey								
United Kingdom								
England and Wales	3.9	4.4	3.7	0.3	0.6	0.2		
Northern Ireland	1.8	4.7	1.6	0.2	0.0	0.2		
Scotland	3.0	4.2	2.8	0.5	0.8	0.4		

Persons victimised by assault and rape (% of surveyed population Table 5.B.1 [women only for rape], averaged over 3 sweeps)

* See 5.A.3 for an explanation of «averaged yearly rates». ** See 5.A.2 for an explanation of the sampling method.

Relevant part of questions (for exact wording see technical information): Rape: «would you describe the incident as a rape (forced intercourse)?» Other assault and threat: «have you been personally attacked or threatened?»

	Burgta			Theft o	fear		Theft from a car		
		rate av	eraged			veraged		rate av	
		sweeps			sweeps				(1988.
		nd 1995		1001 a	nd 1995			nd 1995	
sample**		urban	rural	national	urban	, rural	national	urban	rural
	Папола	3.4	3.8		0.2	Turus		4.9	3.8
Albania	0.0	0.2	1.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	1.8	2.2	1.6
Austria	0.9	2.7	2.2	0.2	0.6	1.0	3.9	5.0	3.8
Belgium	2.2		4.4	0.9	1.2	1.0	3.7	13.4	5.0
Bulgaria		5.8			0.9			5.1	
Croatia		1.0			0.9			5.1	
Сургия	2.1		2.0		1.8	0.9	8.1	11.3	7.5
Czech Republic	3.1	4.0	3.0	1.1	1.8	0.9	0.1	11.5	1.3
Denmark		7.0	~ ~	1.2	2.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	5.2
Estonia	5.0	7.2	3.7	1.3	2.0	0.8	8.0		
Finland	0.6	0.4	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.5	3.3	4.5	2.8
France	2.4	4.2	1.9	2.0	2.2	2.0	8.2	10.2	7.7 4.2
Gеппалу	1.3	1.8	1.1	0.4	0.5	0.4	5.0	7.1	4.2
Greece								0.5	
Hungary		2.5			1,8			8.5	[
Ireland							0.4	110	
Italy	2.4	2.8	2.2	2.7	3.5	2.4	9.4	11.9	8.4
Latvia		2.9	2.2		2.4	2.1		8.1	3.2
Lithuania	4.1	5,5	2.7	0.6	1.1	0.2	7.0	11.2	3.9
Luxembourg						0.0		10 (
Malta	0.8	0.4	1.3	1.2	1.7	0.5	9.4	12.6	5.5
Moldova									
Netherlands	2.3	3.5	2.0	0.4	0.6	0.4	6.1	8.6	5.5
Norway	0.7	4.2	0.1	1.1	2.3	0.8	3.5	8.7	2.5
Poland	2.0	2.5	1.8	0.8	1.5	0.5	6.1	9.9	4.6
Portugal									
Romania		1.1	2,9		0.2			7.7	1.6
Russia		2.5			1.7			9.2	
Slovakia	3.4	6.5	3.1	1.1	1.8	1.1	4.6	16.0	4.6
Slovenia	1.9	2.8	1.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	5.5	8.0	4.5
Spain	1.6	2.4	2.1	1.4	2.0	1.0	10.1	14.6	8.8
Sweden	1.3	2.6	1.0	1.5	2.4	1.3	5.6	8.2	4.9
Switzerland	1.1	1.6	1.1	0.0		0.0	2.5	4.5	2.3
The F.Y.R.O.Macedonia		2.3		0.4				7	
Turkey									
United Kingdom									
England and Wales	2.7	4.5	2.0	2.7	3.2	2.4	9.3	11.1	8.7
Northern Ireland	1.3	3.3	1.1	1.6	4.2	1.4	4.9	7.5	4.7
Scotland	1.7	2.0	1.7	1.3	2.3	1.0	7.0	9.4	6.4

Table 5.B.2Households victimised by burglary, theft of car and theft from a car(% of surveyed population, averaged over 3 sweeps)

* See 5.A.3 for an explanation of «averaged yearly rates».

** See 5.A.2 for an explanation of the sampling method.

Relevant part of questions (for exact wording see technical information):

Burglary: «did anyone actually get into your house or flat without permission, and steal or try to steal something? (...) not including thefts from garages, sheds or lock-ups?»

Theft of car: «have you or have other members of your bousehold had any of their cars/vans/trucks stolen?»

Theft from a car: «over the past five years have you or members of your household been the victim of a theft of a car radio, or something else which was left in your car, or theft of a part of the car?»

	Debbe			Dickor	cketin	a	Other personal		
	Robbe	rota al	veraged			в veraged			
	yearly	rate av	(1088	yearry	cueens	(1988,	vearly	rate aver	aged
		nd 1995			nd 1995			sweeps	
	1971 4	nu 1995)	1371 0	iu 1775	,		nd 1995	
sample**	national	urban	rural	national	urban	rural	national	urban	rural
Albania		1.4	2.4		7.7	7.1		15.9	10.9
Austria	0.2	0.2	0.2	2.5	4.4	1.8	8.1	12.3	6.6
Belgium	0.1	2.7	0.8	1.4	1.0	1.4	6.4	4.8	6.6
Bulgaria		3.1			9.2			12.3	
Croatia		0.8			2.6			5.9	
Cyprus								1	
Czech Republic	1.2	1.1	1.3	5.0	8.0	4.0	14.0	17.3	12.7
Denmark	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,								
Estonia	3.3	4.9	2.3	2.6	4.2	1.5	11.5	13.6	10.2
Finland	0.7	0.9	0.6	1.5	2.0	1.3	8.1	10.3	7.3
France	0.6	0.7	0.6	2.2	5.2	1.5	6.2	11.1	5.0
Germany	0.8	1.6	0.6	1,3	2.4	0.9	7.0	9.4	6.2
Greece									
Hungary		0.7			4.1			8.3	1
Ireland									
Italy	1.3	2.6	0.8	2.2	3.9	1.6	7.2	10.4	6.0
Latvia		3.4	1.3		11.0	7.4		15.0	16.3
Lithuania	2.0	2,0	2.2	5.5	6.4	5.0	12.1	11.2	12.9
Luxembourg									
Malta	0.4	0.2	0.6	1.1	0.7	1.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
Moldova	ł								
Netherlands	0.8	1.6	0.6	2.0	3.5	1.6	13.5	18.6	12.2
Norway	0.5	1.6	0.3	0.5	0.0	0.6	6.0	6.6	5.9
Poland	1.8	2.2	1.6	4.8	7.4	3.7	10.3	13.4	9.0
Portugal									1
Romania		1.0	0		10.5	0.7		13.4	3.3
Russia	1	3.8			9.1	·		14.1	
Slovakia	1.6	1.2	1.6	3.3	9.8	3.2	11.5	15.1	11.4
Slovenia	0.9	1.1	0.6	0.7	1.1	0.5	5.6	8.9	4.8
Spain	3.1	3.8	1.9	2.7	3.4	1.3	6.9	7.1	5.1
Sweden	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.7	1.6	0.5	11.6	16.9	10.3
Switzerland	0.7	1.3	0.6	1.6	1.8	1.6	10.7	11.2	10.6
The F.Y.R.O.Macedonia		1.1			5.6			8.1	
Turkey				1					
United Kingdom			[
England and Wales	1.1	1.7	0.8	1.5	2.4	1.2	6.6	7.8	6.1
Northern Ireland	0.5	1.6	0.4	0.7	0.5	0.7	3.6	5.7	3.5
Scotland	0.7	1.1	0.6	1.1	2.1	0.9	5.1	6.1	4.9

Table 5.B.3 Persons victimised of robbery, pickpocketing and personal theft (% of surveyed population)

* See 5.A.3 for an explanation of «averaged yearly rates».

** See 5.A.2 for an explanation of the sampling method.

Relevant part of questions (for exact wording see technical information):

Robbery: «Has anyone stolen something from you by using force or threatening you, or did anybody try to steal something from you by using force or threatening force?»

Other personal theft: "Apart from theft involving force (...) have you personally been the victim of thefts?"

Pickpocketing: «Was it a case of pickpocketing?»

5.C TECHNICAL INFORMATION ON CHAPTER 5

5.C.1 Introduction

In this section, detailed information is given on the calculation of average victimisation rates, the wording of the questionnaire and the sample sizes.

5.C.2 Calculation of average victimisation rates

The figures in tables 5.A.1, 5.A.2 and 5.A.3 are average victimisation rates over the three sweeps of the survey. They were calculated as follows. In each of the sweeps, the respondents were asked if they had been the victim of a certain type of crime over the last five years. If they answered positively, they were asked the exact date of the incident. Only if the victimisation had actually occurred in the year under consideration in 1995 for the 1996 survey), was it taken into account when calculating the victimisation rate number of victims per 100 respondents) for that year. The average victimisation rates for each of the sweeps, in which a country participated; this sum was subsequently divided by the number of sweeps.

5.C.3 Wording of the questionnaire

In the victimisation surveys, the questions were worded as follows:

Theft of car, screening question: « Over the past five years have you or other members of your household had any of their cars/vans/trucks stolen? Please take your time to think about it».

Theft of car, follow up question: «First of all, you mentioned the theft of a car. When did this happen? Was this ... (this year / last year / before then / don't know / can't remember)»

Note: the event was counted in the annual victimisation rate only if the victim replied «last year» to the follow up question.

Theft from a car: «Apart from this, over the past five years have you or members of your household been the victim of a theft of a car radio, or something else which was left in your car, or theft of a part of the car, such as a car mirror or wheel?»

Theft from a car, follow up question: «The theft from your car that you mentioned, when did this happen? Was it ... (this year / last year / before then / don't know / can't remember)»

Note: the event was counted in the annual victimisation rate only if the victim replied «last year» to the follow up question.

Burglary, screening question: «Over the past five years, did anyone actually get into your house or flat without permission, and steal or try to steal something? I am not including here thefts from garages, sheds or lock-ups.»

Burglary, follow up question: «You said a burglar got into your home without permission in the last five years. When did this happen? Was it ...(this year / last year / before then / don't know / can't remember)»

Note: the event was counted in the annual victimisation rate only if the victim replied «last year» to the follow up question.

Robbery: «Next I want to ask you some questions about what may have happened to you personally. Things that you have mentioned already or which happened to other members of your household must not be mentioned now.»

«Over the past five years has anyone stolen something from you by using force or threatening you, or did anybody try to steal something from you by using force or threatening force?»

Robbery, follow up question: «The theft involving force that you mentioned, when did this happen? Was it ... (this year / last year / before then / don't know / can't remember)»

Note: the event was counted in the annual victimisation rate for robbery only if the victim replied «last year» to the follow-up question.

Other personal theft: «Apart from theft involving force there are many other types of theft of personal property, such as pickpocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, sports equipment. This can happen at one's work, at school, in a pub, on public transport, on the beach, or in the street. Over the past five years have you personally been the victim of any of these thefts?»

Other personal theft, follow up question: «The theft of personal property that you mentioned, when did this happen? Was it ...(this year / last year / before then / don't know / can't remember)»

Note: the event was counted in the annual victimisation rate for other personal theft only if the victim replied «last year» to the follow up question.

Pickpocketing, follow up question: «(The last time) were you holding or carrying what was stolen (e.g., was it a case of pickpocketing?)»

«I would like now to ask you some questions about crimes of violence of which you personally may have been the victim.»

Note: the event was counted in the annual victimisation rate for pickpocketing only if the victim replied «last year» to the first follow up question and «yes» to the second one.

Sexual assault: «First, a rather personal question. People sometimes grab, touch or assault others for sexual reasons in a really offensive way. This can happen either at home, or elsewhere, for instance in a pub, the street, at school, on public transfer, in cinemas, on the beach, or at one's workplace. Over the past five years has anyone done this to you? Please take your time to think about it.»

Sexual assault, follow up question: «You mentioned that you had been a victim of sexual offence. Could I ask you about this. When did this happen? Was it ... (this year / last year / before then / don't know / can't remember).»

Sexual assault, follow up question: «Would you describe the incident as a rape (forced intercourse), an attempted rape, an indecent assault or as just behaviour which you found offensive.»

Note: This question was put to female respondents only. The event was counted in the annual victimisation rate for sexual assault only if the victim replied «last year» to the first follow up question and «rape» to the second one.

Other assault and threat: «Apart from the incidents just covered, have you over the past five years been personally attacked or threatened by someone in a way that really frightened you, either at home or elsewhere, such as in a pub, in the street, at school, on public transport, on the beach, or at your workplace?»

Other assault and threat, follow up question: « The attack or threat that you mentioned, when did this happen? Was it ... (this year / last year / before theu / don't know / can't remember).»

Note: the event was counted in the annual victimisation rate only if the victim replied «last year» to the follow up question.

5.C.4 Sampling

In table 5.C.1, the sample sizes for each of the sweeps are indicated for the European countries which participated in at least one of the surveys. In this connection, special attention should be paid to the column sub-headings (national, urban, rural). In a number of countries smaller samples of the population were interviewed (sometimes drawn from parts of the country only), and this was mainly for financial and practical reasons; in some cases this sample was complemented by a sample from one or more rural areas.

The breakdown into urban and rural areas is based on the information the respondents provided themselves on the number of inhabitants in their respective communities. A community was considered to be urban, if the number of inhabitants was said to be 100000 or more. Only in those cases where a sample size is indicated in the column 'national', is this sample actually representative of the total population of a given country. In all other cases, the samples only represent part of the total population which lives in one or more large cities and one or more rural areas.

		coveri aumber cases			coveri number ases		Survey covering 1995 / 1996*, number of valid cases		
sample**	national	urban	rural	national	urban	rural	national	urban	rural
Albania								983	217
Austria							1507	433	1074
Belgium	2060	123	1937	1485	242	1243			
Bulgaria**	i							1076	
Croatia**								994	
Сургия									
Czech Republic ***				1262	237	1025	1801	717	1084
Denmark									
Estonia				1000	457	543	1173	364	809
Finland	1025	222	803	1655	420	1235	3830	977	2853
France	1502	347	1155				1003	199	804
Germany	5274	1523	3751					ļ	
Greece								756	
Hungary								756	
Ireland						1474			
Italy				2024	550	1474	1411	1011	400
Latvia							1176	656	520
Lithuania**							11/0	020	520
Luxembourg							1000	543	456
Malta**							1000	545	450
Moldova	2000	100	1614	2000	409	1591	2008	434	1574
Netherlands	2000 1009	386	864	2000	407	1391	2000	FCF	1374
Norway	1009	145	004	2033	666	1367	3483	1073	2410
Poland				2033	000	1507	5405	1075	2410
Portugal							1091	1000	91
Romania					1002		1091	1018	
Russia				508	21	487		1105	
Slovakia**, ***				500	1000	407	2053	1107	946
Slovenia**	2041	895	1146		1000		2055	1107	
Spain Sweden	2041	075	1140	1707	327	1380	1000	234	766
	1000	128	872	1.1.0.1	54,	1300	1000	110	890
Switzerland The F.Y.R.O.Macedonia	1000	120	072				1000	700	
Turkey United Kingdom									
England and Wales	2006	628	1378	2001	496	1505	2171	559	1612
Northern Ireland	2000	020	2000	2001			1042	262	780
Scotland	2000	484	1523				2194	353	1841
ocotiano	2007	404	1,223						

Table 5.C.1. Sample size in individual countries - ICVS sweeps of 1989, 1992, and 1996.

* The figure in the column «national» gives the size of a sample which was representative at national level. If no representative sample was drawn at national level, no figure is given in this column. The figures in the columns «urban» and «rural» indicate the number of respondents who declared that they lived in a community of 100000 or more inhabitants («urban») or less than 100000 («rural»).

** In the countries concerned the third sweep of the survey was carried out in 1997 and covered victimisation in 1996.

*** The results from the 1991 survey for Czechoslovakia were separated into information for the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. This was based upon information collected on the place of residence of each respondent.

5.D References for Chapter 5

Dijk, J.J.M. van, P. Mayhew & M. Killias, Experiences of Crime across the World; Key Findings of the 1989 International Crime Survey, Deventer, 1990, Kluwer (2nd ed. 1991)

Mayhew, P. & J.J.M. van Dijk, Criminal Victimisation in Eleven Industrialised Countries; Key findings from the 1996 International Crime Victims Survey, Den Haag, 1997, Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum

Zvekic, U. & A. Alvazzi del Frate, The International Crime (Victim) Survey in the developing world, In: Scherpenzeel, R. (ed.), Computerization in the management of the criminal Justice System; proceedings of the Workshop and the Symposion on Computerization of Criminal Justice Information at the Ninth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders; Cairo, Egypt, 29 April – 8 May 1995, 1996, HEUNI / Ministry of Justice of The Netherlands

•