

**European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice
Statistics – 2006**

241

Onderzoek en beleid

European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2006

Third edition

Marcelo Fernando Aebi

Vasilika Hysi

Kauko Aromaa

Jörg - Martin Jehle

Bruno Aubusson de Cavarlay

Martin Killias

Gordon Barclay

Paul Smit


Beata Gruszczyńska


Cynthia Tavares

Hanns von Hofer


Home Office


CESDIP
CENTRE DE RECHERCHES SOCIOLOGIQUES
SUR LE DROIT ET LES INSTITUTIONS PÉNALES


Office fédéral de la statistique
Bundesamt für Statistik
Ufficio federale di statistica
Uffizi federal da statistica
Swiss Federal Statistical Office
OFS BFS UST

 **Bju** | Boom Juridische uitgevers

Justitie 

**Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en
Documentatiecentrum**

Onderzoek en beleid

De reeks Onderzoek en beleid omvat de rapporten van onderzoek dat door en in opdracht van het WODC is verricht.

Opname in de reeks betekent niet dat de inhoud van de rapporten het standpunt van de Minister van Justitie weergeeft.

Exemplaren van dit rapport kunnen worden besteld bij het distributiecentrum van Boom Juridische uitgevers:

Boom distributiecentrum te Meppel

Tel. 0522-23 75 55

Fax 0522-25 38 64

E-mail bdc@bdc.boom.nl

Voor ambtenaren van het Ministerie van Justitie is een beperkt aantal gratis exemplaren beschikbaar.

Deze kunnen worden besteld bij:

Bibliotheek WODC, kamer KO 14

Postbus 20301, 2500 EH Den Haag

Deze gratis levering geldt echter slechts zolang de voorraad strekt.

De integrale tekst van de WODC-rapporten is gratis te downloaden van www.wodc.nl.

Op www.wodc.nl is ook nadere informatie te vinden over andere WODC-publicaties.

© 2006 WODC

Behoudens de in of krachtens de Auteurswet van 1912 gestelde uitzonderingen mag niets uit deze uitgave worden verveelvoudigd, opgeslagen in een geautomatiseerd gegevensbestand, of openbaar gemaakt, in enige vorm of op enige wijze, hetzij elektronisch, mechanisch, door fotokopieën, opnamen of enige andere manier, zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de uitgever.

Voorzover het maken van reprografische verveelvoudigingen uit deze uitgave is toegestaan op grond van artikel 16h Auteurswet 1912 dient men de daarvoor wettelijk verschuldigde vergoedingen te voldoen aan de Stichting Reprorecht (Postbus 3060, 2130 KB Hoofddorp, www.reprorecht.nl). Voor het overnemen van (een) gedeelte(n) uit deze uitgave in bloemlezingen, readers en andere compilatiewerken (art. 16 Auteurswet 1912) kan men zich wenden tot de Stichting PRO (Stichting Publicatie- en Reproductierechten Organisatie, Postbus 3060, 2130 KB Hoofddorp, www.cedar.nl/pro).

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from the publisher.

ISBN-10 90 5454 733 2

ISBN-13 978 90 5454 733 4

NUR 824

The European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2006 (third edition) was prepared by a group of experts including:

Martin Killias (chair)
Marcelo Fernando Aebi
Kauko Aromaa
Bruno Aubusson de Cavarlay
Gordon Barclay
Beata Gruszczyńska
Hanns von Hofer
Vasilika Hysi
Jörg - Martin Jehle
Paul Smit
Cynthia Tavares (secretariat)

The third edition is a partial update of the second edition¹ and covers the years 2000 – 2003

¹ European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics - 2003, second edition.
Boom Juridische Uitgevers, Den Haag, 2003
Onderzoek en beleid series, no. 212, Ministry of Justice, Research and Documentation Centre (WODC)

List of participating countries and national correspondents:

Vasilika Hysi (Albania)
Anna Margaryan (Armenia)
Arno Pilgram (Austria)
Charlotte Vanneste (Belgium)
Nikolena Tzenkova, Tsveta Doncheva (Bulgaria)
Ksenija Turkovic (Croatia)
Androula Boularan (Cyprus)
Simona Diblikova (Czech Republic)
Britta Kyvsgaard (Denmark)
Andri Ahven (Estonia)
Kauko Aromaa (Finland)
Bruno Aubusson de Cavarlay (France)
Georgi Glonti (Georgia)
Jörg-Martin Jehle (Germany)
Calliope Spinellis, George Papanicolaou, Maria Galanou (Greece)
Tibor Nagy (Hungary)
Rannveig Thorisdottir (Iceland)
Noel Sullivan, Noel Carolan (Ireland)
Uberto Gatti, Giovanni Fossa (Italy)
Algimantas Čepas (Lithuania)
No national correspondent (Luxembourg)
Joseph A. Filetti, Stefano Filetti (Malta)
Natalia Stadnic (Moldova)
Paul Smit (the Netherlands)
Beata Gruszczyńska (Poland)
Maria João Morgado Costa (Portugal)
Horia Vasilescu, Raluca Simion (Romania)
Alexander Salagaev, Alexander Shashkin (Russia)
Mario Buksa (Slovakia)
Marko Bošnjak (Slovenia)
Marcelo Fernando Aebi (Spain)
Hanns von Hofer (Sweden)
Martin Killias, Daniel Fink (Switzerland)
Olena Shostko (Ukraine)
Gordon Barclay (UK: England & Wales)
Eddie Finn, Tony Mathewson (UK: Northern Ireland)
David Signorini (UK: Scotland)

Preface

In 1993, the Council of Europe charged a Committee of Experts² with the preparation of a feasibility study concerning collection of crime and criminal justice data for Europe. There were reservations regarding the comparability of legal systems, offence definitions and data collection procedures between different countries but it was recognised that, despite similar problems (such as offence definitions and data collection procedures which may vary between U.S. States as they do between European countries), the American *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics* provides information on all the U.S. States.

The members of the Council of Europe's experts' committee decided to carry out a feasibility study by collecting data on offences and offenders recorded by the police, prosecutions, convictions and corrections through members of that Committee who had access to the data in 10 particular countries³. The report was received favourably and in 1995, the Council of Europe decided to enlarge the Committee in order to include other parts of Europe.⁴ The first official edition of the *European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics* was published by the Council of Europe in 1999. It covered 36 countries and relied on national correspondents in each country.

After the first edition, the Council of Europe was no longer able to sustain the costs of the project. The UK Home Office, the Dutch Ministry of Justice Research and Documentation Centre (WODC) and the Swiss Department of Foreign Affairs (through the University of Lausanne) appreciated the value of such a publication and a network of national correspondents. Consequently, they agreed to share the financial and other resource implications in order to produce a second edition. A smaller Committee of Experts⁵ reviewed the first edition in an attempt to improve the comparability of the figures wherever feasible. After the publication of the second edition in late 2003, several contacts were made in order to stabilize the project under a different umbrella. It turned out, however, that a new formula could not be found within reasonable time limits. In order to avoid that data become outdated, the Committee decided to publish the present (third) edition, concentrating

² Members were: Gordon Barclay and Chris Lewis (United Kingdom), Hanns von Hofer (Sweden), Jörg-Martin Jehle (Germany), Imre Kertesz (Hungary), Martin Killias (Switzerland, Chair), Max Kommer (the Netherlands), Wolfgang Rau (Council of Europe, secretary), Pierre Tournier (France).

³ France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom

⁴ New members were (in addition to the members of the original group): Marcelo F. Aebi (database administrator, Switzerland/Spain), Andri Ahven (Estonia), Bruno Aubusson de Cavarlay (France, replacing Pierre Tournier in 1998), Uberto Gatti (Italy), Zdenek Karabec (Czech Republic), Vlado Kambovski (Macedonia), Alberto Laguia Arrazola (Spain), Calliope Spinnellis (Greece), Paul Smit (the Netherlands, replacing Max Kommer in 1997).

⁵ See the list of members on page 5.

on updating trend data on offences and offenders known to the police as well as convictions and corrections. For more detailed analyses, such as sentencing patterns and alternative sanctions, the available resources did not allow for updates on the information contained in the second edition. For these – rather stable – areas, the reader will have to consult the second edition or the European Sourcebook website⁶. Finally, the website will also contain information on errors in the second edition and raw data including comments provided by our national correspondents.

The Committee wishes to thank all those who, in whatever capacity, have worked on the present as well as the former editions. First of all, our thanks go to the national correspondents⁷, to the Committee's secretary, Cynthia Tavares (Home Office), to the database administrator, Marcelo F. Aebi and to the website and publication manager Paul Smit (Dutch Ministry of Justice, WODC). Special thanks are due to the Swiss Office of Statistics who has generously granted the funds to continue the project, as well as to the Home Office and the Dutch Ministry of Justice (Research and Documentation Centre) for their continued support of, respectively, data collection and publication. Support by the bodies of Committee members who have funded travel and meeting expenses, as well as by the *Centre d'Études Sociologiques sur le Droit et les Institutions Pénales* (CESDIP) for data checking, the German Federal Ministry of Justice for their sponsorship of a conference in Berlin in 2005 and the European Commission for funding one meeting are also kindly acknowledged.

We hope that this new edition will continue to promote comparative research throughout Europe and make European experiences and data available across the world.

Lausanne, June 2006

Martin Killias, Chair

6 www.europeansourcebook.org

7 Listed on page 6.

Contents

General Introduction: The European Sourcebook Project	13
1 Police statistics	25
1.1 General comments	25
1.2 Tables	37
1.3 Technical information	76
1.4 Sources	85
2 Prosecution statistics	87
2.1 General comments	87
2.2 Future Developments	92
3 Conviction statistics	93
3.1 General comments	93
3.2 Tables	99
3.3 Technical information	119
3.4 Sources	123
4 Correctional statistics	125
4.1 General comments	125
4.2 Tables	129
4.3 Technical information	149
4.4 Sources	149
Appendix I Offence definitions	151
Appendix II Population figures	167
WODC-rapporten	169

The European Sourcebook Project

Background

1. The assessment of trends in crime and criminal justice has been a permanent concern of the Council of Europe and other international organizations. 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.
2. Against this background, the European Committee on Crime Problems (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). The Group was composed of experts from France, Germany, Hungary, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom⁸.
3. During a relatively short period, a great number of theoretical and technical issues were addressed. These issues included 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 European Sourcebook Project et cetera.
4. 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 the year 1990 for twelve European countries. Extensive technical comments were added to the tables in order to document the numerous methodological problems that are 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).
5. Thus, at its 45th plenary session in June 1996, the CDPC entrusted the Group of Specialists with the preparation of 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

⁸ The members of the Group were: Martin Killias (Switzerland), Chairman of the Group, Gordon Barclay (United Kingdom), Hanns von Hofer (Sweden), Imre Kertesz (Hungary), Max Kommer (Netherlands), Jörg-Martin Jehle (Germany), Chris Lewis (United Kingdom) and Pierre Tournier (France). HEUNI was represented by an Observer (Kristiina Kangaspunta). Secretary to the Group: Wolfgang Rau, Directorate of Legal Affairs, Council of Europe.

European Sourcebook covering, if possible, the total membership of the Council of Europe and presenting crime and criminal justice data for the years 1990 to 1996. Additional specialists in the collection of statistical data resulted in the enlargement of the Group and members were given responsibilities as ‘regional co-ordinators’.⁹

6. 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 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. These data were 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.
7. 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 data to ensure good quality.
8. The list of national correspondents is given in the beginning of this publication. Some of them have served all sweeps of this project, whereas others have joined later. They 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 Experts’ Group in their capacity as ‘regional co-ordinators’.
9. After the publication of the first edition in 1999, the Council of Europe was, unfortunately, no longer able to support the project financially. In 2000, in order to maintain continuity in a data collection effort (which was seen as important) and especially to avoid dismantling the network of correspondents (from 40 countries), the British Home Office, the Swiss Foreign Ministry (through the University of Lausanne School of Criminal Sciences) and the Dutch Ministry of Justice agreed to continue supporting the project until publication of the second edition. These three new funding agencies commissioned

9 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 replacing Max Kommer and Pierre Tournier, respectively.

a small group of experts with the work of updating the European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics¹⁰.

10. After publication of the second edition in 2003, the Swiss Federal Office of Statistics and the Dutch Ministry of Justice (WODC) offered financial and logistic support to maintain the work for the present edition. The *Centre d'Études Sociologiques sur le Droit et les Institutions Pénales* (CESDIP) kindly offered to assist in data validation procedures. The European Commission, the German Federal Ministry of Justice and the Home Office provided the funds necessary to organize one meeting each. The latter also financed secretarial support. Travelling costs of some members of the Groups were covered by their respective countries or organizations.
11. Given the modest resources and the yet uncertain perspectives of support by the European Union (and Eurostat), the Experts' Group decided to concentrate on updating time-series data as well as on improving data quality. Along with the traditional French and English versions, the questionnaire for this third edition has also been made available in Russian.
12. With the co-operation of the correspondents and thanks to the assistance by CESDIP staff¹¹, errors in the tables published in the 2003 edition were identified (see comments in individual chapters). This may considerably improve the validity of the data for comparative purposes, as former work based on the 2003 (and improvements realized at that time over the 1999 edition) suggests.
13. The Swiss Federal Office of Statistics provided financial support for the entry of the data provided by the national correspondents in the database developed by Marcelo Aebi, who produced the tables included in the Sourcebook.
14. Since 2001, the Dutch Ministry of Justice has provided the necessary resources to set up and maintain a website containing all the data published in the 1999 edition of the European Sourcebook (www.europeansourcebook.org) under the supervision of Paul Smit

¹⁰ The members of the new group of experts were: Martin Killias (Switzerland, chair), Marcelo F. Aebi (Switzerland/Spain, Database administrator), Kauko Aromaa (Finland), Bruno Aubusson de Cavarlay (France), Gordon Barclay (United Kingdom), Hanns von Hofer (Sweden), Beata Gruszczynska (Poland), Vasilika Hysi (Albania), Jörg-Martin Jehle (Germany), Paul Smit (Netherlands, website administrator), and Cynthia Tavares (United Kingdom, Secretariat). Chris Lewis (United Kingdom) also assisted with the editing of the final publication.

¹¹ By Marta Zimolag under the supervision of Bruno Aubusson de Cavarlay.

(WODC, Ministry of Justice of the Netherlands). This service has been extended to the present edition.

15. The data included in the Sourcebook have been used in different scientific publications, mainly two special issues of the *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* (issue 1, vol. 8, 2000, and issues 2-3, vol. 10, 2004).

Offence definitions

16. Comparative criminology has to face the problem of national offence definitions that are often incompatible. The Group adopted the following procedure: For all offences included in the European Sourcebook, a standard definition was used and countries were invited to follow the standard definition where possible. Offence definitions and related commentaries are given in Appendix I to this book, providing for each of the selected offences:
 - the standard definition;
 - a list of those countries that were not able to entirely meet this definition with an indication of which elements of the definition they were unable to meet. Countries not listed were able to conform to the standard definition.

The Structure of the European Sourcebook

17. Although the aim of the third European Sourcebook edition was to collect data for the period 2000 to 2003, it was clear that priority should be given, given scarce resources, to trend data where an update may be seen as more urgent, namely Tables:
 - 1.2.1.1 - 1.2.1.14 (offences recorded by the police),
 - 1.2.2.1 - 1.2.2.13 (suspected offenders),
 - 1.2.4.1 - 1.2.4.2 (police staff),
 - 3.2.1.1 - 3.2.1.13 (convicted offenders),
 - 4.2.1.1 - 4.2.1.5 (prison population, 'stock') and
 - 4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.5 (prison population, 'flow').

In addition, it was decided to update structural data that were not hard to collect (beyond the trend data already mentioned) for the year 2003, namely *percentage of minors, females, and aliens* among:

- those suspected by the police (Table 1.2.3.1 - 1.2.3.3),
- convicted (Table 3.2.2.1 - 3.2.2.3), or
- detained (Table 4.2.3.1 - 4.2.3.4).

18. It was clearly a difficult decision to exclude time-series data for sanctions/measures, as well as other longitudinal data; however the Group felt that this decision was sensible as legal rules on sanctions, sentencing practices and criminal justice resources change rather slowly over time. For the complete time-series from 1990, the reader will need to look at the first and the second editions of the European Sourcebook, published in 1999 and 2003.

19. The chapters are, in general, subdivided in four sections:

1. General comments
2. Tables
3. Technical information
4. Sources

20. The European Sourcebook is divided into five chapters:

A. *Police data* (offences and suspected offenders recorded by the police and police staff). This chapter provides information on the volume of crime and the number of suspected offenders in each country. Most of the data are available as time-series data for 2000-2003. Detailed information on the sex, age group, and nationality of the offender is provided for the year 2003.

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 included are identical to the ones used in the second edition of the Sourcebook:

- a. Total offences, *of which* traffic violations which are punishable as offences (traffic violations were thus excluded)
- b. Homicide *of which* completed homicide (according to police and vital statistics)
- c. Assault
- d. Rape
- e. Robbery
- f. Theft *of which* theft of motor vehicle *of which* burglary *of which* domestic burglary
- g. Drug offences *of which* drug trafficking

B. *Prosecution statistics*. The statistical data in this chapter have not been updated.

C. *Conviction statistics*. The tables in this chapter concern persons who have been convicted, i.e. found guilty according to law, of having committed one of the selected offences. Information is presented by

offence for the years 2000 to 2003 and detailed information by sex, age group, and nationality of the offender is provided for the year 2003. The present edition does not include an update on the sentencing information included in the first two editions of the Sourcebook.

- D. *Correctional statistics.* The content of this chapter has been shortened considerably compared with earlier Sourcebook editions. It no longer includes data on the number and the capacity of penal institutions; data on expenditure; nor data describing the stock and flow of the execution of non-custodial sentences. It contains data on 'stock' and 'flow' of prison populations for the years 2000-2003, including percentages of pre-trial detainees, females, minors and foreigners. It also includes data on convicted population by offence in 2003.
- E. *Survey data.* The 2005 International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) has not been made public at the time this document went to print. Therefore, the reader will need to look up in the 2003 edition where the data from the 1992, 1996, and 2000 sweeps have been used.

Methodological issues

Data recording methods

- 21. 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.

Validation

- 22. 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. Notably deviations from figures published in the previous editions were scrutinized. It then produced a series of check-tables to further assist validation. The function of these tables was:
 - A. To check arithmetical coherence in the tables. It turned out that this was not always the case.
 - B. To compare figures and to ensure that they were consistent with those given in other sections of the European Sourcebook questionnaire.

- C. 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.
23. This procedure resulted in the need to go back 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 edition. 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. This is particularly true for the way attempts are classified in police statistics. As a rule, attempts are included in all offences throughout the European Sourcebook, although the proportion of attempts differs between offences and countries. For example, an aggression or threat will usually be counted as assault, injury or threat, whereas the police e.g. in the Netherlands classify such incidents relatively often as attempted murder. This not only substantially increases the overall rate of murder (i.e. including attempts), but also affects the severity of dispositions since sentences tend to be shorter for attempts than for completed offences. A similar difficulty arises from the treatment of minors who, in some countries and at some stages of the criminal procedure, are included in statistics, whereas they are not in others.
24. In some cases it was possible to correct the data. However, despite the considerable efforts made by the Group to detect errors and inconsistencies in the data, not all of these may have been identified; nor was it possible to deal with all errors and inconsistencies in a fully satisfactory way.
25. The year 2000 is covered by both the second and the present editions of the Sourcebook. In some cases, there are differences in these data. In principle, data included in the present edition should be considered as more accurate. Usually, the reason for these differences was that the data for the year 2000 of the second edition were provisional as the questionnaire had been sent a few months after the end of that year. Likewise, data for 2003 in the present edition – which were collected in 2004-5 – could sometimes also be provisional.

26. In the course of the data validation process, a certain number of errors in the previous edition have been discovered. Readers will find a list of amendments on the website (www.europeansourcebook.org).

Presentational details

27. In order to increase the clarity of the present report, the Group took the following practical decisions:
- A. To make all raw data and all comments available in a separate document through the website www.europeansourcebook.org. Thus, the present document contains only a selection of all the data and commentaries submitted.
 - B. To eliminate, in general, tables where the number of reporting countries was very small.
 - C. To use decimals sparingly so as to avoid the impression of false precision. However, increases and decreases have been computed taking decimals into account.
 - D. To use the English notation for figures. The decimal marker is represented by a 'point' (i.e. 1.5 means one and a half). The thousand marker is represented by a 'space' (i.e. 1 500 means one thousand five hundred).
 - E. To translate comments (although left in the original language in the database that can be accessed through the European Sourcebook website)
 - F. To use the following symbols throughout the tables:
 - a) '0' to indicate a number between 0 and 0.4;
 - b) '...' to indicate that data is not (yet) available or that the question / concept as used in the European Sourcebook questionnaire does not apply;
 - c) '> 1000' to indicate that the percentage change between 2000 and 2003 is above one thousand per cent.
 - G. To condense the vast amount of technical information on definitions, data collection methods, processing rules et cetera into clearly arranged summary tables, listings and footnotes.
 - H. 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 at the end of the publication.
 - I. To use the term 'Eastern European countries' to refer to countries in Eastern Europe that formerly had a communist or socialist regime and were allied with the former USSR (except for the former German Democratic Republic which is included in the Western Europe). For all the remaining countries we use the term 'Western

European countries'. Also, the term 'Common Law system countries' is used to indicate Ireland and the UK countries.

- J. To use the following measures throughout the tables to provide information on the data dispersion:

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.

Median: The median is the score that divides the distribution of scores into two exact halves.

Minimum: The lowest score in the table.

Maximum: The highest score in the table.

Percentage change 2000-2003 (based upon unrounded scores).

Comparability

28. The basic aim of the European Sourcebook data collection is 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 2nd edition, Chapter 5).
29. There can be no doubt that international comparisons based on official statistics give rise to delicate problems. 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 purpose the data are intended to serve should determine whether or not they are suitable as a basis for analysis.
30. Comparative analyses generally fall into one of three categories: (A) distributive comparisons, (B) level comparisons and, (C) trend comparisons.

- A. *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?
 - B. 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?
 - C. In contrast, interpretations of *trends* deal with such questions as: Did the increase in rape offences differ over time in various countries?
31. 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: (a) *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; (b) *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 (c) *statistical circumstances* such as the formal data collection and processing rules and their practical implementation.
32. 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.
33. In order to facilitate the use of the data contained in this European 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 3 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.

Basic rules on how to use the statistical information contained in the Sourcebook

1. Do not use any figures from the Sourcebook without referring to the footnotes and the technical information provided in 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.
4. 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.

1 Police statistics

1.1 General comments

1.1.1 *Police statistics as a measure of crime*

1. This chapter provides information on offences recorded by the police, the number and characteristics of suspected offenders and the number of police staff.
2. Police statistics are collected in every country but for several reasons they do not always provide a good measure of crime.
3. Firstly, victims may choose not to report the crime to the police or may not be aware that they have been a victim of crime. In addition, reporting may be self-incriminating (e.g. when a victim is also an offender) or humiliating; or the victim may think that nothing will be gained by reporting (e.g. the victim does not think that the police will be able to solve the burglary or return the stolen goods). If a victim does not report a crime and the police do not learn about the offence from another source, the offence will not be recorded and therefore not counted in police statistics. Research suggests that assault and rapes tend to be less reported than property offences.
4. Even when a crime is reported to the police, it might not be recorded in the official statistics. This occurs mainly after official enquiries, which lead the police to believe that the event reported did not actually constitute a crime. Research has shown that recording is less complete for offences against the person than for property offences.
5. Not all crimes are reported by a victim or witness. The police themselves may report some violent crimes, for example homicide (a dead body is found), and 'victimless' offences (i.e. offences against rules and regulations, such as illegal possession of arms, drunk driving and most drug offences).
6. Readers should be aware that petty offences are not always recorded in police statistics. Also, countries differ in the way they consider certain offences as petty (e.g. theft of small value).
7. In assessing national differences, comparisons with other data sources, such as survey measures of crime provided by the International Crime Victimization Survey, are equally helpful. The results of such comparisons suggest that both data sources catch international differences rather accurately, although the absolute volume of crime, as indicated by both sources, may differ for reasons

which may be hard to explain¹². Therefore, the data contained in this document should not be used for country by country (level) comparisons.

1.1.2 *The position of the police in the criminal justice system*

8. In most countries the police can be regarded as the first stage of the criminal justice process. However, this does not mean that the figures on recorded crime such as those in this chapter give an accurate account of the total input to the criminal justice system. This is because, in a number of countries, the prosecuting authorities may initiate criminal proceedings without receiving a police report. For example, in some Eastern European countries serious violent offences will not always be recorded by the police but by the public prosecutor's office. Also, 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. Nevertheless, most of the offences covered by the Sourcebook will be reported to or detected by the police.
9. The position of the police in the criminal justice system may also directly influence the number of offences recorded and their classification. This is firstly because, in some countries the police may be quite independent in its activities, whilst in others they may work under the close supervision of the prosecutor or the court. Secondly, the police may have the power to 'label' the incidents that they investigate as specific offences, or this may be done by the prosecutor. This difference may also have consequences for the relative distribution of the various types of offences dealt with in the Sourcebook.
10. When looking at police staff, 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 substantial differences exist between countries in the tasks that the police carry out. For example, in most countries the police deal with traffic offences like drunk 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 various situations (from providing information to rendering first

¹² Marcelo F. Aebi, Martin Killias, Cynthia Tavares, (2002). 'Comparing Crime Rates: International Crime (Victim) Surveys, the European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics, and Interpol Statistics', *International Journal of Comparative Criminology* 2/1, 22-37.

aid). This might not apply, however, to all types of police or related agencies, which have been included in the tables on police staff. Therefore, care should be taken when relating police resources to the volume of recorded crime or the number of suspected offenders.

1.1.3 *Counting offences and offenders*¹³

11. As well as problems of classification (e.g. is a dead body found in the road a victim of traffic accident, an assault, a murder or one who died of natural causes?) other issues need to be considered when examining police statistics.
 - The first is the point in time at which the offence was recorded in the statistics. This relates to whether it was following an initial report ('input' statistic) or following 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). Therefore, an awareness of whether the offences committed were counted separately or whether a principal offence rule was applied (i.e. only counting the most serious offence) is essential. In addition, in relation to serial or continuous offending, issues such as whether a gang rape is counted as one rape or several, are important, as is a report of domestic violence experienced over a period of time, and whether this represents one offence or several offences.
12. Similar problems arise in connection with the counting of offenders. In most countries, a person will only be classed as an offender if his or her guilt has been proven and this verdict is usually the end-result of a judicial process. Therefore, at police level, it is common practice to speak of 'suspects' or 'suspected offenders' but this introduces new problems such as the point in time at which it is appropriate to record a person as a suspected offender. Again, major differences between countries exist and practices range from recording a person as a 'suspected offender' as soon as the police are reasonably convinced that is the case (perhaps even before questioning), to recording a person as a 'suspect' only after the prosecutor has started criminal proceedings.

1.1.4 *Counting police officers*

13. European countries organise their police systems in different ways. Most of them have more than one police force, e.g. state police,

¹³ Aebi, Marcelo F. (submitted for publication). *Measuring the influence of statistical counting rules on cross-national differences in recorded crime*. Paper presented at the 2nd Conference of the European Society of Criminology (Toledo, 4-7 September 2002).

communal police, municipal police, gendarmerie or judicial police, all of which perform tasks in connection with the offences under consideration in this Sourcebook although some also undertake military duties (e.g. gendarmerie). 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 within 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, the national correspondents were asked to use a standard definition for 'police officer' which includes criminal police, traffic police, border police, gendarmerie and uniformed police but excludes customs police, tax police, military police, secret service police, part-time officers, police reserves, cadet police officers and court police (see tables 1.3.3.1 - 1.3.3.2). It should also be recalled that many European countries have seen a considerable increase in the private security industry over the last few years and this increase itself can have considerable influence on the counting of crime (e.g. the increase of private security guards and doormen can lead to a fall in the counts of crime in retail shops and clubs as some guards may deal with crime themselves by banning offenders from their premises).¹⁴

1.1.5 Results

Definitions and counting rules

15. Police statistics for offences are available for thirty-seven European countries. All countries could give data, with some possible deviation from the standard definition, for homicide, assault, rape, robbery, total theft, drug offences, and total offences. However, problems arose for motor vehicle theft, burglary, domestic burglary and drug trafficking. Variations from the standard definition are important when comparing levels of recorded crime among European countries. These variations are listed at the end of this Sourcebook (Appendix II) and the most significant are repeated within comments by offences.
16. Four countries reported not to have written counting rules (i.e. rules regulating the way in which the data shown in this table are recorded). For the other countries however, it should be kept in mind that the existence of counting rules is not a guarantee for consistency, but rather a stimulus.

¹⁴ For a discussion of the growth of the private security industry in the UK see Crawford, A. (2004) The pattern of policing in the UK: policing beyond the police, in: Newburn, T. *Handbook of Policing*, Willan Publishing, Cullompton, UK, 136-168.

17. The point at which the data are recorded also varies between countries. For example, in relation to the recording of total criminal offences, only nineteen countries reported that offences were recorded (immediately) when the offence was first reported to the police. Seven countries reported that recording is done subsequently, ten that recording takes place 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, whilst 'after investigation' seems to indicate that the labelling 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 offences such as homicide and assault. For England & Wales and Northern Ireland the introduction of the new National Recording Standards in April 2002 by which crimes are recorded when police first attend an incident rather than following an initial investigation, has meant that percentage changes from 2000-3 cannot be included (except for homicide).
18. The rules for recording both multiple and serial offences vary between countries. For example, with total criminal offences, sixteen countries stated that they applied a principal offence rule and twenty that they did not. In addition, multiple offences are counted as two or more offences in fifteen countries but as one offence in seventeen countries (the situation was uncertain or related to the type of offence in five countries). (For details refer to paragraphs 1.3.1 and 1.3.2).
19. Whilst thirty-three countries answered the question on the number of police officers, very few were able to meet the standard definition for these figures (for details refer to Tables 1.3.3.1. and 1.3.3.2).

General comments

20. For the total criminal offences at police level, differences in levels were substantial (even when traffic offences are removed). This partly reflects technical differences in the offences which are included or excluded and the point at which the statistics are recorded. Moreover, trends for total criminal offences cover quite different situations as regards the type of offences, since many countries limit their crime count to only a small group of offences. Wide variations were found in traffic offences recorded with many Eastern European countries, showing very low levels (Georgia 13 per 100 000 population and Moldova 5) compared with Finland (3 285) and Greece (1 847). Such variations are more likely to reflect differences in the way traffic offences are dealt with than differences in the number of offences committed.

21. Trends in both recorded crime and suspected offenders over the years 2000–3 vary from one type of offence to another. For a particular type, in several central and eastern European countries, trends are quite different from those observed in other countries. These variations may not necessarily reflect actual increases or decreases in the rates under consideration, but could also be the result of improvements in data collection or important changes in the legal definition of offences.
22. For Tables 1.2.3.1 to 1.2.3.3 (percentage of female, minor and alien suspected offenders) there was a wide variation between countries which could not be easily explained. However, for all offences and countries, the proportion of female offenders lay below 30%.
23. The highest proportions of suspected minor offenders (persons under 18) were found for domestic burglary, theft of motor vehicles and robbery and the lowest for homicide and traffic offences.
24. Only half of the total number of countries were able to provide figures on the percentage of suspected offenders who were aliens as, in practice, the nationality or ethnic origin of the suspected offender is not always recorded in the relevant statistics.

1.1.6 Comments by offence

Homicide

25. Homicide rates vary significantly between countries, even when attempted homicide is excluded. Other variations in definitions (for instance thirteen countries excluded assault leading to death) may influence homicide rates but do not explain these differences by themselves. In 2003, the highest rates of completed homicide were observed in Albania, Estonia, Lithuania and the Ukraine (more than 8 per 100 000) and the lowest in Austria, Iceland and Malta (fewer than 1 per 100 000). For over half of the countries, these rates decreased during the period 2000-3. No underlying increase was observed. Comparisons with health statistics based upon death registration show wide variations in many countries which relate in part to the point of recording but also data quality problems, which are currently being investigated by the United Nations and the World Health Organisation.
26. The highest proportion of suspected female offenders for completed homicide in 2003 was found in France (17%), Hungary (23%) and Slovenia (20%). The overall proportion of suspected minor offenders was smaller than for all other offences with a maximum of 16% (Slovenia). However, these only reflect a small number of suspected

offenders and in countries such as Malta and Iceland the results must be excluded when analysing the data.

Assault

27. Assaults vary widely in definition, with five countries including threats, twelve including assaults that only caused pain or slapping or punching. In addition, Croatia included sexual assault. It was also evident that several Eastern European countries counted some cases as public order offences rather than as assaults at police level. Rather low levels of assault rates in some countries may also be explained by the fact that a complaint from the victim is a condition for recording the case.
28. However, it is difficult to adequately explain the big differences between countries for assault rates in relation to these definition problems. For example, in principle, countries where 'only causing pain' and 'slapping/punching' were included in the definition of assault should have high rates of assault, as is the case for Finland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, England and Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland. However, exceptions to this rule were evident in Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Ireland, and Latvia. In contrast, Belgium has a high rate without recording minor assaults. Differences in the rules for counting multiple assaults where they are counted as two or more offences may also be important here. The result is a distribution of countries where low and the high rates are more frequent than rates in the middle. Unfortunately it is not possible to compare only serious assaults from the available data.
29. Trends for assault rates between 2000 and 2003 are not uniform and seem to be increasing in countries where rates are already high (more than 100 per 100 000). In contrast, in countries where rates are already low, they appear to be decreasing. Both the proportion of suspected female offenders and suspected minors were, overall, lower than for completed homicide, although more data were available for offenders suspected of assault. The involvement of females and minors in offences of violence are higher than in the previous survey (1999) in most countries.

Rape

30. Rape statistics are affected by the deviation from the standard definition proposed in the questionnaire, with twenty-five countries showing such deviation. But many countries reported some changes in legal definition of rape leading to more compliance with the standard definition (inclusion of violent intra-marital sexual intercourse).

31. According to the mean and median, rape offences recorded by the police increased consistently between 2000 and 2003. However, just as can be seen for assault, rates in twenty-three countries are increasing (with fifteen showing rates equal to or above the median in 2003), rates in ten countries are decreasing (all under the median with the exception of Finland). However, as stated previously, changes may reflect differences in reporting practices with action being taken in all countries to improve the reporting of violence against women.
32. In some countries females are counted among the offenders suspected of having committed rape offences (eight countries reported figures of one percent or more). The most likely explanation is that suspected female offenders acted as accomplices in rape incidents. The proportion of minor suspects varied considerably between countries and was on average slightly lower than for most offences but slightly higher than for assault and homicide. However, this may reflect the fact that some countries included sexual intercourse with a minor without force in their rape statistics.

Robbery

33. The differences in levels between countries are still important and may reflect variation in definition of robbery (seven countries excluded muggings – bag snatching – and five excluded theft immediately with violence). However, their distribution around the mean or the median is more concentrated. In 2003, five countries had a rate above 150 per 100 000; fourteen countries below 150 and above the median; another sixteen were below the median but above 10 per 100 000, and three were under 10.
34. Between 2000 and 2003, there was an increase in recorded robbery in twenty-one countries. There was an increase of more than 30% in seven countries and an increase of more than 50% in Croatia, Cyprus, and Slovakia. For some countries, the increase occurred mainly at the end of the period. However, in Albania and Moldova there was a reduction of about 40%.
35. There was a low proportion of females but a high proportion of minors (the highest proportion after theft of a motor vehicle). Both proportions show an increase over those found in 1999.

Theft

36. All theft (except robbery) is, in principle, included in this category. Differences between countries cannot be explained totally by a variation in offence definition. Even for the five countries where

thefts of small value are included, their exclusion does not produce a very significant reduction in the level of theft. This may be due to the fact that in some countries where theft of small value is, in principle, included, only cases prosecuted after a formal complaint are counted.

37. Variations in theft rates (from 50 per 100 000 in Albania to over 7 000 per 100 000 in Sweden in 2003) can be related to a ratio calculated by dividing the number of offenders by the number of offences. This ratio is different from the clearance rate but depends on it, as the higher the clearance rate, the higher this ratio is. It appears to be high for countries with a low rate of theft registered by the police (Albania, Armenia, Moldova, Romania). In contrast, several countries with a low ratio of offenders/ offences have a high rate for theft (France, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, England and Wales). This could mean that, in some countries, either victims do not register theft with the police when they do not know the offender or the police do not necessarily record it.
38. In the majority of countries, there is no clear trend for the period 2000-2003 with an increase in fourteen countries for the year 2003.
39. A relatively high percentage of female offenders is recorded for theft. This would be even higher if motor vehicle theft and burglary were excluded. The high percentages of minors are probably related to vehicle theft.

Theft of a motor vehicle theft

40. The differences in levels between countries can be related to the definition of these offences. For example, at least eight countries did not include joyriding, whereas many countries included only joyriding or an equivalent offence (vehicle theft being included within total theft). In addition, some countries mentioned that data referred to all vehicles (including bicycles) and other countries that it referred to cars only. The number of offences is also dependant on the number of vehicle owners.
41. The rates for motor vehicle theft decreased during the period 2000-3 in twenty-three countries with Albania as the only country with a substantial increase (46%).
42. The proportion of females among offenders was low (under 10%), whereas the proportion of minors was high (mean value of 25% for those countries where data were available).

Burglary

43. The concept of burglary varies widely between countries. For example, some countries adopt a relatively narrow definition whereas others apply the (continental law) concept of aggravated theft. Thirteen countries include theft from a car as burglary. Definitions for domestic burglary show also significant variations with four countries excluding theft from a secondary residence and seven others excluding theft from an attic or basement in a multi-dwelling building.
44. For total burglary and domestic burglary a majority of countries reported a decrease in rates for many countries, the largest overall fall being between 2002-3.
45. The overall proportion of females amongst the suspected offenders was relatively low, while that of minors was relatively high.

Drug offences

46. From the thirty-six countries that provided figures for total drug offences only twenty-seven provided figures for drug trafficking. The proportion of drug trafficking in the total figures varies widely between countries reflecting whether non-trafficking offences were included. For Russia, drug trafficking represents about 96% of the total drug offences and for the Netherlands the total figure refers to drug trafficking only. Spain provided figures for drug trafficking only, not total drug offences.
47. Belgium, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland and Scotland have the highest rates for total drug offences. However, in many countries drug trafficking accounts for less than 30% (e.g. 3% for Germany). The main differences come from the inclusion or exclusion of offences linked to personal use in the total drug offences and/or in drug trafficking.
48. The proportion of suspected female offenders is relatively high in comparison with other offences (except total theft) and the proportion of minors is relatively low.

Trends

50. Table 1a summarises trends (i.e. percentage changes between 2000 and 2003) in police data by types of offences. Its purpose is to give a general view of differences in trends for each offence; it should not be used to examine changes in specific offences for particular countries.

Table 1.a Trends in police data (percentage change of the rates between 2000 and 2003)

	Homicide		Assault	Rape	Robbery	Theft	Drug Offences				
	Total	Complete					Total Theft	Motor Vehicle Theft	Burglary		Total
			Total	Domestic Burglary							
Albania	-	0	-	-	-	+	+	...	0	--	...
Armenia	-	-	0	0	0	-	-	...	0	-	-
Austria	-	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	0	+	+
Belgium	+	0	0	0	0	0	-	...	-	-	-
Bulgaria	-	-	+	0	+	-	-	-	...	++	...
Croatia	-	-	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	-
Cyprus	++	+	0	++	+	+	+	++	...	+	...
Czech Republic	-	...	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-
Denmark	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	+
Estonia	0	0	--	+	--	0	0	...	0	-	++
Finland	0	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	+	...
France	0	0	+	+	+	0	-	0	+	+	+
Georgia	0	+	+	-	+	+	++	+	+
Germany	-	-	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	0	-
Greece	-	-	0	0	+	0	...	0	...	+	...
Hungary	0	+	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	0
Iceland	--	--	-	+	+	+
Ireland	0	+	++	+	0	+	-	+	+	-	+
Italy	0	0	0	+	0	0	-	...	-	0	...
Lithuania	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	...	0	+	...
Luxembourg	0	-	+	+	+	+	-	0	0	-	+
Malta	+	--	+	-	+	0	-	+	-	-	...
Moldova	-	...	-	+	-	-	+	...
Netherlands	0	...	+	0	0	0	-	0	...	++	...
Poland	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	++	-
Portugal	...	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	-	+
Romania	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Russia	0	...	+	0	+	-	+	...	-	-	-
Slovakia	0	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	-
Slovenia	-	-	-	-	-	+	...	0	-	-	-
Spain	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Sweden	0	+	0	0	-	0	0	+	0
Switzerland	+	0	+	+	+	+	-	+	0	0	0
Ukraine	...	-	...	0	0	+	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	+	0	0	+	0	-	-	-	-	+	0

Note:

-- : decrease of 50% or more

- : decrease of [50, 10%]

o : decrease or increase of less than 10%

+ : increase of [10, 100%]

++ : increase of more than 100%

1.1.7 Police staff

51. The number of police officers (excluding civilians) per 100 000 population (hereafter referred to as police density) in 2003 varied between 150 and 1 150. In summary Table 1.b, the distribution over five density categories is given.

Table 1.b Number of police officers (excluding civilians) per 100 000 population (police density) in 2003

Under 200	200-299	300-399	400-499	500 and over
Denmark	Estonia	Albania	Croatia	Cyprus
Finland	Hungary	Austria	Czech Republic	Georgia
Sweden	Iceland	Belgium	Greece	Russia (2000)
	the Netherlands	France	Italy	
	Poland	Ireland	Portugal	
	Romania	Lithuania	Northern Ireland	
	Switzerland	Slovakia		
	England and Wales	Slovenia		
	Luxembourg	Scotland		

52. Twelve countries had a police density below 300 and sixteen between 300 and 500. Densities of more than 500 are found in Cyprus (531), Georgia (1 140) and Russia (1 213). Overall there does not seem to be a clear relationship between police density and the level of recorded crime.

53. Fifteen countries were unable to give data for civilian employees within police. For other countries, there were some differences in the ratio of police officers/civilian employees. This proportion was under 10% in four countries and over 20% in twelve countries. The highest use of civilians was in England & Wales (33%).

Table 1.c Percentage of police staff (officers and civilians) who were civilians

Under 10%	10-19%	20-29%	Over 30%
Cyprus	Belgium	Croatia	England & Wales
France	Ireland	Czech Republic	
Portugal	Lithuania	Denmark	
Romania	Luxembourg	Estonia	
	Poland	Finland	
	Slovenia	Hungary	
		the Netherlands	
		Sweden	
		Switzerland	
		Northern Ireland	
		Scotland	

1.2 Tables

1.2.1 Offences per 100 000 population

Table 1.2.1.1 Offences per 100 000 population – Criminal offences: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R11TC00	R11TC01	R11TC02	R11TC03	2000-2003
Albania	150	122	142	165	10
Armenia	396	379	401	369	-7
Austria	6 906	6 428	7 260	7 881	14
Belgium	9 747	9 481	9 886	9 784	0
Bulgaria	1 773	1 769	1 780	1 729	-2
Croatia	1 550	2 197	2 273	2 424	56
Cyprus	575	592	622	944	64
Czech Republic	3 812	3 494	3 630	3 490	-8
Denmark	9 447	8 837	9 145	9 013	-5
Estonia	4 189	4 270	3 918	3 968	-5
Finland	10 259	9 964	10 017	10 343	1
France	6 352	6 808	6 865	6 605	4
Georgia	253	330	352	369	46
Germany	7 622	7 734	7 902	7 976	5
Greece	3 496	4 153	4 409	4 158	19
Hungary	4 446	4 607	4 173	4 110	-8
Iceland	6 613	6 512	6 735	6 018	-9
Ireland	1 933	2 259	2 743	2 634	36
Italy	3 822	3 741	3 852	4 236	11
Lithuania	2 254	2 174	1 999	2 352	4
Luxembourg	5 200	5 092	5 778	5 728	10
Malta	4 364	4 065	4 326	4 489	3
Moldova	864	854	819	697	-19
Netherlands	8 207	8 476	8 825	8 530	4
Poland	3 278	3 597	3 635	3 799	16
Portugal	3 515	3 583	3 753	3 983	13
Romania	1 576	1 518	1 393	1 237	-21
Russia	2 012	2 033	1 739	1 906	-5
Slovakia	1 645	1 722	1 985	2 067	26
Slovenia	3 363	3 719	3 839	3 810	13
Spain	2 307	2 534	2 582	2 377	3
Sweden	13 615	13 304	13 790	13 995	3
Switzerland	3 729	3 775	4 184	4 481	20
Ukraine	1 159	1 061	958	1 188	3
UK: England & Wales	9 917	10 552	11 220	11 241	...
UK: Northern Ireland	7 125	8 275	8 399	7 515	...
UK: Scotland	9 912	9 879	10 032	9 639	-3
Mean	4 524	4 592	4 740	4 736	
Median	3 729	3 741	3 852	3 983	
Minimum	150	122	142	165	
Maximum	13 615	13 304	13 790	13 995	

**Table 1.2.1.2 Offences per 100 000 population – Criminal offences:
Traffic offences**

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R11TT00	R11TT01	R11TT02	R11TT03	2000-2003
Albania
Armenia	19	21	19	17	-9
Austria	571	468	481	478	-16
Belgium
Bulgaria	28	28	27	38	37
Croatia	58	59	57	61	4
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	155	133	157	192	24
Finland	2 795	2 993	2 994	3 285	18
France
Georgia	12	12	13	13	9
Germany
Greece	1 408	1 885	2 091	1 847	31
Hungary	193	193	214	200	4
Iceland
Ireland	1	2	1	1	-18
Italy
Lithuania	51	112	124	88	72
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	4	5	5	5	32
Netherlands	741	751	809	867	17
Poland	51	359	422	437	750
Portugal	285	316	345	394	38
Romania	97	108	103	96	0
Russia	36	37	39	37	3
Slovakia	76	49	53	55	-28
Slovenia
Spain	76	64	61	55	-28
Sweden	833	817	844	853	2
Switzerland
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland	13	12	21	28	...
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	357	401	423	431	...
<i>Median</i>	76	108	103	88	...
<i>Minimum</i>	1	2	1	1	...
<i>Maximum</i>	2 795	2 993	2 994	3 285	...

Table 1.2.1.3 Offences per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R11HO00	R11HO01	R11HO02	R11HO03	2000-2003
Albania	17.5	14.9	11.7	12.6	-28
Armenia	4.2	4.0	3.6	3.7	-12
Austria	2.3	1.9	2.1	1.8	-24
Belgium	6.5	7.2	7.7	8.4	28
Bulgaria	6.5	6.2	5.5	5.3	-18
Croatia	6.7	6.1	6.0	5.3	-21
Cyprus	1.5	2.0	1.0	3.5	141
Czech Republic	2.7	2.3	2.3	2.3	-17
Denmark	4.0	3.7	3.9	4.1	4
Estonia	13.7	12.0	11.4	12.4	-9
Finland	9.8	10.7	10.2	9.2	-6
France	3.9	4.2	4.3	3.9	0
Georgia	9.6	10.5	10.4	10.6	10
Germany	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.4	-11
Greece	2.7	2.6	2.2	2.3	-13
Hungary	3.5	4.0	3.6	3.8	7
Iceland	1.8	2.1	1.7	0.3	-81
Ireland	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	-7
Italy	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9	0
Lithuania	10.9	10.4	8.6	10.3	-6
Luxembourg	13.9	11.2	13.5	12.9	-7
Malta	2.1	3.1	4.3	3.3	60
Moldova	9.3	9.3	9.0	7.6	-19
Netherlands	10.9	11.0	11.2	11.4	5
Poland	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.0	-20
Portugal
Romania	5.7	6.1	5.4	5.1	-11
Russia	21.7	23.0	22.2	21.9	1
Slovakia	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.7	2
Slovenia	4.0	3.2	3.9	2.9	-28
Spain	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.2	9
Sweden
Switzerland	2.2	2.4	2.9	2.5	13
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	3.0	3.3	3.5	3.3	...
UK: Northern Ireland	10.2	12.8	16.5	9.0	...
UK: Scotland	13.7	15.6	17.8	16.2	18
<i>Mean</i>	6.6	6.6	6.6	6.3	
<i>Median</i>	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.9	
<i>Minimum</i>	1.4	1.4	1.0	0.3	
<i>Maximum</i>	21.7	23.0	22.2	21.9	

Table 1.2.1.4 Offences per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide: Completed

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change 2000-2003
	R11HC00	R11HC01	R11HC02	R11HC03	
Albania	7.9	9.0	6.6	8.5	8
Armenia	3.0	2.9	2.3	2.5	-15
Austria	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.6	-39
Belgium	2.0	2.3	2.2	1.8	-8
Bulgaria	3.9	3.6	3.2	3.0	-22
Croatia	2.5	2.0	1.9	1.8	-30
Cyprus	1.1	0.9	0.3	1.8	72
Czech Republic
Denmark	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.2	9
Estonia	10.4	10.0	10.3	10.9	5
Finland	3.4	3.6	3.1	2.6	-25
France	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.0	-5
Georgia	5.8	6.2	6.3	6.4	11
Germany	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.3	-19
Greece	1.5	1.3	1.0	1.1	-23
Hungary	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.3	12
Iceland	1.8	0.4	1.4	0.0	-100
Ireland	1.0	1.4	1.4	1.1	11
Italy	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.3	-7
Lithuania	10.1	9.7	8.1	9.5	-6
Luxembourg	0.9	1.3	0.9	0.7	-28
Malta	1.0	1.3	1.3	0.0	-100
Moldova
Netherlands	1.4	1.6	1.3	1.4	...
Poland	2.5	2.0	1.9	1.7	-32
Portugal	2.4	2.7	2.5	2.6	8
Romania	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.5	-5
Russia
Slovakia	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.4	-11
Slovenia	1.8	0.7	1.4	1.0	-42
Spain	1.2	1.3	...	1.2	0
Sweden
Switzerland	0.9	1.2	1.2	1.0	4
Ukraine	9.8	9.4	8.9	8.5	-14
UK: England & Wales	1.6	1.7	2.0	1.6	...
UK: Northern Ireland	2.9	3.1	2.7	1.9	...
UK: Scotland	2.1	2.1	2.5	2.1	-2
<i>Mean</i>	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7	
<i>Median</i>	2.0	2.1	2.0	1.8	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.9	0.4	0.3	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	10.4	10.0	10.3	10.9	

Table 1.2.1.5 Offences per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide according to health statistics

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change 2000-2002
Albania	4.2	7.2
Armenia	2.3	1.8	2.2	...	-6.1
Austria	0.9	0.9	0.9	...	-7.6
Belgium
Bulgaria	3.5	3.1	2.9	...	-19.5
Croatia	2.6	2.0	2.0	...	-23.7
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.0	1.3	1.3	...	32.3
Denmark
Estonia	21.2	15.2	11.7	...	-44.8
Finland	2.6	3.0	2.6	...	-2.7
France	0.9
Georgia	3.3	3.9
Germany	0.7	0.7
Greece	1.1	1.1
Hungary	2.5	2.4	2.4	...	-6.3
Iceland	2.1	0.7
Ireland	1.0	1.0
Italy	1.0	1.0
Lithuania	9.9	10.2	7.1	...	-27.5
Luxembourg	1.6	2.0	1.8	...	12.6
Malta	1.0	2.3	1.3	...	22.3
Moldova
Netherlands	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.2	6.2
Poland	2.1	1.7	1.8	...	-14.5
Portugal	0.9	1.3	1.8	...	86.2
Romania	3.6	3.5	3.7	...	1.7
Russia
Slovakia	2.2
Slovenia	1.1	0.8	1.4	...	26.1
Spain	1.0	1.0
Sweden	1.0	1.0
Switzerland
Ukraine	10.9	12.6	11.9	...	9.1
UK: England & Wales	0.7	0.7	0.7	...	-1.4
UK: Northern Ireland	3.3	1.2	1.6	...	-51.7
UK: Scotland	1.8	1.8	2.3	...	27.3
<i>Mean</i>	3.2	3.2	3.5
<i>Median</i>	2.0	1.7	2.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.7	0.7	0.7
<i>Maximum</i>	21.2	15.2	11.9

Source: World Health Organization, *European health for all database*: 170402 SDR, homicide and purposeful injury, all ages per 100 000.

SDR is the age-standardized death rate calculated using the direct method, i.e. it represents what the crude rate would have been if the population had the same age distribution as the standard European population. ICD-10 code: X85-X99, Y00-Y09.

Available on-line: www.who.dk/hfadb.

Table 1.2.1.6 Offences per 100 000 population – Assault

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R11AS00	R11AS01	R11AS02	R11AS03	2000-2003
Albania	4	4	5	4	-15
Armenia	41	44	44	39	-6
Austria	461	367	388	412	-11
Belgium	574	565	597	624	9
Bulgaria	1	1	1	1	13
Croatia	22	26	27	26	18
Cyprus	13	15	13	14	8
Czech Republic	70	69	71	67	-5
Denmark	184	188	192	202	10
Estonia	30	31	...	15	-51
Finland	538	528	540	555	3
France	179	195	209	224	25
Georgia	13	14	14	16	31
Germany	465	486	517	546	18
Greece	68	69	71	73	8
Hungary	108	106	114	114	6
Iceland	106	114	64	66	-37
Ireland	45	81	129	100	123
Italy	50	53	50	53	5
Lithuania	38	36	43	67	75
Luxembourg	259	251	281	298	15
Malta	192	191	209	252	32
Moldova	10	9	8	9	-15
Netherlands	277	304	326	330	19
Poland	84	80	79	76	-9
Portugal	421	451	494	533	27
Romania	63	53	45	39	-38
Russia	34	38	40	39	16
Slovakia	69	69	80	75	9
Slovenia	21	21	20	16	-27
Spain	43	42	47	61	42
Sweden	659	665	688	727	10
Switzerland	74	79	83	91	22
Ukraine	13	13	...
UK: England & Wales	859	930	1 209	1 348	...
UK: Northern Ireland	1 098	1 360	1 431	1 505	...
UK: Scotland	1 205	1 211	1 215	1 232	2
<i>Mean</i>	233	243	260	267	
<i>Median</i>	72	80	80	75	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	1	1	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	1 205	1 360	1 431	1 505	

Table 1.2.1.7 Offences per 100 000 population – Rape

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R11RA00	R11RA01	R11RA02	R11RA03	2000-2003
Albania	3	2	2	2	-13
Armenia	1	1	1	1	-2
Austria	14	14	15	15	1
Belgium	24	25	28	26	9
Bulgaria	7	7	6	7	6
Croatia	4	3	3	5	26
Cyprus	2	2	2	5	195
Czech Republic	5	5	6	6	29
Denmark	9	9	9	9	-6
Estonia	5	4	6	8	50
Finland	11	9	11	11	-2
France	14	16	17	17	21
Georgia	1	1	1	1	-25
Germany	9	10	10	11	17
Greece	2	2	2	2	-2
Hungary	3	3	3	3	-12
Iceland	27	34	43	38	40
Ireland	9	12	16	12	33
Italy	4	4	4	5	17
Lithuania	5	5	6	10	92
Luxembourg	7	6	9	8	18
Malta	3	2	1	3	-17
Moldova	5	4	5	6	26
Netherlands	10	11	11	10	-1
Poland	7	7	7	6	-4
Portugal	4	3	4	4	0
Romania	6	6	6	4	-27
Russia	5	6	6	6	4
Slovakia	2	3	3	4	80
Slovenia	4	4	4	3	-19
Spain	4	4	8	4	16
Sweden	23	23	24	29	26
Switzerland	6	6	7	7	33
Ukraine	2	2	2	2	-10
UK: England & Wales	16	19	23	25	...
UK: Northern Ireland	14	17	21	23	...
UK: Scotland	14	15	18	20	40
<i>Mean</i>	8	8	9	10	
<i>Median</i>	5	6	6	6	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	1	1	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	27	34	43	38	

Table 1.2.1.8 Offences per 100 000 population – Robbery

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change 2000-2003
	R11RO00	R11RO01	R11RO02	R11RO03	
Albania	11	7	6	6	-46
Armenia	8	8	7	8	2
Austria	37	35	45	54	45
Belgium	253	258	266	248	-2
Bulgaria	55	53	62	66	19
Croatia	18	18	27	27	51
Cyprus	6	6	5	9	58
Czech Republic	46	43	53	54	17
Denmark	59	60	60	59	0
Estonia	345	327	...	140	-59
Finland	50	42	41	39	-22
France	185	225	222	208	13
Georgia	23	26	27	34	46
Germany	72	69	71	73	0
Greece	16	18	20	22	35
Hungary	34	33	34	33	-5
Iceland	12	14	11	13	11
Ireland	81	84	85	80	-2
Italy	117	115	118	122	4
Lithuania	120	115	125	136	14
Luxembourg	82	69	95	95	16
Malta	37	41	40	49	32
Moldova	66	58	52	39	-41
Netherlands	117	132	133	127	9
Poland	111	107	104	114	3
Portugal	166	179	189	189	14
Romania	15	15	14	12	-15
Russia	27	31	33	34	25
Slovakia	23	25	29	35	51
Slovenia	26	29	26	21	-19
Spain	234	261	255	222	-5
Sweden	101	96	100	96	-5
Switzerland	52	52	54	59	14
Ukraine	11	12	11	12	5
UK: England & Wales	182	232	206	192	...
UK: Northern Ireland	105	132	147	116	...
UK: Scotland	87	83	97	82	-6
<i>Mean</i>	81	84	80	79	
<i>Median</i>	55	53	54	59	
<i>Minimum</i>	6	6	5	6	
<i>Maximum</i>	345	327	266	248	

Table 1.2.1.9 Offences per 100 000 population – Theft: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R11TH00	R11TH01	R11TH02	R11TH03	2000-2003
Albania	41	36	38	50	21
Armenia	127	114	115	94	-26
Austria	3 206	3 177	3 788	4 263	33
Belgium	4 521	4 466	4 556	4 171	-8
Bulgaria	1 120	1 088	1 056	995	-11
Croatia	678	778	1 142	1 222	80
Cyprus	110	94	124	195	77
Czech Republic	2 465	2 220	2 308	2 298	-7
Denmark	5 498	5 174	5 405	5 323	-3
Estonia	2 885	2 879	...	2 727	-6
Finland	4 218	3 850	3 867	3 812	-10
France	3 692	3 947	3 899	3 681	0
Georgia	90	100	114	131	45
Germany	3 630	3 612	3 752	3 677	1
Greece	631	623	631	642	2
Hungary	2 311	2 295	2 076	1 832	-21
Iceland
Ireland	2 005	2 146	2 446	2 385	19
Italy	2 369	2 253	2 253	2 290	-3
Lithuania	1 458	1 344	1 162	1 345	-8
Luxembourg	2 812	2 838	3 118	3 150	12
Malta	2 684	2 511	2 670	2 785	4
Moldova	482	468	416	331	-31
Netherlands	5 398	5 530	5 649	5 290	-2
Poland	1 745	1 657	1 604	1 634	-6
Portugal	1 588	1 573	1 675	1 717	8
Romania	443	425	325	261	-41
Russia	893	872	638	796	-11
Slovakia	1 021	1 000	1 064	1 127	10
Slovenia	1 900	2 058	2 096	2 153	13
Spain	1 591	1 799	1 830	1 664	5
Sweden	7 787	7 363	7 569	7 360	-5
Switzerland	3 327	3 322	3 693	3 967	19
Ukraine	...	506	418	561	...
UK: England & Wales	5 718	6 007	6 190	5 847	...
UK: Northern Ireland	3 111	3 468	3 551	3 038	...
UK: Scotland	4 551	4 228	4 171	3 735	-18
<i>Mean</i>	2 460	2 384	2 440	2 404	
<i>Median</i>	2 311	2 183	2 096	2 221	
<i>Minimum</i>	41	36	38	50	
<i>Maximum</i>	7 787	7 363	7 569	7 360	

**Table 1.2.1.10 Offences per 100 000 population – Theft:
Theft of a motor vehicle**

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R11TV00	R11TV01	R11TV02	R11TV03	2000-2003
Albania	6	5	6	8	46
Armenia	5	4	5	4	-16
Austria	130	103	99	126	-3
Belgium	481	437	386	318	-34
Bulgaria	31	27	29	20	-36
Croatia	42	46	47	46	9
Cyprus	28	15	26	33	20
Czech Republic	249	229	255	247	-1
Denmark	632	550	541	466	-26
Estonia	168	206	...	159	-5
Finland	510	436	445	421	-17
France	675	702	638	546	-19
Georgia	3	4	7	8	137
Germany	155	148	141	133	-14
Greece
Hungary	141	123	112	120	-15
Iceland
Ireland	426	388	356	318	-25
Italy	423	408	401	382	-10
Lithuania	246	245	225	250	1
Luxembourg	140	129	125	115	-18
Malta	270	216	180	224	-17
Moldova
Netherlands	203	185	191	158	-22
Poland	176	154	139	141	-20
Portugal	256	252	290	286	12
Romania	10	9	6	5	-47
Russia	26	42	33	31	18
Slovakia	112	99	94	98	-13
Slovenia	...	34	41	34	...
Spain	336	368	359	311	-8
Sweden	842	820	844	749	-11
Switzerland	263	240	210	209	-21
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	650	627	603	551	...
UK: Northern Ireland	642	689	496	315	...
UK: Scotland	518	458	445	353	-32
<i>Mean</i>	275	254	243	218	
<i>Median</i>	225	206	185	159	
<i>Minimum</i>	3	4	5	4	
<i>Maximum</i>	842	820	844	749	

Table 1.2.1.11 Offences per 100 000 population – Theft: Burglary: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R11BU00	R11BU01	R11BU02	R11BU03	2000-2003
Albania
Armenia
Austria	1 080	1 027	1 195	1 490	38
Belgium
Bulgaria	505	469	419	371	-27
Croatia	378	482	496	522	38
Cyprus	134	105	160	409	205
Czech Republic	723	616	702	672	-7
Denmark	1 865	1 774	1 920	1 872	0
Estonia	1 687	1 714
Finland	881	767	707	674	-23
France	625	698	722	677	8
Georgia
Germany	565	544	538	530	-6
Greece	302	301	300	293	-3
Hungary	707	678	583	470	-33
Iceland
Ireland	569	612	641	641	13
Italy
Lithuania
Luxembourg	673	652	655	741	10
Malta	322	291	358	358	11
Moldova
Netherlands	3 124	3 233	3 278	2 958	-5
Poland	944	843	789	763	-19
Portugal	458	422	431	448	-2
Romania	85	78	54	45	-47
Russia	...	569	398	199	...
Slovakia	473	435	407	402	-15
Slovenia	794	777	817	842	6
Spain	1 009	1 141	1 146	1 045	4
Sweden	1 462	1 319	1 348	1 368	-6
Switzerland	831	785	826	925	11
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	1 603	1 678	1 691	1 551	...
UK: Northern Ireland	942	1 015	1 100	963	...
UK: Scotland	962	886	867	727	-24
<i>Mean</i>	878	854	835	813	
<i>Median</i>	723	688	702	674	
<i>Minimum</i>	85	78	54	45	
<i>Maximum</i>	3 124	3 233	3 278	2 958	

**Table 1.2.1.12 Offences per 100 000 population – Theft:
Burglary: Domestic Burglary**

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change 2000-2003
	R11BD00	R11BD01	R11BD02	R11BD03	
Albania	11	8	10	12	7
Armenia	28	24	26	25	-9
Austria	163	160	157	165	1
Belgium	817	775	829	674	-18
Bulgaria
Croatia	67	91	93	92	37
Cyprus
Czech Republic	110	103	116	119	8
Denmark	615	603	662	628	2
Estonia	528	559	541	481	-9
Finland	179	154	143	142	-21
France	314	353	374	360	15
Georgia
Germany	282	274	268	261	-7
Greece
Hungary	265	259	227	193	-27
Iceland
Ireland	353	388	399	411	17
Italy	359	317	292	298	-17
Lithuania	252	237	192	237	-6
Luxembourg	364	331	349	339	-7
Malta	201	158	173	173	-14
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland	200	187	174	169	-16
Portugal	205	200	192	210	2
Romania	85	78	54	45	-47
Russia	237	240	178	180	-24
Slovakia	60	58	51	49	-19
Slovenia	163	125	152	118	-28
Spain
Sweden	197	170	185	193	-2
Switzerland	339	348	295	358	6
Ukraine	139	...
UK: England & Wales	773	822	832	762	...
UK: Northern Ireland	498	537	597	525	...
UK: Scotland	492	445	431	365	-26
<i>Mean</i>	291	286	285	266	
<i>Median</i>	245	239	192	193	
<i>Minimum</i>	11	8	10	12	
<i>Maximum</i>	817	822	832	762	

Table 1.2.1.13 Offences per 100 000 population – Drug offences: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change 2000-2003
	R11DR00	R11DR01	R11DR02	R11DR03	
Albania	16	10	7	6	-59
Armenia	16	14	14	9	-45
Austria	223	269	275	273	22
Belgium	501	421	446	407	-19
Bulgaria	10	19	21	26	166
Croatia	146	173	176	157	8
Cyprus	38	52	57	62	62
Czech Republic	43	41	42	37	-16
Denmark	248	246	245	269	8
Estonia	115	168	...	87	-24
Finland	260	287	267	289	11
France	175	154	180	209	19
Georgia	33	40	40	41	24
Germany	297	300	305	310	4
Greece	74	92	94	99	35
Hungary	34	43	47	34	-1
Iceland	278	320	345
Ireland	221	245	232	192	-13
Italy	60	62	66	64	7
Lithuania	25	28	26	28	11
Luxembourg	279	242	293	248	-11
Malta	14	14	13	12	-17
Moldova	46	43	56	52	14
Netherlands	47	65	79	96	105
Poland	50	76	94	123	146
Portugal	63	55	42	39	-38
Romania	...	2	6	7	...
Russia	166	165	131	126	-24
Slovakia	...	19	21	24	...
Slovenia	68	76	76	52	-24
Spain
Sweden	363	362	424	456	25
Switzerland	641	631	668	633	-1
Ukraine	93	99	121	120	29
UK: England & Wales	218	232	268	267	...
UK: Northern Ireland	86	66	113	152	...
UK: Scotland	621	714	799	800	29
<i>Mean</i>	164	162	174	166	
<i>Median</i>	90	84	94	99	
<i>Minimum</i>	10	2	6	6	
<i>Maximum</i>	641	714	799	800	

**Table 1.2.1.14 Offences per 100 000 population – Drug offences:
Drug trafficking**

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change 2000-2003
	R11DT00	R11DT01	R11DT02	R11DT03	
Albania	1	1	...
Armenia	3	2	2	1	-44
Austria	19	30	28	31	66
Belgium	119	108	110	105	-12
Bulgaria
Croatia	3	3	2	2	-33
Cyprus
Czech Republic	32	31	33	27	-14
Denmark	18	17	20	20	15
Estonia	22	46	...	45	102
Finland
France	7	7	9	10	41
Georgia	0	1	0	1	65
Germany	10	10	10	8	-18
Greece
Hungary	6	8	8	5	-7
Iceland	37	41	42	51	40
Ireland	45	55	65	59	30
Italy
Lithuania
Luxembourg	29	22	34	39	36
Malta
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland	5	4	4	4	-21
Portugal	31	37	39	36	15
Romania
Russia	159	159	124	121	-24
Slovakia	...	12	12	13	...
Slovenia	47	57	58	39	-18
Spain	28	29	28	26	-5
Sweden	45	42	42	42	-7
Switzerland	100	95	100	97	-2
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	38	38	42	46	...
UK: Northern Ireland	14	12	17	24	...
UK: Scotland	173	203	204	179	3
<i>Mean</i>	41	43	42	40	
<i>Median</i>	28	30	28	29	
<i>Minimum</i>	0	1	0	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	173	203	204	179	

Notes on Tables 1.2.1.1 to 1.2.1.14

Austria: Change rates are partially due to the introduction of a new system of electronic data collection beginning on 1 February 2000. This system was not fully introduced before 2002. Therefore, changes between 2000, 2001 and 2002 might be due to statistical artefacts.

Cyprus: All figures for the year 2003 are noticeably higher than the previous years. This is because of the specific procedure followed by the Cyprus Police up to the year 2002.

Estonia: 2002-2003 are not fully comparable with previous years due to:

- 1) major changes in legislation (e.g. decriminalization of drug use caused a decrease in the number of criminal offences and suspects);
- 2) substantial changes in statistical databases and counting rules.

France: Data for metropolitan France (i.e. excluding the overseas territories).

Lithuania: There were various changes in the Criminal Code, the Code of Criminal Procedure and the Code of Execution of Penalties of Lithuania in 2003.

UK England & Wales: Changes in the way that data are recorded through the introduction of the National Crime Recording Standard in April 2002 caused an increase in the number of offences recorded by the police. Except for serious offences (i.e. Homicide) figures from 2002/03 onwards are therefore not directly comparable with earlier years.

UK: Northern Ireland: A new crime recording system was introduced in 2000, resulting in substantial differences in the statistics between 2000 and 2001.

Notes on Table 1.2.1.1: total

Denmark: Theft of motor vehicle, which mostly consists of joy-riding, is not included in the total number.

Portugal: Data concerning the total of offences recorded by the police in the year 2000, have been altered (with respect to the second edition of the Sourcebook).

Switzerland: From 2000, the total, covering a list of offences selected from the police statistics, also includes drug offences.

Notes on Table 1.2.1.2: traffic offences

Czech Republic: As traffic offences are not defined as offences in their own right, it is not possible to differentiate them from the total.

Lithuania, Poland: The increased number of traffic offences during 2001-2003 is due to criminalization of drunk driving

Portugal: Includes driving under the influence of alcohol and driving without license.

Notes on table 1.2.1.3 and 1.2.1.4: intentional homicide (total and completed)

Czech Republic: If a person were to kill somebody intentionally, the offence is murder. If a person dies because somebody else wanted to cause him harm (=intention) or if the person dies because of someone else's negligence, it is assault (either intentional or negligent) when death is the result. So there is no special category for 'completed homicide'. The statistics do not show how many of the 'murders' were attempts and how many were completed murders.

Netherlands: A tendency to handle some cases (which will, in most other countries be seen as an assault (or even a threat)) as an attempted homicide probably explains the high number of homicide attempts.

The counting unit for completed intentional homicide is the number of *victims* known to the police.

Portugal: In police statistics, attempts are not recorded as intentional homicides. As the police classify offences at an early stage of the investigation, the question of intent is difficult to ascertain.

Romania: From 2000 assaults leading to death are included (excluded in the 2nd edition in which total homicide in fact only covered completed homicides).

UK: England & Wales: The homicide figure for 2002/03 includes 173 murders committed by a single serial offender in previous years but coming to light in the official inquiry in 2002.

Notes on Table 1.2.1.6: assault

Czech Republic: Assaults leading to death are included.

Lithuania: From 2000 less serious assault was included, which explains the difference between the second and the third edition.

Romania: Includes body injury and aggravated body injury (change in statistical definition).

Spain: The increase in registered cases of domestic violence causes the increase in assault.

Notes on Table 1.2.1.9: theft - total

Albania: Robbery is also included.

Notes on Table 1.2.1.10: theft of motor vehicle

Cyprus: Data refer to theft of cars only.

Finland: Theft of motor vehicle: law changed in 2002, introducing the offence of stealing something for use - such incidents are mostly unauthorised use of motor vehicles.

Notes on Table 1.2.1.11: burglary (total)

Malta: There is no difference in the legislation between burglary and domestic burglary.

Notes on Table 1.2.1.12: domestic burglary

Albania: Under 'Domestic burglary' are included all types of theft committed by using force or without force.

Luxembourg: From 2002 attempts are included.

Notes on Table 1.2.1.13: drug offences (total)

Denmark: From 2000, drug offences listed in a special code (outside the penal code) on less dangerous drugs and/or dealing of minor quantities or only possession for personal use are included (excluded in the second edition).

Estonia: Since September 2002, use of drugs and possession of small quantities of narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances has been decriminalized. This means that a substantial number of previous 'drug offences' have been excluded since 2003.

Poland: The high increase of drug offences was the result, among other factors, of the change of legislation and the hardening of criminal policy.

Portugal: Since 2001, possession of drugs for personal use is no longer considered a crime. Only cultivation, either for personal use or for any other end, is still considered a crime. This explains the decrease in the number of offences recorded by the police.

Romania: The legal and statistical definitions of drug offences have changed in 2001. No data are available for 2000 according to the standard definition.

Notes on Table 1.2.1.14: drug trafficking

Albania: The data on drug trafficking covers the period April - December 2002. The data on this type of crime for the period January-March 2002 are included under the total, but could not be collected separately.

1.2.2 Offenders

Table 1.2.2.1 Offenders per 100 000 population – Criminal offences: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R12TC00	R12TC01	R12TC02	R12TC03	2000-2003
Albania	179	142	163	180	1
Armenia
Austria	2 457	2 507	2 586	2 807	14
Belgium
Bulgaria	695	890	994	967	39
Croatia	664	741	695	670	1
Cyprus	693	708	673
Czech Republic	1 268	1 246	1 209	1 184	-7
Denmark
Estonia	964	978	711	807	-16
Finland	6 763	6 784	6 704	7 107	5
France	1 405	1 401	1 514	1 589	13
Georgia	173	187	172	178	3
Germany	2 782	2 772	2 825	2 858	3
Greece	3 128	3 781	4 003	3 703	18
Hungary	1 212	1 193	1 209	1 175	-3
Iceland	...	2 056	2 232	2 019	...
Ireland	949	1 134	1 278	1 154	22
Italy	1 139	1 192	1 327	1 334	17
Lithuania	685	731	709	655	-4
Luxembourg	2 908	2 162	2 684	2 575	-11
Malta	...	771	846	847	...
Moldova	474	439	491	423	-11
Netherlands	1 686	1 727	1 996	2 138	27
Poland	1 048	1 382	1 430	1 443	38
Portugal	2 389	2 433	2 546	2 702	13
Romania	1 070	1 105	1 030	924	-14
Russia	1 187	1 126	866	855	-28
Slovakia	865	917	1 003	1 280	48
Slovenia	1 984	2 103	2 172	1 849	-7
Spain	527	545	560	514	-2
Sweden	971	1 015	1 074	1 102	13
Switzerland	720	706	835	837	16
Ukraine	562	545	...
UK: England & Wales	4 083	3 921	4 053	4 221	3
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	1 554	1 574	1 599	1 634	
<i>Median</i>	1 070	1 134	1 141	1 175	
<i>Minimum</i>	173	142	163	178	
<i>Maximum</i>	6 763	6 784	6 704	7 107	

**Table 1.2.2.2 Offenders per 100 000 population – Criminal offences:
Traffic offences**

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R12TT00	R12TT01	R12TT02	R12TT03	2000-2003
Albania
Armenia
Austria	518	511	535	523	1
Belgium
Bulgaria	22	27	27	29	35
Croatia	55	56	53	57	4
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	132	115
Finland	2 790	2 975	2 950	3 210	15
France
Georgia	5	6	5	5	5
Germany
Greece	1 425	1 905	2 105	1 857	30
Hungary	161	157	179	172	7
Iceland
Ireland	1	1	2	1	41
Italy
Lithuania	41	99	119	54	30
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova
Netherlands	281	285	305	341	21
Poland	48	348	407	421	783
Portugal	285	316	346	393	38
Romania	69	78	74	71	3
Russia	28	28
Slovakia
Slovenia
Spain	73	61	57	46	-37
Sweden	261	286	301	311	19
Switzerland
Ukraine	26	...
UK: England & Wales	1 491	1 442	1 478	1 607	8
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	427	483	559	537	
<i>Median</i>	103	136	240	172	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	1	2	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	2 790	2 975	2 950	3 210	

Table 1.2.2.3 Offenders per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change 2000-2003
	R12HO00	R12HO01	R12HO02	R12HO03	
Albania	20.8	18.2	12.9	13.2	-37
Armenia	4.8	4.1	3.6	4.0	-18
Austria	1.9	1.5	2.2	1.8	-4
Belgium
Bulgaria	5.8	5.9	5.3	5.1	-12
Croatia	6.2	5.6	5.8	4.9	-21
Cyprus	2.0	1.4	0.8
Czech Republic	2.6	2.2	2.3	2.0	-20
Denmark
Estonia	13.8	11.2
Finland	9.3	10.3	10.3	9.9	7
France	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.4	0
Georgia	3.9	5.4	4.6	5.9	50
Germany	4.4	3.9	4.0	3.9	-11
Greece	2.6	2.6	2.1	2.5	-4
Hungary	3.4	3.9	3.6	3.7	9
Iceland	1.8	3.5	1.7	0.3	-81
Ireland	0.9	1.1	1.8	0.9	8
Italy	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.6	6
Lithuania	7.9	9.8	9.2	7.7	-3
Luxembourg
Malta	0.8	2.8	6.9	2.8	262
Moldova	9.3	9.7	9.9	7.2	-22
Netherlands	12.4	11.1	12.6	10.4	-17
Poland	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.1	-16
Portugal
Romania
Russia	18.9	19.9
Slovakia	2.3	2.8	2.9	2.5	6
Slovenia	4.4	3.5	4.2	3.2	-26
Spain	3.5	3.5	3.9	4.0	13
Sweden
Switzerland	2.4	2.4	3.2	3.0	24
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	2.0	2.7	2.2	2.3	19
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	5.7	5.7	4.9	4.5	
<i>Median</i>	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.6	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.8	1.1	0.8	0.3	
<i>Maximum</i>	20.8	19.9	12.9	13.2	

Table 1.2.2.4 Offenders per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide: Completed

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R12HC00	R12HC01	R12HC02	R12HC03	2000-2003
Albania	11.7	7.5	5.3	4.3	-63
Armenia	3.5	2.7	2.4	2.6	-26
Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria	3.5	3.4	3.0	2.9	-17
Croatia	2.1	1.6	1.9	1.8	-13
Cyprus	0.8	0.8	0.3
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	10.8
Finland	3.0	3.2	3.2	2.3	-23
France	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.8	-8
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary	2.0	2.5	2.1	2.4	19
Iceland	1.8	0.4	1.4	0.0	-100
Ireland	0.7	1.1	1.8	0.9	28
Italy	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1	-1
Lithuania	7.3	9.1	8.4	7.1	-2
Luxembourg
Malta	0.8	0.5	4.6	0.0	-100
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal	2.2	1.6	1.5	1.3	-40
Romania	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.8	-4
Russia
Slovakia
Slovenia	2.0	0.9	1.4	1.2	-39
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Ukraine	...	9.5	9.5	8.2	...
UK: England & Wales	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.4	15
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	3.3	2.9	3.0	2.5	
<i>Median</i>	2.1	1.7	2.0	1.8	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	11.7	9.5	9.5	8.2	

Table 1.2.2.5 Offenders per 100 000 population – Assault

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R12AS00	R12AS01	R12AS02	R12AS03	2000-2003
Albania	5	4	6	4	-27
Armenia
Austria	293	287	406	391	33
Belgium
Bulgaria	4	1	1	1	-66
Croatia	24	28	28	28	16
Cyprus	15	20	20
Czech Republic	63	61	60	61	-3
Denmark
Estonia	17	16
Finland	490	495	484	506	3
France	135	140	154	167	24
Georgia	13	15	13	12	-5
Germany	448	464	492	519	16
Greece	75	75	77	80	6
Hungary	59	55	59	57	-4
Iceland	...	92	62	63	...
Ireland	43	84	129	94	120
Italy	45	48	46	50	10
Lithuania	25	24	30	31	25
Luxembourg
Malta	151	165	178	213	41
Moldova	8	7	7	7	-16
Netherlands	187	203	219	237	27
Poland	84	83	83	80	-4
Portugal	519	549	601	646	25
Romania	65	55	47	41	-38
Russia	27	29
Slovakia	...	65	67	77	...
Slovenia	23	22	21	15	-35
Spain	26	27	30	41	56
Sweden	125	131	138	137	10
Switzerland	65	67	73	80	22
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	324	329	344	372	15
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	120	121	138	149	
<i>Median</i>	61	63	65	77	
<i>Minimum</i>	4	1	1	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	519	549	601	646	

Table 1.2.2.6 Offenders per 100 000 population – Rape

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R12RA00	R12RA01	R12RA02	R12RA03	2000-2003
Albania	3.1	2.2	1.7	2.3	-25
Armenia	1.0	1.1	1.3	0.8	-16
Austria	9.3	9.8	12.5	11.3	22
Belgium
Bulgaria	9.2	9.4	7.9	9.2	0
Croatia	3.4	2.5	2.3	3.4	0
Cyprus	3.7	1.7	1.6
Czech Republic	3.5	4.0	4.1	4.1	16
Denmark
Estonia	2.9	2.1
Finland	6.5	6.3	7.1	7.5	15
France	9.2	10.0	10.9	11.3	23
Georgia	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	29
Germany	7.2	7.7	8.4	8.8	23
Greece	2.1	1.8	1.9	1.9	-11
Hungary	1.7	1.8	1.6	1.5	-13
Iceland	...	30.5	36.8	33.0	...
Ireland	6.9	7.8	9.5	6.4	-7
Italy	3.8	4.0	4.5	5.3	39
Lithuania	4.6	4.6	4.8	3.6	-21
Luxembourg
Malta	3.3	2.3	1.3	3.0	-9
Moldova	5.7	5.1	5.3	6.1	6
Netherlands	6.4	6.6	7.0	6.9	8
Poland	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.0	-1
Portugal	4.1	3.7	4.4	4.1	-1
Romania	6.5	6.1	6.0	4.7	-27
Russia	4.6	4.8	4.3	4.5	-2
Slovakia	2.9	3.5	3.2	4.7	64
Slovenia	4.0	3.7	3.9	2.9	-27
Spain	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.6	8
Sweden	2.8	3.0	3.6	3.9	38
Switzerland	4.4	5.3	5.1	5.5	24
Ukraine	...	2.0	1.8
UK: England & Wales	4.0	5.1	5.7	5.4	34
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	4.5	5.2	5.7	5.8	
<i>Median</i>	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.5	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	
<i>Maximum</i>	9.3	30.5	36.8	33.0	

Table 1.2.2.7 Offenders per 100 000 population – Robbery

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R12RO00	R12RO01	R12RO02	R12RO03	2000-2003
Albania	11	10	9	8	-33
Armenia
Austria	13	12	23	24	86
Belgium
Bulgaria	40	32	36	40	-2
Croatia	6	6	7	6	0
Cyprus	7	6	6
Czech Republic	23	21	30	31	37
Denmark
Estonia	96	90
Finland	37	33	31	31	-16
France	38	38	38	37	-3
Georgia	10	11	11	10	1
Germany	47	46	46	47	-1
Greece	7	7	8	9	25
Hungary	17	16	18	17	2
Iceland	...	14	12	13	...
Ireland	26	46	43	36	36
Italy	23	22	25	25	6
Lithuania	37	46	53	59	59
Luxembourg	32	33	45	36	10
Malta	11	7	11	9	-24
Moldova	32	31	35	25	-22
Netherlands	44	40	51	51	15
Poland	52	53	50	52	0
Portugal	303	331	354	344	13
Romania	18	18	16	14	-21
Russia	25	27
Slovakia	...	24	24	25	...
Slovenia	24	28	23	18	-26
Spain	48	51	54	47	-4
Sweden	15	14	18	17	17
Switzerland	24	22	24	28	17
Ukraine	13	11	...
UK: England & Wales	24	29	31	27	10
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	38	38	38	38	
<i>Median</i>	24	27	25	25	
<i>Minimum</i>	6	6	6	6	
<i>Maximum</i>	303	331	354	344	

Table 1.2.2.8 Offenders per 100 000 population – Theft: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R12TH00	R12TH01	R12TH02	R12TH03	2000-2003
Albania	45	40	39	43	-5
Armenia	61	65	55	43	-30
Austria	434	500	654	643	48
Belgium
Bulgaria	621	416	464	428	-31
Croatia	128	141	127	124	-3
Cyprus	322	244	269
Czech Republic	399	404	346	342	-14
Denmark
Estonia	421	417
Finland	1 674	1 495	1 457	1 492	-11
France	336	340	350	350	4
Georgia	46	54	36	48	3
Germany	870	850	867	842	-3
Greece	78	77	80	80	3
Hungary	370	362	327	296	-20
Iceland	...	716	992	780	...
Ireland	317	771	806	774	144
Italy	131	125	130	126	-4
Lithuania	322	330	295	274	-15
Luxembourg	453	390	484	482	6
Malta	230	224	275	264	15
Moldova	248	221	228	184	-26
Netherlands	604	579	665	660	9
Poland	280	269	257	243	-13
Portugal	330	356	370	374	13
Romania	339	342	282	236	-30
Russia	446	389
Slovakia	232	224	249	256	11
Slovenia	715	647	625	503	-30
Spain	176	194	193	165	-6
Sweden	317	316	332	354	12
Switzerland	440	414	500	505	15
Ukraine	...	257	229	215	...
UK: England & Wales	525	516	501	472	-10
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	384	384	403	387	
<i>Median</i>	330	342	327	319	
<i>Minimum</i>	45	40	36	43	
<i>Maximum</i>	1 674	1 495	1 457	1 492	

Table 1.2.2.9 Offenders per 100 000 population – Theft: Theft of a motor vehicle

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change 2000-2003
	R12TV00	R12TV01	R12TV02	R12TV03	
Albania	5	5	5	5	-15
Armenia
Austria	28	27	32	32	15
Belgium
Bulgaria	1	6	6	5	216
Croatia	7	7	7	8	11
Cyprus
Czech Republic	37	37	36	36	-2
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France	47	45	44	40	-16
Georgia	1	3	3	3	303
Germany	39	38	36	35	-11
Greece
Hungary	9	18	16	15	72
Iceland
Ireland	27	58	72	56	108
Italy	14	13	12	11	-23
Lithuania	18	19	16	11	-38
Luxembourg
Malta	19	16	14	15	-23
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland	14	12	10	10	-31
Portugal	33	33	38	36	6
Romania	4	4	4	4	-4
Russia
Slovakia
Slovenia	...	7	6	4	...
Spain	42	46	46	39	-8
Sweden	46	46	50	45	-1
Switzerland
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	56	57	57	51	-9
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	24	25	26	23	
<i>Median</i>	19	18	16	15	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	3	3	3	
<i>Maximum</i>	56	58	72	56	

Table 1.2.2.10 Offenders per 100 000 population –Theft: Burglary: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R12BU00	R12BU01	R12BU02	R12BU03	2000-2003
Albania
Armenia
Austria	80	84	136	141	76
Belgium
Bulgaria	215	143	148	129	-40
Croatia	51	54	46	43	-16
Cyprus	173	117	155
Czech Republic	127	115	113	113	-11
Denmark
Estonia	221	205
Finland
France	57	55	59	60	6
Georgia
Germany	91	84	84	83	-8
Greece	39	37	39	37	-6
Hungary	100	90	78	63	-37
Iceland	...	267	212	151	...
Ireland	82	206	158	142	73
Italy
Lithuania
Luxembourg	48	53	60	56	16
Malta	...	59	54	64	...
Moldova
Netherlands	291	271	307	292	0
Poland	145	127	114	100	-31
Portugal	99	101	103	102	4
Romania	51	49	40	35	-32
Russia
Slovakia
Slovenia	274	203	220	168	-39
Spain	104	110	107	92	-12
Sweden	51	51	49	49	-3
Switzerland	118	94	107	126	7
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	94	92	94	89	-6
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	119	116	113	102	
<i>Median</i>	99	94	105	92	
<i>Minimum</i>	39	37	39	35	
<i>Maximum</i>	291	271	307	292	

Table 1.2.2.11 Offenders per 100 000 population – Theft: Burglary: Domestic Burglary

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R12BD00	R12BD01	R12BD02	R12BD03	2000-2003
Albania	9	8	9	10	12
Armenia	3	2	2	1	-44
Austria	19	17	22	17	-7
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia	7	8	7	7	-5
Cyprus
Czech Republic	21	20	20	21	0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France	25	23	26	28	12
Georgia
Germany	35	32	33	32	-8
Greece
Hungary	30	36	31	27	-8
Iceland
Ireland	44	119	80	74	70
Italy	19	17	17	16	-16
Lithuania	42	50	48	32	-25
Luxembourg
Malta	33	29	24	28	-14
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal	45	49	46	48	7
Romania	51	49	40	35	-32
Russia
Slovakia
Slovenia	50	27	37	19	-63
Spain
Sweden	10	10	10	10	-4
Switzerland
Ukraine	...	29	...	30	...
UK: England & Wales	49	49	50	48	-1
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	29	32	30	27	
<i>Median</i>	30	28	26	28	
<i>Minimum</i>	3	2	2	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	51	119	80	74	

Table 1.2.2.12 Offenders per 100 000 population – Drug offences: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R12DR00	R12DR01	R12DR02	R12DR03	2000-2003
Albania	18	10	9	8	-56
Armenia
Austria	208	259	266	262	26
Belgium
Bulgaria	11	19	22	27	152
Croatia	120	143	143	123	3
Cyprus	49	68	75
Czech Republic	18	19	21	22	27
Denmark
Estonia	46	74
Finland	277	309	289	288	4
France	175	155	179	207	18
Georgia	18	19	28	26	48
Germany	246	246	250	258	5
Greece	109	133	137	143	31
Hungary	30	39	42	29	-5
Iceland	...	349	398	561	...
Ireland	49	71	86	78	59
Italy	85	84	85	87	3
Lithuania	15	19	16	16	5
Luxembourg	392	330	382	340	-13
Malta	...	12	14	12	...
Moldova	37	36	49	33	-9
Netherlands	73	85	105	128	75
Poland	17	26	35	44	156
Portugal	97	77	55	54	-44
Romania	7	...
Russia
Slovakia	13	18	16	22	65
Slovenia	78	84	85	55	-30
Spain
Sweden	134	145	161	172	28
Switzerland	622	609	639	610	-2
Ukraine	67	73	87	78	17
UK: England & Wales	177	178	194	197	11
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	118	127	138	139	
<i>Median</i>	73	77	86	78	
<i>Minimum</i>	11	10	9	7	
<i>Maximum</i>	622	609	639	610	

Table 1.2.2.13 Offenders per 100 000 population – Drug offences: Drug trafficking

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change 2000-2003
	R12DT00	R12DT01	R12DT02	R12DT03	
Albania	1	2	...
Armenia
Austria	18	28	26	29	64
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia	1	2	1	1	-21
Cyprus
Czech Republic	14	15	17	18	30
Denmark
Estonia	8	17
Finland
France	12	11	14	17	39
Georgia	0	0	...
Germany	11	11	11	9	-22
Greece
Hungary	5	6	5	4	-16
Iceland	...	27	27	34	...
Ireland	46	63	73	67	45
Italy
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland	2	2	2	3	15
Portugal	52	53	51	50	-3
Romania
Russia	108	99
Slovakia	10	13	11	14	36
Slovenia	55	63	67	42	-23
Spain	42	43	42	40	-6
Sweden	19	20	22	22	16
Switzerland	100	98	102	103	2
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	29	31	30	31	6
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	31	34	28	27	
<i>Median</i>	18	24	19	20	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	2	0	0	
<i>Maximum</i>	108	99	102	103	

Notes on Tables 1.2.2.1 to 1.2.2.13

In general, the notes for Tables 1.2.1.1 to 1.2.1.14 also apply to these tables. Only notes that regard offenders are given here.

Cyprus: Figures include minors suspected of serious offences only.

UK: England & Wales: Suspected offenders = persons proceeded against + cautioned.

UK: Northern Ireland: A new recording system was introduced in 2000, resulting in a gradual improvement in recording over the period of the survey.

Notes on Table 1.2.2.3: Intentional homicide - Total

Germany: No data available on suspects for completed intentional homicide separately, only for both completed and attempted together.

Notes on Table 1.2.2.7: Robbery

Portugal: Due to differences in data recording methods, figures for Portugal are not comparable to the figures of other countries.

Notes on Table 1.2.2.8, 1.2.2.10, 1.2.2.11: total theft and (domestic) burglary

UK: England & Wales: Unauthorised taking of a motor vehicle is now included in both total theft and theft of a motor vehicle. Figures for 2000 have been amended to reflect this change.

Notes on Table 1.2.2.12: total

Portugal: Since 2001, the possession of drugs for personal use is no longer considered a crime. Only cultivation, either for personal use or for any other end, is still considered a crime. This explains the decrease in the number of offenders known to the police.

Table 1.2.3.1 Percentage of female offenders - 2003

	Criminal offences: Total	Traffic offences	Intentional homicide:		Rape	Robbery	Theft: Total	Theft: a motor vehicle	Theft: Burglary: Total		Drug offences: Total	Drug offences: Drug trafficking
			Intentional homicide: Total	Intentional homicide: Completed					Burglary: Domestic	Burglary		
	P13TCW03	P13TTW03	P13HOW03	P13HCW03	P13ASW03	P13ROW03	P13THW03	P13TVM03	P13BUW03	P13BDW03	P13DRW03	P13DTW03
Albania	1.2	...	4.1	7.3	0.7	0.4	1.0	0.6	...	1.2
Armenia	4.2	5.1	5.5
Austria	20.1	26.7	14.4	...	13.5	10.9	24.3	4.7	5.9	8.6	15.2	10.3
Belgium
Bulgaria	8.7	6.5	7.8	6.3	0.3	4.3	10.5	1.7	4.8	...	7.1	...
Croatia	10.8	13.3	9.5	12.3	4.0	6.1	8.5	1.4	4.7	5.2	9.2	17.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	12.0	...	12.4	...	7.6	8.2	9.0	3.1	4.5	6.5	12.1	13.6
Denmark
Estonia	11.0
Finland	15.5	13.4	12.6	17.2	12.0	12.4	20.8	15.5	...
France	15.2	...	14.1	17.3	11.9	6.1	18.3	3.2	7.5	11.3	7.8	9.8
Georgia	2.8	3.2	6.1	...	2.1	1.1	2.9	2.8	35.7
Germany	23.6	...	12.4	...	14.9	9.4	30.0	5.2	9.1	13.1	12.2	12.9
Greece	13.9	10.0	4.5	...	11.2	4.4	10.4	...	7.4	...	7.9	...
Hungary	14.6	6.1	20.5	23.0	9.0	8.9	14.6	2.8	5.3	7.3	9.6	10.2
Iceland	17.9	...	100.0	...	5.4	13.2	24.9	...	13.2	...	12.4	8.1
Ireland	19.3	12.5	2.7	2.7	8.6	6.5	22.7	2.9	4.5	4.3	10.7	1.1
Italy
Lithuania	9.8	11.1	11.6	11.3	9.3	3.3	8.1	3.7	...	8.4	26.1	...
Luxembourg	20.9	8.6	20.8	...	13.3	...	14.9	...
Malta	12.0	...	0.0	0.0	10.9	11.6	13.4	5.3	25.2	22.1	20.0	...

	Criminal offences: Total	Traffic offences	Intentional homicide:		Assault Completed	Rape	Robbery	Theft:		Theft: of a motor vehicle	Theft: Burglary:		Theft: Burglary: Domestic		Drug offences:		
			Total	Completed				Total	Total		Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	trafficking	
	P13TCW03	P13TTW03	P13HOW03	P13HCW03	P13ASW03	P13RAW03	P13ROW03	P13THW03	P13TW03	P13BUW03	P13BDW03	P13DRW03	P13DTW03				
Moldova
Netherlands	13.1	9.8	11.6	...	11.6	1.8	7.0	18.3	...	6.4	...	14.0
Poland	9.0	2.9	11.8	...	7.2	0.9	4.6	7.3	1.4	2.6	...	7.7	8.6
Portugal	14.8	4.5	...	10.7	19.2	1.6	3.6	13.9	3.6	11.9	15.8	11.8	12.0
Romania	13.2	2.0	...	6.5	...	0.2	4.6	7.8	20.8
Russia	16.6
Slovakia	7.1	...	9.8	...	10.6	0.0	4.8	7.6	9.0	9.5
Slovenia	15.7	...	9.2	20.0	5.9	0.0	5.2	12.5	3.6	20.5	15.2	7.9	7.5
Spain	10.0	3.3	9.8	...	4.8	1.0	9.7	10.9	6.3	6.8	14.3
Sweden	18.8	17.8	11.5	0.3	5.3	28.6	7.5	9.1	11.4	14.8	11.9
Switzerland	15.4	...	12.7	...	10.9	0.0	6.8	17.7	...	6.8	...	13.3	5.1
Ukraine	12.3	10.0
UK: England & Wales	17.9	13.2	9.3	9.9	16.4	0.5	11.0	22.6	7.4	7.3	9.1	11.3	15.7
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	13.6	9.8	13.5	10.6	9.4	0.8	6.8	14.6	3.8	8.8	10.0	12.2	12.0
Median	13.9	9.9	9.8	10.0	10.0	0.5	6.3	13.4	3.6	7.0	8.9	12.0	10.3
Minimum	1.2	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.4	1.0	0.6	2.6	1.2	2.8	1.1
Maximum	23.6	26.7	100.0	23.0	19.2	2.4	13.2	30.0	7.5	25.2	22.1	26.1	35.7

	Criminal offences: Total	Traffic offences	Intentional homicide:		Assault Completed	Rape	Robbery	Theft:		Theft: of a motor vehicle	Theft: Burglary:		Drug offences:	
			Total	Completed				Total	Domestic		Total	Domestic	Total	Drug trafficking
	P13TCM03	P13TTM03	P13HOM03	P13HCM03	P13ASM03	P13RAM03	P13ROM03	P13THM03	P13TVM03	P13BUM03	P13BDM03	P13DRM03	P13DT03	
Moldova
Netherlands	17.0	1.9	7.1	..	15.9	18.8	30.2	22.5	..	24.3	3.5	..
Poland	8.4	0.5	2.5	..	20.9	9.6	23.6	20.8	8.6	24.8	13.9	6.9
Portugal
Romania	6.8	2.6	..	6.3	..	11.9	23.0	17.1	6.5	..
Russia	11.8
Slovakia	6.2	..	1.5	..	8.4	5.9	25.9	18.3	10.0	10.7
Slovenia	9.8	..	9.2	16.0	11.4	8.5	27.3	17.0	20.2	7.8	10.7	..	15.5	12.1
Spain	11.8	..	4.5	23.6	17.7	26.8	10.9
Sweden	13.1	9.5	17.7	10.8	29.5	17.2	25.6	17.4	13.1	..	5.6	3.1
Switzerland	19.8	..	5.4	..	15.4	6.7	39.5	23.0	..	20.8	11.3	2.9
Ukraine	10.5	5.2	4.1	..
UK: England & Wales	10.4	2.7	6.6	5.4	20.7	11.6	41.8	27.9	49.6	29.4	26.1	..	14.9	7.1
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	11.1	3.9	5.5	9.2	10.6	9.7	24.4	18.8	25.0	21.3	23.1	..	9.1	7.7
Median	10.5	2.8	4.7	6.1	10.5	9.1	24.0	18.3	22.9	24.3	24.9	..	10.0	7.1
Minimum	2.4	0.5	0.0	1.9	0.8	0.0	2.6	3.4	0.8	2.7	9.5	..	0.0	0.0
Maximum	21.2	9.7	25.9	38.9	20.9	24.4	41.8	31.3	49.6	34.6	37.0	..	19.6	18.4

	Criminal offences: Total	Traffic offences	Intentional homicide: Completed		Assault	Rape	Robbery	Theft: Total	Theft: of a motor vehicle	Theft: Total	Theft: Burglary: Total	Theft: Burglary: Domestic	Drug offences: Total	Drug offences: trafficking
			P13HTA03	P13HA03										
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland	1.0	0.8	2.0	...	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.3	1.0	0.3	0.4	6.9
Portugal
Romania	0.8	0.9	...	1.7	...	0.0	0.6	0.1	6.2	...
Russia	3.3
Slovakia	1.1
Slovenia	7.8	...	7.7	8.0	3.9	10.2	6.8	5.7	9.5	7.8	10.7	...	3.1	3.5
Spain	31.9	...	27.6	30.2	24.4	...	27.3
Sweden
Switzerland	55.3	...	61.5	...	52.8	61.7	60.6	58.8	...	55.9	40.5	36.1
Ukraine	0.6	1.6
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	15.2	4.2	19.9	5.9	10.2	19.5	18.5	15.0	6.9	18.3	11.9	...	13.5	22.9
Median	6.8	3.1	11.8	1.7	6.3	10.2	12.0	5.7	5.0	14.6	8.5	...	7.3	26.5
Minimum	0.6	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.2	...	0.4	2.9
Maximum	61.8	14.0	100.0	27.2	52.8	100.0	60.6	66.7	26.1	55.9	50.6	...	52.2	47.5

Notes on Tables 1.2.3.1 to 1.2.3.3

Cyprus, Lithuania and Malta: Data refer to the year 2002 (instead of 2003).

Iceland: Only one person was convicted for total homicide in 2003. That explains the percentages of 100% in tables for women and aliens.

Notes on Table 1.2.3.2 (minors)

Austria: New definition of minors since 2001: under 18 years (before: under 19 years).

Notes on Table 1.2.3.3 (aliens)

Czech Republic: Theft of motor vehicle: for aliens these statistics exclude two-wheel vehicles (e.g. motorcycles).

1.2.4 Police staff

Table 1.2.4.1 Police staff: Number of police officers per 100 000 population

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R14OP00	R14OP01	R14OP02	R14OP03	2000-2003
Albania	417	364	356	353	-15
Armenia
Austria	357	350	341	326	-9
Belgium	363	352	...
Bulgaria
Croatia	527	517	445	447	-15
Cyprus	531	532	533	531	0
Czech Republic	436	438	444	455	4
Denmark	191	191	190	192	0
Estonia	263	259	258	263	0
Finland	155	158	160	159	2
France	393	...	392	387	-2
Georgia	1 072	1 147	1 172	1 140	6
Germany
Greece	484	488	487	491	1
Hungary	309	285	288	293	-5
Iceland	235	233	...
Ireland	307	308	307	306	0
Italy	465	464	464	467	1
Lithuania	422	389	371	368	-13
Luxembourg	288	298	...
Malta	441
Moldova
Netherlands	212	223	228	227	7
Poland	261	262	258	259	-1
Portugal	465	466	461	453	-3
Romania	205	198	202	204	-1
Russia	1 213
Slovakia	394	394	394	394	0
Slovenia	342	366	367	374	9
Spain
Sweden	180	180	180	182	1
Switzerland	200	204	202	200	0
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	241	248	254	264	9
UK: Northern Ireland	491	423	420	429	-13
UK: Scotland	290	299	302	306	5
Mean	402	366	357	357	
Median	375	350	341	326	
Minimum	155	158	160	159	
Maximum	1 213	1 147	1 172	1 140	

Table 1.2.4.2 Police staff: Number of civilians per 100 000 population

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R14CP00	R14CP01	R14CP02	R14CP03	2000-2003
Albania
Armenia
Austria
Belgium	61	64	...
Bulgaria
Croatia	176	137	131	136	-23
Cyprus	5	5	4	3	-45
Czech Republic	116	115	115	118	1
Denmark	47	48	49	49	5
Estonia	83	85	81	86	4
Finland	53	53	54	55	3
France	22	...	22	25	14
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary	90
Iceland
Ireland	46	46	46	42	-7
Italy
Lithuania	104	93	84	80	-23
Luxembourg	33	45	...
Malta
Moldova
Netherlands	80	86	91	93	17
Poland	50	51	51	51	3
Portugal	39	36	37	39	0
Romania	12	12	11	12	-5
Russia
Slovakia
Slovenia	75	75	77	77	2
Spain
Sweden	70	74	76	75	9
Switzerland	48	45	48	53	9
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	105	113	118	128	22
UK: Northern Ireland	199	184	184	180	-9
UK: Scotland	93	104	109	118	27
Mean	76	76	71	73	
Median	72	74	61	64	
Minimum	5	5	4	3	
Maximum	199	184	184	180	

1.3 Technical information

Table 1.3.1 Data recording methods in connection with Tables 1.2.1.1 to 1.2.1.14
Description of data recording methods in connection with Tables 1.2.1.1 to 1.2.1.14

Question	Are there written rules regulating the way in which these data are recorded?	When are the data collected for the statistics?	What is the counting unit used in this table?	Is a principal offence rule applied?	How are multiple offences counted?	How is an offence committed by more than one person counted?	Have the data recording methods been substantially modified between 2000 & 2003?
Possible answers	1: Yes 2: No	1: When the offence is reported to the police 2: Subsequently 3: After investigation	1: Offence 2: Case 3: Decision 4: Other	1: Yes 2: No	1: As one offence 2: As two or more offences 3: Uncertain	1: As one offence 2: As two or more offences	1: Yes 2: No
Albania	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
Armenia	...	1	1	2	3	1	2
Austria	1	3	1	2	2	1	1
Belgium	1	3	1	2	1	1	1
Bulgaria	1	1	1	2	1	1	2
Croatia	1	3	1	2	2	1	2
Cyprus	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
Czech Republic	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Denmark	2	1	1	2	2	1	2
Estonia	1	1	1	2	3	1	2
Finland	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
France	1	3	4	2	2	1	2
Georgia	2	2	1	2	3	1	2
Germany	1	3	1	1	2	1	2
Greece	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
Hungary	1	3	1	2	2	2	2
Iceland	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
Ireland	1	1	1	1	1	1	2

Question	Are there written rules regulating the way in which these data are recorded?	When are the data collected for the statistics?	What is the counting unit used in this table?	Is a principal offence rule applied?	How are multiple offences counted?	How is an offence committed by more than one person counted?	Have the data recording methods been substantially modified between 2000 & 2003?
Possible answers	1: Yes 2: No	1: When the offence is reported to the police 2: Subsequently 3: After investigation	1: Offence 2: Case 3: Decision 4: Other	1: Yes 2: No	1: As one offence 2: As two or more offences 3: Uncertain	1: As one offence 2: As two or more offences	1: Yes 2: No
Italy	1	3	1	2	2	1	2
Lithuania	1	2	1	1	2	1	1
Luxembourg	...	1	2	...	1	...	1
Malta	2	1	2	1	1	1	2
Moldova	1	1	1	2	1	1	2
Netherlands	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
Poland	1	3	1	1	1	1	2
Portugal	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Romania	1	3	1	1	2	2	2
Russia	1	2	1	2	2	1	2
Slovakia	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
Slovenia	1	3	1	2	3	1	1
Spain	1	1	1	2	1	1	2
Sweden	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
Switzerland	2	2	1	2	2
Ukraine	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
UK: England & Wales	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
UK: Northern Ireland	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
UK: Scotland	1	2	1	1	1	1	2

Notes on Table 1.3.1

Written rules regulating the way in which the data are recorded

Switzerland: There are no general rules at 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 the country).

When are data collected

Belgium: The year an offence is recorded is according to the year the offence was committed, not when the offence was reported to the police.

What is the counting unit used in Tables 1.2.1

France: The counting unit depends upon the type of offence.

UK: Scotland: Counting rules for crimes recorded by the police vary with type of offence. For offences against the person, one crime is counted for each victim. For offences of dishonesty (including robbery) one crime is counted per incident, regardless of the number of victims.

Principal offence rule applied

Some restrictions are listed below.

Belgium: A sequence of offences may be reduced to a single one (the most serious) only if there is a common criminal intent.

How are multiple offences counted

When the counting unit depends on the offence type, the answer is 'uncertain'.

France: The rule applied for multiple offences is linked to the counting unit. For some offences type multiple offences are counted as one, for others they are counted as two or more. For instance, when the counting unit is the case, multiple offences reported in the same case are counted as one (e.g. drug trafficking); when the counting unit is the offence, multiple offences reported in the same case are counted as two or more (e.g. burglary). The most common situation is the last one.

Germany: Multiple offences against the same victim or without a victim are counted as one offence, multiple offences against different victims are counted as two offences.

How is an offence committed by more than one person counted?

The general rule is to count one offence (with the exception of Greece, Hungary and Switzerland). In Sweden, there is an exception to this general rule for rape. In France, it depends on the offence type.

Changes in data recording methods 2000-2003

Austria: Starting by 1 February 2000 there are new rules for counting, in particular of offenders, victims, criminological characteristics et cetera., There is also a new electronic data collection system. No new rules for counting offences.

Belgium: Due to a police reorganisation in the years 2000-2002 there were considerable changes in the production of the police statistics.

Luxembourg: Since 2002 data are also collected from the police judiciaire.

Portugal: Since 2001 possession of drugs for personal use is not considered a crime anymore. Only cultivation, either for personal use or for any other end, is still considered a crime.

Slovenia: In 2003 the upgraded system for entering data into the central police computer system and their processing allowed for a more precise presentation of the criminal offences, suspects against whom criminal offences were filed and investigated crime. Statistical data for that year are therefore not completely comparable with the data for the previous periods.

UK: England & Wales and Northern Ireland: From 1 April 2002, there was a change in the data recording rules.

Table 1.3.2 Data recording methods in connection with Tables 1.2.2.1 to 1.2.2.13 and 1.2.3.1 to 1.2.3.3

Description of data recording methods in connection with Tables 1.2.2.1 to 1.2.2.13

Question	How is a person suspected of more than one offence in the same year counted?	Has a principal offence rule been applied?	How is a person suspected of multiple offences counted?
Possible answers	1= As one person 2= As two or more people 3 = Other	1: Yes 2: No	1= As one person 2= As two or more people 3 = Other
Albania	1	1	3
Armenia	2	2	2
Austria	1	2	2
Belgium
Bulgaria	1	2	1
Croatia	2	2	1
Cyprus	2	1	2
Czech Republic	1	1	3
Denmark
Estonia	2	1	2
Finland	2	2	2
France	1	1	2
Georgia	1	2	1
Germany	3	1	3
Greece	2	1	2
Hungary	2	2	2
Iceland	1	2	1
Ireland	1	1	2
Italy	2	2	2
Lithuania	1	1	3
Luxembourg
Malta	1	1	2
Moldova	1	2	2
Netherlands	1	1	2
Poland	1	1	2
Portugal	1	1	2
Romania	2	1	2
Russia	1	2	1
Slovakia	1	1	2
Slovenia	1	2	2
Spain	2	2	2
Sweden	3	2	3
Switzerland	3	2	2
Ukraine	1	2	1
UK: England & Wales	1	1	2
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland

Notes on Table 1.3.2.1**How is a person suspected of more than one offence in the same year counted?**

Albania: If the person is suspected of more than one offence in the same year, he can be counted in different ways. If he was punished for one offence by a final decision of a court and again commits a crime, he will be counted twice. If the person is suspected of more than one offence, but there is no court decision, he will be counted as one person.

Germany: If a person is suspected to have committed different types of offences an entry for each category is made, but in the total of all offenders he only figures once. If a person is suspected to have committed the same type of offence in several cases this person is counted only once in the same federal state.

Ireland: If a person was charged with more than one offence within the same year that person will be counted in each type of offence, but only once for the primary offence within the total number.

Lithuania: It depends on the time when the information about the other offences by that person was received. If the other offences become known before sentencing, the person is counted as one and if it happens after the sentencing as two or more.

Sweden: As one person if it regards multiple offence of the same type. As two or more persons if it regards multiple offences of different types.

Has a principal offence rule been applied?

The general rule is that when a person is suspected of multiple offences he or she is counted only once for the principal offence. This offence may be:

- implicit, not described in the answer (Albania, Czech Republic, Greece, Lithuania, Malta, Slovakia);
- the most 'serious' one (France, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania);
- the offence with the maximum penalty (Germany, Ireland);
- the offence for which the heaviest sentence was imposed or for which the statutory maximum penalty is the most severe if the same disposal is imposed (UK: England & Wales).

Person suspected of multiple offences

Germany: If a person is suspected to have committed different types of offences an entry for each category is made, but in the total of all offenders he only figures once. If a person is suspected to have committed the same type of offence in several cases this person is counted only once in the same federal state.

Sweden: As one person if it regards multiple offence of the same type. As two or more persons if it regards multiple offences of different types.

Age brackets used in Table 1.2.3.2

Almost all countries count minors as persons who are not yet 18 years old. See the footnotes for the exceptions.

The lower limit varies widely among countries as far as consideration in police statistics is concerned. Persons below the age of criminal responsibility will not be convicted and therefore not counted in conviction statistics (for details refer to 3.3.2.1). However, this is not necessarily the case for police statistics where persons below that age are sometimes included (minimum age = 0 in the following table), suggesting that all persons below 18 would be counted in police statistics. All the countries in the following table include offences committed by minors in police statistics.

Table 1.3.2.3 Minimum age for inclusion in Tables 1.2.2.1-13 and 1.2.3.2

Albania	14
Armenia	14
Austria	0
Belgium	...
Bulgaria	14
Croatia	14
Cyprus	10
Czech Republic	6
Denmark	...
Estonia	14
Finland	0
France	0
Georgia	14
Germany	8
Greece	8
Hungary	14
Iceland	15
Ireland	7
Italy	14
Lithuania	14
Luxembourg	...
Malta	...
Moldova	...
Netherlands	0
Poland	13
Portugal	0
Romania	14
Russia	14
Slovakia	15
Slovenia	14
Spain	...
Sweden	15
Switzerland	7
Ukraine	14
UK: England & Wales	10
UK: Northern Ireland	...
UK: Scotland	...

Note:

Austria: Until 2000 18-year-olds were considered as minors. From 2001 they were considered as adults.

Cyprus: Up to 1998 age limits for minors were 7 to 15. From 1999 onwards age limits for minors are 10 to 15 (inclusive).

Estonia: Minimum age of 14 is since September 1, 2002, before it was 13.

Poland: 17-year-old persons are also seen as adults.

Portugal: The number of suspects under 18 cannot be determined from the statistical return sent by the police.

The age brackets used in police statistics are: under 16; 16 to 24; 25 and over.

Definition of alien

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

	criminal police	traffic policeborder police	gendarmerie police	uniformed police	city guard, municipal police	customs officers	tax police	military police	secret service police	part-time officers	police reserves	cadet police court officers	police court	
1= Included														
2= Excluded														
	D14OPA03	D14OPB03	D14OPC03	D14OPD03	D14OPE03	D14OPF03	D14OPG03	D14OPH03	D14OPI03	D14OPJ03	D14OPK03	D14OPL03	D14OPM03	D14OPN03
Malta	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	...
Moldova
Netherlands	1	1	1	...	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Poland	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Portugal	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Romania	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Slovenia	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2
Spain
Sweden	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	...
Switzerland	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Ukraine	2
UK: England & Wales	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	...	2	2	2
UK: Northern Ireland	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
UK: Scotland	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2

Table 1.3.3.2 Police staff: Civilians

	cadet police	clerical staff	technical	maintenance	traffic	domestic staff
1= Included						
2= Excluded	officers		staff	staff	wardens	
	D14CPA03	D14CPB03	D14CPC03	D14CPD03	D14CPE03	D14CPF03
Albania	1	1	1	1	2	2
Armenia
Austria
Belgium	2	1	1	1	2	2
Bulgaria
Croatia	2	1	1	1	2	1
Cyprus	1	1	1	1	2	2
Czech Republic	2	1	1	1	1	1
Denmark	2	1	1	1	2	1
Estonia	2	1	1	1
Finland	2	1	1	1	2	2
France	2	1	1	1	2	1
Georgia	2	1	1	1	2	1
Germany
Greece	2	2	2	2	2	2
Hungary	...	1	1	1	2	2
Iceland
Ireland	2	1	1	1	2	1
Italy
Lithuania	2	1	1	1	2	1
Luxembourg
Malta	1	1	1	1	2	2
Moldova
Netherlands	2	1	1	1	2	2
Poland	2	1	1	1	2	2
Portugal	1	2	1	1	2	2
Romania	1	1	1	1	2	2
Russia	1	...	1	2	2	...
Slovakia	1	1	1	1	2	2
Slovenia	2	2	1	1	2	1
Spain
Sweden	2	1	1	1	2	1
Switzerland	2	1	1	2	2	2
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	2	1	1	1	2	2
UK: Northern Ireland	2	1	1	1	2	1
UK: Scotland	2	1	1	2	1	...

1.4 Sources

Albania	Police State, Department of Statistics, Ministry of Public Order, unpublished Annual report of the Ministry of Public Order, Tirana 2005
Armenia	Information Centre of the Police of Armenia Ministry of Interior – Police Crime Statistics, 2000-2003. Ministry of Interior – Security Report, 2001-2003. Safety report from the Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Justice
Austria	Federal Police of Belgium, June 2005. See www.polfed.be
Belgium	...
Bulgaria	Ministry of Interior – Department for Analytics and Research Internal data (unpublished)
Croatia	Research & Development Department, Cyprus Police Headquarters 'Criminal Statistics' report for the years 2000 – 2002, Ministry of Finance. (unpublished data)
Cyprus	Criminal Statistics of the Czech Republic, 2000 – 2003. Police Presidium, Department of System Management and Information The Ministry of Interior, Personnel Department (unpublished)
Czech Republic	Statistics Denmark. Police website www.politi.dk
Denmark	Police Board - Crime statistics, Personnel and financial statistics (not published)
Estonia	Statistics Finland
Finland	Ministère de l'Intérieur, Direction Centrale de la Police Judiciaire, 'Aspect de la criminalité et de la délinquance constatées en France' Annual publication, (document in French)
France	Ministry of Internal Affairs. Prosecutors General Office. Supreme Court
Georgia	Bundeskriminalamt (Hrsg.): Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 2000 - 2003, Wiesbaden 2001 - 2004
Germany	Statistics Sourcebook of the Hellenic Police. Ministry of Public Order
Greece	Unified Statistics of the Police and Prosecution
Hungary	National Commissioner of the Icelandic Police
Iceland	Annual Reports of An Garda Síochána (Police)
Ireland	National Institute of Statistics - Istat. Ministero dell'Interno Ministry of Internal Affairs: Department of Informatics and Communication, Section of Statistics and Police Department, Staff Service. www.nplc.it
Italy	Annual report 2003, Police Grand-Ducale Luxembourg Office of the Attorney General. The data represents all reports received in our Police Stations
Lithuania	Statistical Yearbook of Moldova, Département de statistique et de sociologie, Chisinau: 2004. Ministry of Internal affairs
Luxembourg	Ministry of Justice (WODC) and Central Bureau of Statistics. Ministry of the Interior
Malta	
Moldova	
Netherlands	

Albania	Police State, Department of Statistics, Ministry of Public Order, unpublished Annual report of the Ministry of Public Order, Tirana 2005
Poland	Police Headquarters, Statistical Information Bureau and the HR Department
Portugal	Legal Policy and Planning Office, Ministry of Justice
Romania	Directorate for Criminal Records, Statistics and Operational Registry, Romanian Police, Ministry of the Administration and the Interior www.mvdinform.ru
Russia	www.npar.ru/journal/2003/3/violence.php www.demoscope.ru/weekly/2002/065/analit03.php www.gks.ru/bgd/regl/brus05/lssWWW.exe/Stg/11-01.htm Ministry of Internal Affairs Crime Bulletin 2003
Slovakia	Statistical yearbooks of the Ministry of Interior and of the Attorney General
Slovenia	Ministry of the Interior, General Police Directorate
Spain	Ministerio del Interior: Secretaría General Técnica. Anuario Estadístico del Ministerio del Interior. Published annually. www.mir.es
Sweden	Official Swedish Criminal Statistics published by the National Crime Prevention Council Office fédéral de la police, Statistique policière de la criminalité, Berne. www.fedpol.ch
Switzerland	Office central des stupéfiants, Statistique suisse des stupéfiants, Berne. www.fedpol.ch Office fédéral de la statistique, non-published data
Ukraine	State committee of statistics of Ukraine: Statistical yearbook of Ukraine, 2004. Ministry of Internal Affairs
UK: England & Wales	Home Office: Research, Development and Statistics
UK: Northern Ireland	Police Service of Northern Ireland (Central Statistics Unit) Police Service of Northern Ireland (Personnel Branch)
UK: Scotland	Scottish Executive Justice Department – Justice Statistics Unit Branch 2. Police staff numbers from Quarterly Strength Return from all forces as at 31 March of each year

2 Prosecution statistics

1. No new data have been collected about the Public Prosecution Service (PPS) in European countries for this edition. There were two reasons for this:
 - Our previous work had shown that information and data recording at the national level about the work of the Public Prosecution Service was relatively poor. Also that the categories of data used in previous questionnaires were not sufficient to create a proper picture of the activities of the PPS to be described.
 - On the other hand a good deal of legal and actual change has recently taken place in the PPS field throughout Europe.

As a result we have concluded that an improved instrument for collecting data on PPS activities throughout Europe needs to be developed. This will be done in good time for the new questionnaire to be used to collect data for the next edition of the European Sourcebook. Paragraph 2.2 below describes some of the pilot work that has been carried out so far.

In order to give an impression of the situation as we had studied it up to the year 2000, some selected results from the second edition of the European Sourcebook are re-printed here.

2.1 General Comments

2.1.1 Background

Definitions of the prosecution stage

2. Once an offence has been reported to the police and a suspect identified, in almost all of the criminal justice systems presented the decision needs to be taken whether or not to prosecute, i.e. to bring the case before a court.
3. In a narrow sense, the term prosecution refers only to carrying through a case in a criminal court. In the Sourcebook 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.
4. 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 and denominators vary widely between countries. In most European countries, the prosecution of

suspected offenders is dealt with by a special prosecuting authority: either a public prosecutor and/or an investigating judge.

5. There are vast differences and many variations in the form this prosecutorial level takes within the different European countries this chapter deals with. For the purpose of the Sourcebook, the prosecution stage is considered as an intermediate stage between the police and court levels. Accordingly, this chapter deals with the decisions taken at this intermediate stage.

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

6. In some countries, the input into the prosecutorial level is identical with the output of the police level (including specialised authorities of public order, such as customs or tax authorities). This should be the case in countries (such as France and Germany) in which the police are regarded purely as a supporting institution to the public prosecutor, with no own powers to dispose of a criminal case. Consequently they are obliged to transfer all cases to the prosecuting authority. This applies also to cases in which no suspect has been found. Thus the prosecution input will appear disproportionately high in such systems, especially when cases without suspects are counted (e.g. in France).
7. However, in some European countries actual practice deviates from this model, i.e. the input at prosecutorial level is not identical to police level output 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. However, the powers of the police are always limited to minor cases, in some countries including only petty traffic offences.
8. These different structures influence the scale of the input and thus the prosecution system statistics. Furthermore, according to changes in definitions and counting rules from one level to another, these statistics at the prosecution level may show some difference with the police 'output'.

What is recorded?

9. Unlike in most other chapters in the Sourcebook, the prosecution chapter did not differentiate between different types of offence. This is because most countries concerned were unable to provide such data. The prosecution chapter does cover all kinds of offences disposed of by the public prosecution authorities.

10. In order to make the data comparable, the figures should exclude minor traffic offences (e.g. parking offences) and breaches of police and administrative regulations. On the other hand the data should include the traffic offences of drunk driving and dangerous driving. This rule could be applied by almost all countries.
11. The counting unit used here should be the case in the sense of proceedings against one defendant, not the offence. Thus, one case may combine several offences. In general, these cases are counted as single cases, but there are some exceptions (see also paragraph 18 below).

Discretion at prosecutor level (output)

12. The data provided for the cases disposed of by the prosecuting authority refer to the 'output' at public prosecutor's level, i.e. the type of decision taken. This means that pending cases are not included in the total of disposals. Some countries were not able to give data for the breakdown of the total.
13. 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: *number of cases brought before a court, number of cases ended by a sanction from the prosecution authorities with or without admission of guilt, number of cases dropped, and number of other disposals*. Some of these categories may not apply to every country considered.
14. Three *basic structures* are possible:
 - Countries in which the prosecuting authority has neither the power to drop a case nor to impose conditions / sanctions upon an offender; in accordance with a strict principle of legality the prosecuting authority merely has the function of preparing a case for court.
 - In most of the countries the prosecuting authority has the power to decide whether or not to prosecute (i.e. to drop a case completely).
 - 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, i.e. to bind or sanction the suspected offender (only possible if he agrees to the measure – otherwise the case will go to court), or to pay a sort of fine.
15. 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. In some countries, the court has to approve all decisions made by the prosecutor to end a prosecution without formally taking it to court, whereas in others the public prosecutor has more powers in this regard.

16. A distinction has to be made between sanctions imposed by the prosecutor with or without admission of guilt by the defendant. In the first case, which includes the penal order (Strafbefehl) known in some countries, the defendant is considered as convicted (and should be counted as such in Chapter 3). Sanctions imposed without formal recognition of guilt are usually administered in a rather informal way. Usually, the defendant agrees to pay a fine or accepts any restrictions in exchange to ending prosecution, implying that he will not be considered as formally convicted.
17. According to the questionnaire, 'other disposals' (e.g. cases that were transferred to another competent domestic jurisdiction) should be included in the total of cases handled by the prosecuting authorities. This may lead to some double counting and/or to a significant difference between the total and the sum of the output disposals. Some countries provided specific information in order to solve this difficulty or to explain the difference.

Statistical rules

18. Most of the countries reporting data on prosecution level apply written rules on recording. Most of them count proceedings if more than one person is involved as one case. Most countries do the same if multiple offences occurred. Unlike this the majority of countries record two cases if a person is subject of two proceedings in one year. Usually, data collected by other authorities than public prosecution are not included as well as cases disposed of by the police.

2.1.2 Results

19. If one considers the output, i.e. the total of cases disposed of by the prosecution authorities, a wide variation can be observed: from 218 disposals per 100 000 population in Albania to 5878 in Italy for 1999 (see European Sourcebook second edition, table 2.B.1). Similar differences can be found on police level. According to the different 'workload' of the national prosecution authorities different modes of handling the cases can be seen.
20. Whereas in the most West European countries the rates of all cases disposed of by prosecution authorities appear to be stable between

1996 and 1999 or 2000 respectively, i.e. to show an increase or decrease in case numbers of less than 10%, there are some countries that show a remarkable increase (between 10 and 50%); and some East European countries that show a high increase (more than 50%); see edition 2003, table 2.B.1. These trends on prosecution level are partially similar to those on police level.

Total of disposals by public prosecution and cases brought before a court

21. A good measure of comparison is the rate of all cases disposed of and the percentage of cases brought before a court. Due to the unavailability of data, several countries had to be excluded. The idea behind this (see European Sourcebook second edition, Table 2.i) is that there is a relationship between the two factors, namely that where a prosecution authority has to deal with a relatively low number of cases the percentage of cases brought before a court will be high and that where the total of cases is high the percentage tends to be low.
22. There are two groups of countries which do not follow this simple trend: the Common Law system countries on the one hand, in which the percentage of cases brought before a court remains relatively high even when the total of cases disposed of is not low, and some of the East European countries on the other, where the percentage of cases brought before a court remains relatively low although the number of cases disposed of is also low.

Staff of the prosecuting authorities; workload

23. The rates of public prosecutors per 100 000 inhabitants in European countries show a wide variability from 27.2 in Latvia to 1.5 in Malta for the year 2000 (see edition 2003, Table 2.B.4.2).
24. For comparison three categories of low, middle and high rates of prosecutors are established and correlated to the rate of all cases disposed of. Under the category of a relatively low rate of prosecutors per 100 000 inhabitants there are only West European countries, and under the opposing category of a relatively high rate of prosecutors almost only East European countries can be found. These rates are not in correlation with the crime situation or with the number of police officers under the supervision of the prosecuting authorities and especially not in line with the amount of disposals made by public prosecution. On the contrary, in the group with a relatively low rate of total disposals one can find only East European countries; and in the group with a high rate almost only West European countries can be found. Evidently the number of prosecutors depends on different factors, particularly on their competence and tasks in the different national systems of criminal justice and state administration.

2.2 Future Developments

Research on the function of Public Prosecution Services Across Europe

25. Clearly there is a need for improving definitions of Public Prosecution Service-disposals and methods of statistical recordings. Moreover, the very different range of Public Prosecution Service competences at national level need to be thoroughly described in order to create a basis for international comparison. In this respect a special research project derived from the European Sourcebook work is currently underway.
26. A pilot study, carried out for England & Wales, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland and Sweden, collected comprehensive information about the law, practice in those countries criminal justice systems, as well as statistical data for the police, prosecution and court levels. The results are about to be published (*Coping with Overloaded Criminal Justice Systems – The Rise of Prosecutorial Power across Europe*, eds. Jehle/Wade, Springer July 2006) and is partially available via internet (www.jura.uni-goettingen.de/jehle/). The next step in this project, which will take place during 2006 is to expanded the collection of information to four new countries: Croatia, Spain, Switzerland and Turkey.
27. The study has shown the following broad conclusions:
- the role of public prosecution services is changing across Europe, giving further powers to authorities to dispose of cases out of court.
 - This relates on the one hand to more well-established diversionary powers for less serious cases, but also on the other hand to a more independent, negotiating or even adjudicative role becoming more common for quite serious offences.
 - These involve the public prosecution service being in negotiation with the defence to produce an agreed settlement which is then subject to relatively brief court scrutiny.
 - The relationship between the Public Prosecution Service and the Police is also changing.
28. It is planned that these developments will be considered as thoroughly as possible for the next edition of the European Sourcebook. In particular more detailed information on the competences and the disposals of Public Prosecution Services will be requested from the national correspondents and more precise categories for comparison will be developed.

Conviction statistics

3.1 General comments

3.1.1 Introduction

1. The tables in this chapter refer to persons who have been convicted, i.e. found guilty, according to the law, of having committed a criminal offence. Information is presented on the type of offence (2000-3); the sex, age and nationality of the offender (2003). Thirty-four countries submitted data¹⁵. An obvious problem in this chapter relates to the major differences in criminal procedures between countries. Unlike the second survey no data were collected on sanctions/measures or custodial sentence lengths.

3.1.2 Offence definitions

2. In comparison with police statistics, 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 but definitions used for recorded sanctions/measures can vary substantially as they are based on the judicial system of each country and are entirely dependent on the offence definition provided in national penal statutes. For this reason, the breakdown of data in this chapter does not follow that in chapter 1. Thus, 'burglary' and 'car theft' were not identified separately for many countries but were merely included in the general category 'theft'. Some countries reported differences between the definitions of offences used by the courts in the conviction statistics and in those used by police in the recorded crime statistics. This affected several countries; for example, in the Portuguese, Swiss and Danish conviction statistics, 'robbery' (street robberies or muggings) were included in the theft category. Also, in the continental systems, 'theft of a motor vehicle' only included those thefts where there was an intention to use the vehicle temporarily whereas if the intention was to keep the vehicle permanently the offence was recorded as 'theft'.

3.1.3 Definition of convictions

3. In the preparation of the questionnaire an attempt was made to provide definitions for 'convictions' of offenders compatible between 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

¹⁵ For Germany the data in this chapter cover West Germany and Berlin only.

definition of ‘persons convicted’ included sanctions/measures imposed by a prosecutor based on an admission of guilt by the defendant. 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) sanctions imposed by the police (e.g. cautions in UK: England & Wales) and (c) where other state authorities imposed a sanction/measure. In addition, to the system of cautioning in England & Wales both the Dutch (the ‘transactie’) and the French have systems for diverting offenders from the courts.

3.1.4 Minimum age of convictions

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 34 countries supplying this information, eleven countries had a minimum age between 15 and 17, fourteen had a minimum age of 14 years, four countries had a minimum age between 10 and 13, whilst in five countries the age was below 10 years. Although this age will be important, many countries have other systems for dealing with minors which divert most minors from the formal Criminal Justice System. How minors are dealt with may also differ between offences.

3.1.5 Validation checks

5. Once the term ‘convictions’ had been defined, it was expected that the number of convictions should be less than or equal to the number of suspected offenders. In the earlier surveys comparisons were made with the number of sanctions/ measures imposed for certain countries these showed significant differences which were not fully explained, although they may be partly due to the different counting units used for convictions and sanctions/measures. In addition, in some countries it is possible to have a conviction without sanction.

3.1.6 Methodology

6. All countries applied some form of written rules to regulate the method used to collect data on both convictions. 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, it was not always 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 offender participated in the commission of an offence, then each perpetrator was counted separately in all countries.

7. There were two different procedures identified with respect to the point at which statistics on court decisions were recorded. Twelve 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 twenty countries where information was available, information was collected only after any such appeal was completed. Variations in the point at which data was collected will have affected the size of the figures in the relevant tables.
8. 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, Armenia, Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia indicated that such convictions would only be counted once in their statistics, which suggests that there will be a lower conviction rate in such countries.

3.1.7 Results

9. The tables show a detailed breakdown of convictions between 2000 and 2003. A full analysis of the data would require more detailed research in each country. The commentary in this chapter looks at six offences (Homicide (completed), Traffic Offences, Assault, Rape, Total Thefts and Drug trafficking) drawing on the definitional differences and the comparison with the trends in the number of recorded offences. These offences were chosen in order to include as many countries as possible with relatively similar definitions. Completed homicides were selected rather than total homicides since the closeness between these two numbers (for some countries) suggest that little distinction is made between the two definitions. Figures for types of theft, e.g. burglary, are not shown separately, as they are often not separated by the Criminal Code.

3.1.8 Total crimes

10. Information on the total number of criminal convictions for the period 2000-2003 shows that the highest numbers per 100 000 population in 2003 were in Finland (3885 per 100 000) and England & Wales (2860), with a median of 587 and the lowest level in Georgia (53). These differences reflect, in part, the way that traffic offences are dealt with in each country and how in Eastern Europe traffic offences are rarely dealt with by courts. In addition, juveniles as explained above are often dealt with outside the formal court system reducing the number of criminal convictions and the proportion of persons convicted who are minors. Even when traffic offences are excluded, England & Wales (1564) and Finland (1487) still retain their high

levels of criminal convictions, followed by Sweden (974) and Hungary (864) while Denmark who recorded no traffic offences was highest at 2 630. The lowest levels were in Albania (183) but it is unlikely that such absolute comparisons provide a good comparison of court convictions between countries.

3.1.9 Traffic offences

11. The number of convictions for traffic offences varies considerably. There is a particular contrast between the rates for Eastern European countries and those for other countries. Rates of convictions for traffic offences were below 100 per 100 000 population for Eastern countries such as Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Moldova, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia, but well above 100 for Western countries such as Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the UK. Exceptions to this rule were Hungary, with a rate of 160, Poland, where a change in the way drunk driving was dealt with caused the traffic offence rate to rise from 27 in 2000 to 364 in 2003; and Spain where the rate remains at under 100.

3.1.10 Homicides (excluding attempts)

12. For 2003, information was available for convictions for intentional homicides (completed, i.e. excluding attempts) in 16 countries with a further 4 countries providing data up to 2002. Over the 2000-2003 period, the rate per 100 000 population for completed homicide convictions rose in 12 of the 16 countries the exceptions were Croatia, Germany, Slovakia and Switzerland. However, the small numbers convicted for homicides makes large year on year variations. In absolute terms, the highest rate of convictions for completed homicides were recorded in Estonia (7.7 per 100 000 in 2000) and Russia (12.2 per 100 000 in 2000). The lowest rates was recorded in Switzerland (0.3 per 100 000), Denmark (0.5 per 100 000) and England & Wales (0.5 per 100 000). Comparisons of absolute rates are more reliable for homicides than other offences since definitions are more comparable. For all countries, less than 9% of convictions for completed homicides in 2003 were for minors (aged less than 18). In addition, in most countries less than 20% of convictions for completed homicides in 2003 were for females, with the exception of Hungary (23%) and Switzerland (17%). In countries where information on the proportion of convictions who were aliens is collected the proportion was under 25% the exceptions were Cyprus (50%) and Switzerland (63%) reflecting their demography.

3.1.11 Assault

13. In paragraph 1.1.6 comments have already been made on the extent to which less serious assaults are included in the recorded assaults varies between countries explaining why many Eastern European countries show very low levels for assaults. In addition, to these differences some countries (e.g. France and the UK) adopt a broader definition of assaults in their conviction statistics than for police statistics.
14. Most countries showed a rise in assaults over the period 2000-2003. Excluding those countries where this reflects an improvement in recording practice (e.g. Ireland) the highest rises were in Spain (107%), Italy (63%), the Netherlands (36%) and Poland (34%). These increases are thought, in part, to reflect improvements in the recording and conviction of offences of domestic violence, although the actual effect cannot be quantified here.

3.1.12 Rape

15. Most countries were able to supply information for convictions for rape. Twenty-six countries provided data for 2003 on rape convictions per 100 000 of population. The highest increase since 2000 was in Ireland (157%) followed by Slovenia (95%) but there were sharp falls in Georgia (34%) and Switzerland (27%). Rises in rape convictions may be the result of legal changes broadening the concept of rape and encouragement to prosecute offenders.
16. In absolute terms, the highest rates for rape convictions (5 to 7 per 100 000 population) in 2003 were in Ireland and Slovenia with the lowest rates in Armenia, Georgia and Portugal. However, almost all countries' statistics on rape will be affected by the extent to which the victims report these offences to the police. As expected, countries showed a low proportion of females convicted for this offence. Minors accounted for more than 10% of convictions in most countries (the highest proportions were in Estonia (38%) and France (24%). The low figures for Spain reflect the exclusion of rape offences committed with other offences (see Notes).

3.1.13 Total thefts

17. Although there is wide variation in the definition for component parts of 'total theft' (e.g. theft of a motor vehicle, burglary), the definition of 'total theft' is fairly uniform.

18. There was a rise in rate of convictions per 100 000 population for total thefts over the period 2000-2003 for 11 countries and a fall in convictions for 14 countries. The biggest rise was in Albania (22 per 100 000 population in 2000 to 30 in 2003) and the biggest fall in Armenia (39 in 2000 to 29 in 2003).
19. In absolute terms, the highest rates for theft convictions in 2000 were in Finland (673 per 100 000), Ireland (586) and Russia (408). There were much lower rates in Albania and Georgia (below 50). The reason for this wide variation is not known. In Denmark, Finland, Ireland and Sweden 25% or more of those convicted in 2003 were females, and in Estonia and Switzerland over 25% were minors.

3.1.14 Drug trafficking

20. There are wide variations between countries in their drug enforcement policy. This analysis has been restricted to drug trafficking offences only, since total drugs offences in some countries also includes non-trafficking offences.
21. For Drug Trafficking, there is wide variation in the rate of convictions, with Switzerland and Ireland over 70 per 100 000 against a median rate of 10 and several countries with a rate of less than 2 per 100 000. The way these rates are changing also varies. In particular, for many eastern European countries, the rate of convictions has increased considerably between 2000 and 2003: Bulgaria (+209%); Poland (+62%); Slovakia (+60%); Slovenia (+36%); the Czech Republic (+32%). The experience of Croatia, where the rate fell by 36% runs counter to this.

3.2 Tables

3.2.1 Persons convicted per 100 000 population

Table 3.2.1.1 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Criminal offences: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R31TC00	R31TC01	R31TC02	R31TC03	2000-2003
Albania	118	122	125	188	60
Armenia	223	181	160	152	-32
Austria	513	477	504	511	0
Belgium	1 443	1 605	1544	1 557	8
Bulgaria	387	369	361	376	-3
Croatia	391	392	447	529	35
Cyprus	117	136	132
Czech Republic	615	586	635	645	5
Denmark	2 787	2 748	2 441	2 630	-6
Estonia	744	823	802
Finland	3 350	3 986	3 451	3 885	16
France	955	898	777	848	-11
Georgia	61	57	50	53	-14
Germany	1 071	1 046	1 044	1 067	0
Greece	557	560	623
Hungary	1 034	1 027	1 075	1 026	-1
Iceland
Ireland	129	557	1 169	974	658
Italy	534	413	382	379	-29
Lithuania	566	574	547	485	-14
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	391	387	425	387	-1
Netherlands	663	661	688	787	19
Poland	576	815	946	1 077	87
Portugal	519	583	593	672	29
Romania	336	370	365	343	2
Russia	807	845	592
Slovakia	433	428	446	502	16
Slovenia	343	379	416	365	6
Spain	246	242	254	298	21
Sweden	1 330	1 238	1 278	1 268	-5
Switzerland	1 209	1 269	1 307	1 345	11
Ukraine	471	418	404	422	-10
UK: England & Wales	2 711	2 559	2 686	2 806	3
UK: Northern Ireland	1 582	1 441	1 420
UK: Scotland	1 182	1 241	1 321
<i>Mean</i>	835	865	865	913	
<i>Median</i>	561	578	608	587	
<i>Minimum</i>	61	57	50	53	
<i>Maximum</i>	3 332	3 967	3 434	3 870	

Table 3.2.1.2 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Criminal offences: Traffic offences

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R31TT00	R31TT01	R31TT02	R31TT03	2000-2003
Albania	4	5	5	5	31
Armenia
Austria
Belgium	1 083	1 232	1 190	1 192	10
Bulgaria	16	12	11	13	-19
Croatia	51	48	46	52	3
Cyprus
Czech Republic	57	53	64	67	17
Denmark
Estonia	94	91	77
Finland	1 933	2 421	2 089	2 398	24
France	347	329	307	331	-5
Georgia	1	1	1	1	-6
Germany	307	293	286	283	-8
Greece	176	199	253
Hungary	153	151	172	162	6
Iceland
Ireland	1	2	2	3	283
Italy
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	7	7	8	11	59
Netherlands	154	146	143	175	14
Poland	27	222	323	364	> 1 000
Portugal	239	260	281	328	37
Romania	23	25	29	32	39
Russia	8
Slovakia	39	40	38	38	-3
Slovenia	41	39	40	33	-19
Spain	66	69	70	80	21
Sweden	264	271	287	294	11
Switzerland	586	639	643	663	13
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	1 152	1 101	1 122	1 242	8
UK: Northern Ireland	914	856	845
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	298	341	333	353	
<i>Median</i>	80	146	143	121	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	1	1	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	1 933	2 421	2 089	2 398	

Table 3.2.1.3 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R31HO00	R31HO01	R31HO02	R31HO03	2000-2003
Albania	9.0	10.1	8.5	9.1	1
Armenia	3.4	2.0	2.1	2.4	-27
Austria	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.8	56
Belgium	1.7	1.6	2.1	1.9	14
Bulgaria	2.0	2.5	2.3	2.2	11
Croatia	4.4	4.3	3.6	3.5	-21
Cyprus	0.4	0.8	0.5
Czech Republic	1.6	1.4	1.5	1.7	6
Denmark	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.7	32
Estonia	8.0	10.8	7.1
Finland	3.2	3.8	4.1	3.7	16
France	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.1	2
Georgia	4.2	4.4	4.8	7.1	71
Germany	1.1	1.2	1.0	1.0	-9
Greece	0.4	0.5	0.3
Hungary	3.0	2.5	2.3	3.4	13
Iceland
Ireland	0.8	1.3	2.6	1.3	67
Italy	1.6	2.0	2.1	2.1	34
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	7.2	9.0	7.7	5.9	-18
Netherlands	7.5	8.0	8.3	9.3	23
Poland	1.6	1.8	1.9	1.9	17
Portugal	2.5	2.9	2.7	2.7	7
Romania	4.7	4.9	5.7	6.6	41
Russia	13.2
Slovakia	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.1	-14
Slovenia	2.7	1.4	3.5	1.0	-61
Spain	1.0	0.9	1.3	1.3	35
Sweden	1.7	1.4	1.5	1.5	-10
Switzerland	1.3	1.4	1.0	0.8	...
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7	12
UK: Northern Ireland	1.0	0.4	0.9
UK: Scotland	2.9	2.6	2.6
<i>Mean</i>	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.9	
<i>Median</i>	1.7	1.6	2.1	1.9	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.7	
<i>Maximum</i>	13.2	10.8	8.5	9.3	

Table 3.2.1.4 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide: Completed

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R31HC00	R31HC01	R31HC02	R31HC03	2000-2003
Albania
Armenia
Austria	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	47
Belgium	0.9	0.8	1.2	1.1	21
Bulgaria	1.6	2.0	1.8	1.6	0
Croatia	2.7	2.7	1.9	1.7	-36
Cyprus	0.1	0.4	0.3
Czech Republic
Denmark	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	37
Estonia	7.7
Finland	1.6	1.8	2.1	1.7	10
France
Georgia
Germany	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.7	-11
Greece	0.3	0.4	0.3
Hungary	1.9	1.7	1.5	2.0	8
Iceland
Ireland	0.8	1.2	2.5	1.3	67
Italy	1.1	1.3	1.6	1.5	43
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	10
Portugal	1.5	2.0	1.8	1.7	15
Romania	2.9	3.0	3.4	3.7	28
Russia	12.2
Slovakia	1.2	1.2	1.0	0.8	-27
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.4	...
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.5	4
UK: Northern Ireland	0.8	0.4	0.8
UK: Scotland	1.6	1.5	1.3
<i>Mean</i>	1.9	1.2	1.3	1.3	
<i>Median</i>	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.4	
<i>Maximum</i>	12.2	3.0	3.4	3.7	

Table 3.2.1.5 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Assault

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R31AS00	R31AS01	R31AS02	R31AS03	2000-2003
Albania	0	2	2	2	2395
Armenia
Austria	65	60	64	68	5
Belgium	42	43	41	40	-5
Bulgaria	3	2	2	3	15
Croatia	17	17	19	23	30
Cyprus	4	9	11
Czech Republic	27	28	30	30	8
Denmark	83	90	89	97	17
Estonia	19	21	18
Finland	152	194	186	203	34
France	87	84	62	73	-17
Georgia	5	4	3	3	-28
Germany	71	73	78	82	17
Greece	24	22	23
Hungary	53	52	57	55	5
Iceland
Ireland	16	71	147	101	512
Italy	8	11	12	13	63
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	7	6	5	6	-10
Netherlands	49	52	56	67	36
Poland	44	45	47	51	14
Portugal	52	54	51	53	2
Romania	12	12	12	10	-16
Russia	24
Slovakia	56	53	51	57	2
Slovenia	31	36	37	32	2
Spain	12	13	15	24	107
Sweden	88	87	88	86	-2
Switzerland	24	27	28	30	25
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	136	136	145	155	14
UK: Northern Ireland	38	34	35
UK: Scotland	222	235	247
<i>Mean</i>	48	52	55	54	
<i>Median</i>	31	39	39	51	
<i>Minimum</i>	0	2	2	2	
<i>Maximum</i>	222	235	247	197	

Table 3.2.1.6 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Rape

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R31RA00	R31RA01	R31RA02	R31RA03	2000-2003
Albania	0.6	0.9	0.6	1.2	92
Armenia	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.5	-5
Austria	1.9	2.0	1.7	2.2	19
Belgium	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	1
Bulgaria	2.3	2.1	2.0	2.4	8
Croatia	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.8	6
Cyprus	0.5	0.3	0.3
Czech Republic	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	14
Denmark	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1	-9
Estonia	2.8	1.8	1.5
Finland	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.3	9
France	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.7	-5
Georgia	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	-34
Germany	2.7	1.5	1.6	1.6	-42
Greece	0.3	0.2	0.1
Hungary	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.4	-11
Iceland
Ireland	2.7	4.4	6.7	6.9	157
Italy	2.0	2.3	2.4	2.3	15
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	3.9	3.0	4.0	4.4	13
Netherlands	1.8	2.0	2.3	2.1	12
Poland	2.2	2.5	2.6	2.7	26
Portugal	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	-15
Romania	2.8	3.3	2.9	3.5	27
Russia	4.4	4.4	4.1
Slovakia	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.5	33
Slovenia	2.9	4.2	5.1	5.7	95
Spain	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	52
Sweden	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.5	9
Switzerland	1.4	1.7	1.4	1.2	-16
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.3	11
UK: Northern Ireland	0.5	0.9	0.6
UK: Scotland	0.8	1.3	0.8
<i>Mean</i>	1.8	1.8	1.9	2.2	
<i>Median</i>	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.6	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	
<i>Maximum</i>	4.5	4.5	6.7	6.9	

Table 3.2.1.7 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Robbery

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R31RO00	R31RO01	R31RO02	R31RO03	2000-2003
Albania	8	7	3	6	-19
Armenia	5	4	3	3	-27
Austria	7	6	7	7	3
Belgium	24	26	23	25	4
Bulgaria	17	14	15	17	-3
Croatia	5	4	5	5	11
Cyprus	2	3	1
Czech Republic	14	13	14	15	11
Denmark	12	12	13	14	15
Estonia	79	85	69
Finland	9	11	10	12	31
France	9	9	10	10	15
Georgia	7	6	8	6	-4
Germany	13	13	13	13	-1
Greece	1	1	1
Hungary	15	14	14	17	9
Iceland
Ireland	14	35	42	37	164
Italy	12	13	12	12	-1
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	27	27	29	26	-6
Netherlands	23	23	24	24	6
Poland	23	27	28	30	34
Portugal	14	16	18	18	30
Romania	12	13	13	13	13
Russia	19
Slovakia	12	12	12	12	0
Slovenia	5	4	5	6	21
Spain	14	13	14	15	4
Sweden	9	8	10	10	7
Switzerland	9	8	8	9	0
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	11	13	15	14	22
UK: Northern Ireland	7	7	9
UK: Scotland	12	12	12
<i>Mean</i>	14	15	15	14	
<i>Median</i>	12	12	12	13	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	1	1	3	
<i>Maximum</i>	79	85	69	37	

Table 3.2.1.8 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Theft: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R31TH00	R31TH01	R31TH02	R31TH03	2000-2003
Albania	22	19	23	30	36
Armenia	39	37	27	29	-25
Austria	125	132	137	142	14
Belgium	75	81	74	72	-4
Bulgaria	195	185	196	201	3
Croatia	87	85	88	102	17
Cyprus	48	47	43
Czech Republic	161	158	153	149	-7
Denmark	391	365	347	349	-11
Estonia	334	326	278
Finland	687	767	596	673	-2
France	157	148	108	124	-21
Georgia	19	20	17	15	-23
Germany	209	200	206	205	-2
Greece	19	21	20
Hungary	340	315	305	274	-19
Iceland
Ireland	56	297	675	586	940
Italy	97	79	64	59	-39
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	207	201	207	175	-15
Netherlands	164	160	171	184	12
Poland	145	148	149	167	15
Portugal	54	53	47	46	-15
Romania	122	142	135	121	-1
Russia	408
Slovakia	132	126	135	134	2
Slovenia	85	100	106	95	12
Spain	74	63	67	79	7
Sweden	273	251	248	268	-2
Switzerland	129	123	130	134	4
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	284	281	285	266	-6
UK: Northern Ireland	167	138	135
UK: Scotland	347	355	365
<i>Mean</i>	177	175	179	180	
<i>Median</i>	139	142	135	138	
<i>Minimum</i>	19	19	17	15	
<i>Maximum</i>	687	767	675	673	

Table 3.2.1.9 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Theft: Theft of a motor vehicle

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change 2000-2003
	R31TV00	R31TV01	R31TV02	R31TV03	
Albania
Armenia
Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia	0	1	2	3	813
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark	31	30	30	26	-16
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia	0	1	1	1	230
Germany
Greece	0	0	0
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland	8	48	80	69	770
Italy
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal
Romania	1	1	2	1	74
Russia
Slovakia	1	2	1	1	-46
Slovenia	7	5	5	3	-55
Spain	7	6	7	8	22
Sweden	19	19	19	18	-9
Switzerland
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	27	26	27	24	-10
UK: Northern Ireland	20	21	18
UK: Scotland	29	26	26
<i>Mean</i>	12	14	17	15	
<i>Median</i>	7	6	7	6	
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	0	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	31	48	80	69	

Table 3.2.1.10 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Theft: Burglary: Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R31BU00	R31BU01	R31BU02	R31BU03	2000-2003
Albania
Armenia
Austria	20	29	21	27	35
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia	34	37	36	44	28
Cyprus	19	18	19
Czech Republic
Denmark	45	42	41	44	-2
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany	23	22	23	22	-6
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland	19	44	119	104	439
Italy
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova
Netherlands	83	82	87	95	15
Poland	84	78	74	77	-8
Portugal
Romania
Russia
Slovakia	50	50	43	44	-11
Slovenia	31	44	42	38	20
Spain	54	45	46	51	-6
Sweden	13	12	12	12	-9
Switzerland	18	17	18	20	12
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	50	47	51	49	-3
UK: Northern Ireland	42	29	35
UK: Scotland	53	54	54
<i>Mean</i>	40	41	45	48	
<i>Median</i>	38	43	42	44	
<i>Minimum</i>	13	12	12	12	
<i>Maximum</i>	84	82	119	104	

Table 3.2.1.11 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Theft: Burglary: Domestic Burglary

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R31BD00	R31BD01	R31BD02	R31BD03	2000-2003
Albania
Armenia
Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark	15	13	13	14	-7
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany	...	3	3	3	...
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland	8	34	58	52	535
Italy
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Russia
Slovakia	25	26	23	22	-10
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	28	26	28	28	-1
UK: Northern Ireland	17	11	13
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	19	19	23	24	
<i>Median</i>	17	20	18	22	
<i>Minimum</i>	8	3	3	3	
<i>Maximum</i>	28	34	58	52	

**Table 3.2.1.12 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Drug offences:
Total**

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R31DR00	R31DR01	R31DR02	R31DR03	2000-2003
Albania	6	8	6	6	-13
Armenia	13	12	10	9	-30
Austria	40	47	54	55	40
Belgium	40	39	39	39	-3
Bulgaria	3	2	4	7	136
Croatia	44	47	67	75	73
Cyprus	20	23	18
Czech Republic	9	11	12	13	34
Denmark	107	97	100	112	4
Estonia	23
Finland	112	124	142	143	27
France	38	35	36	43	14
Georgia	9	7	7	8	-14
Germany	66	67	66	68	3
Greece	15	18	17
Hungary	15	22	27	16	6
Iceland
Ireland	17	69	106	102	490
Italy	31	41	37	36	17
Lithuania	14	18	17	15	5
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	9	11	14	20	125
Netherlands	40	44	54	61	54
Poland	7	11	17	26	244
Portugal	34	37	23	23	-34
Romania	1	1	2	2	147
Russia	68
Slovakia	7	10	9	11	70
Slovenia	12	15	17	16	38
Spain	18	18	18	20	10
Sweden	90	90	102	113	25
Switzerland	183	178	190	186	1
Ukraine	62	63	...
UK: England & Wales	86	87	93	97	13
UK: Northern Ireland	39	28	24
UK: Scotland	107	113	114
<i>Mean</i>	40	43	47	49	
<i>Median</i>	23	28	26	31	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	1	2	2	
<i>Maximum</i>	183	178	190	186	

**Table 3.2.1.13 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Drug offences:
Drug trafficking**

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change 2000-2003
	R31DT00	R31DT01	R31DT02	R31DT03	
Albania	0.2	1.2	...
Armenia
Austria	12.3	14.6	14.1	14.8	21
Belgium	6.0	7.8	8.7	7.9	31
Bulgaria	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	209
Croatia	1.3	0.6	0.6	0.8	-36
Cyprus
Czech Republic	8.0	8.8	9.8	10.5	32
Denmark	8.0	8.2	10.0	9.8	23
Estonia	4.7
Finland
France	12.4	11.7	13.1	15.1	22
Georgia	0.2	0.2	...
Germany	6.8	6.5	6.0	6.3	-8
Greece	1.5	2.4	2.9
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland	16.8	63.1	91.6	91.4	445
Italy
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland	1.3	1.5	1.8	2.2	62
Portugal	12.8	13.1	12.7	12.3	-4
Romania
Russia
Slovakia	4.8	7.5	5.5	7.6	60
Slovenia	8.7	10.2	12.1	11.8	36
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland	89.4	87.8	91.2	90.8	2
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	19.6	19.6	20.0	20.9	7
UK: Northern Ireland	11.8	9.0	6.6
UK: Scotland	26.0	27.3	26.0
<i>Mean</i>	13.3	16.7	16.7	17.9	...
<i>Median</i>	8.0	8.9	9.3	9.8	...
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	...
<i>Maximum</i>	89.4	87.8	91.6	91.4	...

Notes on Tables 3.2.1.1 - 3.2.1.13

Albania: Excludes persons convicted by a military court.

Belgium: A principal offence rule is not applied: all offences are counted.

Estonia: Data for 2002 are not fully comparable with earlier years.

France: The lower figures for Total offences, traffic offences, assault and theft in 2002 are due to a presidential amnesty.

Ireland: A new recording system was introduced in 2000 resulting in a gradual improvement in recording over the period of the survey.

Italy: A large reform of the judicial system was introduced in 1999. As a consequence, figures for 2000 are not reliable for comparisons of trends.

Robbery does not include mugging (bag-snatching).

Netherlands: Excludes cases dealt with by a prosecutor by a fine (a 'transactie'). The case is not brought before a court and, technically, does not constitute a conviction. If included in Table 3.2.1.1 the number of convictions would rise by more than 50%.

Portugal: A change of legislation in 2001 introduced the offence of 'dangerous driving of vehicles' and broadened the punitive scope of 'driving under the influence' in the sense of comparing driving under the influence of alcohol to driving under the effects of drugs. This explains the increase in the number of persons convicted for traffic offences.

Theft covers simple and aggravated theft.

Since 2001, the possession of drugs for personal use is no longer considered a crime. Only cultivation, either for personal use or for any other end, is still considered a crime. This explains the decrease in the number of persons convicted for drug offences.

Spain: Estimated data for 2003.

Switzerland: Traffic offences are included in the Total (in Chapter 1 they were not).

Since 2000 minors are included in the figures provided in these tables. Their inclusion increases the total number of offences by approximately 15%. For this reason, figures are not comparable with previous editions of the Sourcebook. The only exceptions are the figures for homicide and completed homicide that do not include minors for the year 2000. As a consequence, for these two offences, figures for 2000 are not comparable with the ones provided for the following years.

	Criminal offences: Total	Traffic offences	Intentional homicide:		Assault	Rape	Robbery	Theft: Total	Theft: of a motor vehicle	Theft: Burglary:		Theft: Domestic Burglary	Drug offences: Total	Drug offences: Drug trafficking
			Total	Completed						Total	Total			
	P32TCW03	P32TTW03	P32HOW03	P32HCW03	P32ASW03	P32RAW03	P32ROW03	P32THW03	P32TVW03	P32BUW03	P32BDW03	P32DRW03	P32DTW03	
Moldova
Netherlands	11.5	7.6	6.0	...	9.1	1.5	8.3	16.7	...	14.0	...	13.4
Poland	7.2	2.2	15.1	...	4.4	1.0	3.6	6.7	...	2.1	...	6.1	12.2	...
Portugal	8.5	4.0	7.5	10.3	14.9	0.0	4.7	7.0	11.2	13.9	...
Romania	9.7	1.2	6.3	8.5	5.3	0.1	3.9	5.6	3.2	10.3
Russia	13.0
Slovakia	11.3	6.4	15.5	17.4	8.9	0.0	5.8	7.8	0.0	4.5	...	11.4	10.4	...
Slovenia	10.9	16.1	9.5	...	2.9	0.0	6.8	8.2	3.1	2.5	...	7.0	5.9	...
Spain	5.8	2.9	5.2	...	3.4	0.0	7.3	6.0	2.6	4.6	...	12.1
Sweden	16.4	11.0	8.8	...	11.4	0.8	2.9	32.6	5.5	14.3	...	16.4
Switzerland	15.2	12.8	15.8	19.2	8.8	1.1	7.2	21.0	12.7	11.7	...
Ukraine	12.1
UK: England & Wales	17.6	13.3	6.2	6.9	13.2	0.3	11.5	17.8	5.0	5.1	6.5	9.9	14.0	...
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	11	8	9	10	7	1	6	13	3	5	5	9	11	...
Median	11	7	8	9	8	0	6	11	3	5	6	10	10	...
Minimum	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	...
Maximum	20	16	20	23	15	3	11	33	6	14	6	16	38	...

	Criminal offences: Total		Traffic offences	Intentional homicide: Total	Intentional homicide: Completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery	Theft: Total	Theft: of a motor vehicle	Theft: Total	Theft: Burglary: Total	Theft: Burglary: Domestic	Drug offences: Total	Drug trafficking
	P32TCM03	P32TTM03	P32HOM03	P32HCM03	P32ASM03	P32RAM03	P32ROM03	P32THM03	P32TM03	P32BUM03	P32BDM03	P32DRM03	P32DT03		
Moldova	12.4	4.6	6.5	...	5.8	16.3	14.9	18.3	5.9
Netherlands	7.4	0.6	7.0	...	10.2	16.1	26.3	10.6	16.4	2.7	...
Poland	0.2	0.0	2.3	...	0.1	2.1	0.9	0.5	0.8	2.2	0.9
Portugal	4.7	5.6	2.2	2.9	2.3	3.6	17.6	9.9	4.1	2.8
Romania	8.9	2.2	5.3	5.4	3.2	14.6	22.5	17.4	18.9	3.9	...
Russia	12.6	...	6.1	...	6.9	15.5	15.9	16.6	5.7	...
Slovakia	9.0	1.7	3.4	4.3	4.6	15.0	27.4	17.9	15.6	27.2	10.7	10.9
Slovenia	7.7	1.7	0.0	...	6.2	5.2	27.4	13.6	14.1	13.6	17.6	16.4
Spain
Sweden	10.8	7.7	3.7	...	19.0	9.8	29.2	18.2	32.4	14.0	5.0	...
Switzerland	13.5	3.9	8.8	7.7	20.6	16.7	47.9	38.7	35.7	24.5
Ukraine	10.5
UK: England & Wales	6.2	2.7	2.7	3.2	17.7	5.2	36.2	17.0	43.9	22.4	22.0	10.1	4.7
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	7	3	4	4	8	10	20	13	20	16	18	7	7
Median	7	2	3	4	7	10	23	13	18	14	18	5	5
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0
Maximum	15	8	15	9	21	38	48	39	44	27	25	36	25	...	25

	Criminal offences: Total	Traffic offences	Intentional homicide: Total	Intentional homicide: Completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery	Theft: Total	Theft: of a motor vehicle	Theft: Total	Theft: Burglary:		Drug offences: Total	Drug trafficking
											P32TCA03	P32TTA03		
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland	1.6	0.8	1.8	...	0.3	0.4	1.0	0.5	...	0.5	0.7	2.5
Portugal	6.3	7.1	9.3	12.0	2.9	14.5	8.3	5.0	15.6	22.9
Romania	1.2
Russia
Slovakia	0.6	0.5	3.4	4.3	0.4	0.0	1.8	0.2	0.0	0.1	1.8	2.2
Slovenia	4.1	3.5	1.5	0.9	6.0	2.3	9.4	1.8	3.3	4.6
Spain	9.0	5.4	26.7	...
Sweden
Switzerland	47.5	39.6	57.9	61.5	59.0	65.6	60.7	60.5	42.6	53.0
Ukraine	0.8
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	13	9	16	19	11	15	17	17	4	13	4	24	18	28
Median	6	5	12	8	4	9	11	6	2	4	4	24	15	23
Minimum	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	1	0
Maximum	49	40	60	63	58	68	59	67	9	36	67	24	52	89

Notes on Tables 3.2.2.1-3.2.2.3

Cyprus and Estonia: Data relate to the year 2002 (instead of 2003).

Russia: Data relate to the year 2000 (instead of 2003).

Spain: New legislation for minors in 2000 resulted in non reliable statistical data on minors convicted.

3.3 Technical information**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'). Such decisions are counted as convictions and are thus included in the conviction tables. This was the case in Armenia, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Russia, Slovenia, Sweden and Switzerland¹⁶. 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. The only exception is Denmark where sanctions / measures by the police were included. Data collected in previous surveys showed that the numbers recorded in the conviction tables often differ from the totals in the sanction tables. Although these differences cannot be fully explained, they usually reflect the different sources and therefore statistical rules used to collect each set of data. For each court proceeding offenders are counted once under the offence for which there is the most severe penalty or when there is a tie by the offence with the maximum penalty in the Criminal Code.

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

The offence definitions, which underlie Chapter 1, reflect the definitions that 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

¹⁶ In Finland and Hungary also sanctions / measures by the prosecutor not based on admission of guilt by the defender were also included.

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)

Belgium: From 2000, assault leading to death is included in homicide figures and not in assault as it is for Chapter 1.

Finland: Due to principal offence rules, assault leading to death is excluded from intentional homicide but aggravated assault leading to death is included in assault.

France: The definition of assault used in this chapter follows the standard definition and includes *contraventions*, where the bodily injury only resulted in loss of the ability to work for fewer than 8 days, which were not included in Chapter 1. The definition of robbery is more restrictive than in Chapter 1 (mugging may be often prosecuted as simple theft, some violent thefts with other aggravated circumstances are not included).

Germany: Figures for rape convictions in 2000 includes sexual assaults. Theft from an attic or basement in a multi-dwelling building is excluded from domestic burglary convictions.

Italy: Robbery does not include muggings.

Lithuania: The definition of drug offences differs from the one in police statistics. Here it does not include 'illegal production, possession, acquisition, transportation or delivery of precursors of narcotic or psychotropic substances' although the difference is small.

Portugal: Assault leading to death is excluded from homicide. The inclusion of mugging (bag-snatching) under robbery depends on the evaluation of the circumstances by the courts. Burglary is not an independent statistical category.

Romania: Assault leading to death is not included in homicide figures and included in assault. The statistical definitions differ from the second edition.

3.3.1 Data recording methods in connection with Tables 3.2.1 and 3.2.2

Table 3.3.1.1 Description of data recording methods for Tables 3.2.1 and 3.2.2

Question	Are there written rules regulating the way in which the data shown in this table are collected?	What stage of the process do the data refer to?	How is a person who is convicted of more than one offence of the same type counted?	How is a person counted who is dealt with for more than one offence in the same year?
Possible answers	1: Yes 2: No	1: Before appeal 2: After appeal	1= As one person 2=As two or more people 3 = Other	1: As one person 2: As two or more persons 3: Other
	CT32D03	CT32E00	CT32G03	CT32H03
Albania	1	2	1	3
Armenia	...	2
Austria	1	2	1	2
Belgium	1	2	3	2
Bulgaria	2	2	1	2
Croatia	1	2	2	2
Cyprus	1	1	1	2
Czech Republic	2	2	3	3
Denmark	2	1	2	2
Estonia	1	2	1	2
Finland	1	1	1	2
France	2	2	1	2
Georgia	1	1
Germany	1	2	1	2
Greece
Hungary	1	2	2	2
Iceland
Ireland	1	1	1	2
Italy	1	2	2	2
Lithuania	2	1	3	2
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	1	2	1	3
Netherlands	1	1	1	2
Poland	1	2	1	2
Portugal	1	1	2	2
Romania	1	2	1	1
Russia	1	1	1	2
Slovakia	1	2	1	1
Slovenia	2	2	1	1
Spain	1	1	1	2
Sweden	1	1	1	2
Switzerland	1	2	1	2
Ukraine	1	2	1	2
UK: England & Wales	1	1	1	2
UK: Northern Ireland	1	1	1	2
UK: Scotland	2	2	1	2

Spain: If an offender is convicted for more than one offence these offences can be grouped together for intentional homicide, assault and theft.

UK: Northern Ireland: Since 2000 the data are based on extractions from the Police database, ICIS (Integrated Crime Information System). This change in source should be borne in mind when making comparisons with earlier years.

3.3.2 Age brackets and definition of aliens used in Tables 3.2.2.2 and 3.2.2.3

Age brackets used in Table 3.2.2.2

All countries count minors as persons who are under 18 years old. The only exception is Austria, which included 18-year-olds until 2000 and Poland where 17-year-olds are counted

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 1.3.2.2).

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

Table 3.3.1.3 Minimum age for consideration in conviction statistics 2003

Albania	14
Armenia	14
Austria	14
Belgium	16
Bulgaria	14
Croatia	14
Cyprus	7
Czech Republic	15
Denmark	15
Estonia	13
Finland	15
France	7
Germany	14
Greece	7
Hungary	14
Ireland	14
Italy	15
Latvia	14
Lithuania	14
Moldova	14
Netherlands	12
Norway	15
Poland	15
Portugal	16
Romania	14
Slovakia	15
Slovenia	14
Spain	16
Sweden	15
Switzerland	7
Ukraine	14
UK: England & Wales	10
UK: Northern Ireland	10
UK: Scotland	8

Notes on Table 3.3.1.3

The transition from the status of minor to adult raises difficult legal and statistical questions as to how a person is to be treated who, having committed an offence as a minor, is dealt with in court only once he/she has reached the age of adulthood. Some countries apply rules for minors, and count him/her as such, whereas others treat and count him/her as an adult. For details, see the following footnotes.

Belgium: Refers to the moment the court decision is taken, not when the offence was committed.

Estonia: From 1 September 2002 the minimum age rose from 12 to 14 years.

France: Formally, there is no minimum age. In practice and according to jurisprudence however it is 7 years.

Poland: Only the most serious cases involving minors are included in the table.

Slovakia: Individuals who committed crimes as minors are considered as minors even if convicted and sentenced after they reach the age of 18.

Spain: New legislation for minors in 2000 resulted in the small number proceeded against in court.

Sweden: Age bracket refers to the time when the court decision was taken.

UK: Scotland: Except for serious offences children aged 8 - 15 are generally referred to the reporter of the children's panel or given a police warning rather than being proceeded against in a court.

3.4 Sources

Albania	Ministry of Justice, Department of Statistics
Armenia	Statistical Yearbook of Armenia - 2004
Austria	Statistics Austria. Annual Conviction Statistics 2000-2003
Belgium	Ministère de la Justice - Service de la politique criminelle - Point d'appui statistique, Données statistiques en matière de condamnations, suspensions, internements. Tableaux pluri-annuels 1993/4 - 2003 (non publiés)
Bulgaria	Regular statistical documentation of the National Institute of Statistics concerning convicted persons with an effective sentence on the basis of data taken from the publication 'Offences and Convicted Persons', edited by the National Institute of Statistics, Demographic and Social Statistics Direction, Statistics of Social Activities Department
Croatia	State Bureau of Statistics - Department of Judicial and Administrative Statistics Internal documentation (unpublished - only selected data are published)
Cyprus	'Criminal Statistics' for each year. Statistical Service
Czech Republic	Ministry of Justice, Statistical and Informatics Department Criminal Court's Statistics, unpublished. Year 2003 Foreigners in the Czech Republic, Czech Statistical Office, 2004
Denmark	Statistics Denmark
Estonia	Statistical Office of Estonia
Finland	Yearbook of Justice Statistics, relevant year / Statistics Finland
France	Ministère de la Justice, SDSED, annual judicial statistics
Georgia	Department of executions of Ministry of Justice Statistical Department of Supreme Court of Georgia

Germany	Statistisches Bundesamt (Ed.): Strafverfolgungsstatistik 2000 – 2003 Wiesbaden 2001 – 2004
Greece	National Statistical Service of Greece
Hungary	Ministry of Justice
Iceland	...
Ireland	...
Italy	Istat – National Institute of Statistics
Lithuania	National Courts Administration
Luxembourg	...
Malta	...
Moldova	Ministry of Justice
Netherlands	Ministry of Justice (WODC) and Central Bureau of Statistics
Poland	Ministry of Justice, Department of Statistics
Portugal	Legal Policy and Planning Office, Ministry of Justice
Romania	Ministry of Justice, Directorate of Organisation, Human Resources and Judiciary Statistics
Russia	Ministry of Interior Affairs
Slovakia	Ministry of Justice
Slovenia	Statistical office of the Republic of Slovenia. Based on data taken from 'Results of Surveys': Crime. Annual publication
Spain	INE - Instituto Nacional de Estadística. Estadísticas Judiciales de España
Sweden	Official Swedish Criminal Statistics published by the National Crime Prevention Council
Switzerland	Office fédéral de la statistique (unpublished)
UK: England & Wales	Home Office, Research, Development and Statistics Directorate Criminal Statistics. Annual publication
UK: Northern Ireland	Northern Ireland Office Statistics and Research Branch
UK: Scotland	The Scottish Executive Justice Statistics Unit

4 Correctional statistics

4.1 General comments

4.1.1 Introduction

1. This chapter presents data on custodial sanctions. It also briefly reviews the information available on recidivism.
2. The content of this chapter has been shortened considerably compared with earlier Sourcebook editions. It no longer includes data on the number and the capacity of penal institutions; data on expenditure; nor data describing the stock and flow of the execution of non-custodial sentences.
3. *The 'stock' and 'flow' perspective*
Generally speaking, data on custodial sanctions can be described from two perspectives, which generate different, but equally important results. The first perspective concerns 'How many persons are there on a given day?' ('stock'). The second perspective concerns 'How many people have been submitted during the course of the year?' ('flow').
4. The following data were requested:
 - How many people are there in the prisons ('stock', including pre-trial detention and divided into sub-categories: women, minors, and aliens)?
 - How many people are admitted to the prisons ('flow', including pre-trial detention and divided into sub-categories: women, minors, and aliens)?
 - What kind of offences have the convicted prisoners committed ('stock', excluding pre-trial detention, but divided into subcategories: all offences, traffic offences, intentional homicide, completed intentional homicide, assault, rape, robbery, total theft, theft of a motor vehicle, burglary, domestic burglary, total drug offences, drug trafficking)?

4.1.2 Quality of the data

5. Almost all countries (35 out of 42) have reported data on prison populations ('stock' data). Fewer countries (26) provided data on yearly admission and data on the prison population by type of offence.
6. Data describing the prison populations 'stock' ('how many prisoners there are') is overall in accordance with the data published by the SPACE

project (Annual Penal Statistics of the Council of Europe¹⁷). The great majority of the deviations for the year 2003 lie in an acceptable margin of +/- 10%. Five countries (out of 34) deviate from this rule.

7. Data describing prison populations' 'flow' ('how many prisoners are admitted yearly') do not show a correspondence with the SPACE data that is equally good. Nine countries (out of 22) deviate from the 10%-rule. This is not surprising since it is technically more difficult to measure 'flow' data than it is to measure 'stock' data.

4.1.3 Results

8. There are considerable differences between the countries as regards the absolute size of the prison population: in 2003, the prison rates range from a low 38 to a high 607 per 100 000. The countries' relative positions have not changed significantly between 2000 and 2003.
9. Between 2000 and 2003, prison populations in European countries show changes between -20% and +39%. The median prison rate in Europe increased from 96 to 100 per 100 000 population, while the mean prison rate remained stable (142 per 100 000). Substantial decreases occurred in some Eastern European countries, while substantial increases can be noted in some Northern and Southern European countries.
10. Typically, between 25-29 % of the prison population are pre-trial detainees. This proportion has been decreasing slightly during the years 2000-2003.
11. The proportion of women in prison is low (4-5 %) and varies very little between the countries.
12. As regards aliens, the percentage varies considerably between the countries, reflecting diverse factors such as geographical location, economic development, or immigration policies. Also, definitions vary widely between countries. There is no general trend of an increasing proportion of alien prisoners in European prisons.
13. Minors (i.e. persons under the age of 18) do not usually enter the prison system and they account for 2-3% of the prison populations in Europe.

17 www.coe.int/T/E/Legal_affairs/Legal_co-operation/Prisons_and_alternatives/Statistics_SPACE_I/List_Space_I.asp (2 March 2006).

14. In 2003, the prisoners ('stock') have been imprisoned for violence (homicide, assault, rape, and robbery) in about 35% of the cases, for theft in about 27%, and for drug offences in about 10% of the cases.
15. Between 2000 and 2003, the number of prisoners admitted to European prisons ('flow') has been rather stable. On average, the time spent in prison (pre-trial detention included) can be estimated at 6-7 months.

4.1.4 *Recidivism*

16. Due to the many technical and methodological problems, data on recidivism were not collected. However, a brief account of some of the main methodological issues and some common features in the results from available reconviction studies are presented here.
17. Measuring reconviction varies between countries. Some do this by defining the concept of a recidivist within their Penal Code and simply count the persons that reoffend whereas other countries rely on research studies to estimate reconvictions rates of offenders. Some countries have built up large databases of offender histories, which enable reconviction rates and criminal careers to be studied on a regular basis.
18. However, there is little standardisation between countries in the methodology used. In general, results are dependent, among other factors, on
 - the size of the studied sample or population;
 - the characteristics of the offenders (are all offenders chosen or only special subgroups according to gender, age, prior conviction, type of offence, type of sanction et cetera);
 - the length of the follow-up period;
 - the definition of the event, which constitutes 'reconviction'/'recidivism' (e.g. all offences or only special offences/sanctions meet the criterion of reconviction).
19. Indeed, when choosing different offender characteristics, follow-up periods and reconviction criteria, 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. Nor should it be forgotten that reconviction rates are in fact 'rates of recapture'. Therefore, recidivism rates may depend on the efficiency of the different criminal justice systems.

20. Although reconvictions rates vary considerably in their magnitude between countries, there are some common features in the results, namely

- past criminal history is the most important predictor of reconviction rates, the highest rates being for offenders with the longest criminal history;
- reconviction rates are higher for males than for females; this is mostly explained by differences in criminal history and age, however;
- younger persons tend to have higher reconviction rates than older persons;
- reconviction rates are highest in the first year after the initial conviction/release;
- there is no simple relationship between the seriousness of the offence and reconviction;
- there is no simple relationship between the first conviction and the subsequent offences either;
- there is no simple relationship between the type of sentence and the reconviction rate.

4.2 Tables

Table 4.2.1.1 Prison population per 100 000 population: STOCK – Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R41ST00	R41ST01	R41ST02	R41ST03	2000-2003
Albania	69	72	78	73	6
Armenia
Austria	85	85	94	96	13
Belgium	81	81	86	86	5
Bulgaria	121	120	125	133	10
Croatia	59	60	59	62	5
Cyprus	38	33	46	46	21
Czech Republic	210	188	158	169	-20
Denmark	63	60	64	67	7
Estonia	341	355	351	322	-6
Finland	52	59	67	66	26
France	82	79	90	96	16
Georgia	167	154	138	136	-19
Germany	97	96	91	99	2
Greece	72	78	80	81	11
Hungary	148	169	179	169	14
Iceland	28	39	37	38	39
Ireland
Italy	96	99	98	98	2
Lithuania	260	317	305	223	-14
Luxembourg	91	77	87	100	9
Malta	63	66	72	70	12
Moldova	222	245	238	243	9
Netherlands	84	89	94	100	18
Poland	169	207	210	209	24
Portugal	124	126	132	130	5
Romania	221	225	230	203	-8
Russia	722	633	675	607	-16
Slovakia	132	138	143	164	24
Slovenia	57	57	56	55	-3
Spain	113	117	127	137	22
Sweden	63	66	72	75	18
Switzerland	79	70	68	71	-10
Ukraine	445	458	400	395	-11
UK: England & Wales	125	127	135	140	12
UK: Northern Ireland	63	54	60	68	7
UK: Scotland	115	122	129	131	14
<i>Mean</i>	142	143	145	141	
<i>Median</i>	96	96	94	100	
<i>Minimum</i>	28	33	37	38	
<i>Maximum</i>	722	633	675	607	

Table 4.2.1.2 Prison population: % of pre-trial detainees in the total STOCK

	2000	2001	2002	2003
	P41SP00	P41SP01	P41SP02	P41SP03
Albania	57	53	50	52
Armenia
Austria	24	25	26	26
Belgium	41	41	36	35
Bulgaria	16	17	20	19
Croatia	31	31	31	33
Cyprus	8	20	9	13
Czech Republic	28	24	21	20
Denmark	26	26	29	29
Estonia	35	32	32	30
Finland	14	16	14	15
France	34	33	36	38
Georgia	61	58	61	61
Germany	23	22	24	21
Greece	29	28	25	28
Hungary	22	20	19	18
Iceland	19	9	19	7
Ireland
Italy	44	43	40	37
Lithuania	20	16	15	17
Luxembourg
Malta	39	31	30	33
Moldova	33	30	28	24
Netherlands	38	41	42	40
Poland	29	31	27	25
Portugal	30	28	31	26
Romania	22	23	20	15
Russia	27	25	22	17
Slovakia	27	26	30	33
Slovenia	27	28	25	24
Spain	20	22	23	22
Sweden	24	28	28	27
Switzerland	32	31	30	32
Ukraine	21
UK: England & Wales	18	17	18	18
UK: Northern Ireland	29	29	33	33
UK: Scotland	16	15	20	19
<i>Mean</i>	29	28	28	27
<i>Median</i>	27	28	27	25
<i>Minimum</i>	8	9	9	7
<i>Maximum</i>	61	58	61	61

Table 4.2.1.3 Prison population: % of females in the total STOCK

	2000	2001	2002	2003
	P41SW00	P41SW01	P41SW02	P41SW03
Albania
Armenia
Austria	6	6	6	5
Belgium	4	4	4	4
Bulgaria	3	3	3	3
Croatia	3	4	4	4
Cyprus	4	8	6	6
Czech Republic	4	4	4	4
Denmark	5	5	5	5
Estonia	2	3	3	3
Finland	5	5	6	6
France	4	3	4	4
Georgia	2	2	2	2
Germany	4	5	5	5
Greece	5	5	5	5
Hungary	7	7	6	6
Iceland	4	5	5	5
Ireland
Italy	4	4	4	5
Lithuania	3	4	4	3
Luxembourg	6	4	7	4
Malta
Moldova	4	4	5	5
Netherlands	7	9	9	9
Poland	2	3	3	3
Portugal	9	9	8	7
Romania	4	4	5	4
Russia	6
Slovakia	4	3	3	3
Slovenia	4	...	4	...
Spain	8	...	8	...
Sweden	4	5	5	5
Switzerland	7	6	6	6
Ukraine	5
UK: England & Wales	5	6	6	6
UK: Northern Ireland	2	2	2	2
UK: Scotland	3	4	5	5
<i>Mean</i>	5	5	5	5
<i>Median</i>	4	4	5	5
<i>Minimum</i>	2	2	2	2
<i>Maximum</i>	9	9	9	9

Table 4.2.1.4 Prison population: % of minors in the total STOCK

	2000	2001	2002	2003
	P41SM00	P41SM01	P41SM02	P41SM03
Albania
Armenia
Austria	3	2	2	...
Belgium	0	0	0	...
Bulgaria	1	1	1	1
Croatia	3	4	5	5
Cyprus	8	12	7	7
Czech Republic	1	1	1	1
Denmark	0	0	0	1
Estonia	...	2	2	1
Finland	5	5	5	4
France	1	1	1	1
Georgia	2	2	2	2
Germany	2	2	2	2
Greece	8	6	6	6
Hungary	2	2	1	1
Iceland	0	0	0	0
Ireland
Italy	1	1	1	1
Lithuania	2	3	3	2
Luxembourg	...	1
Malta
Moldova	3	3	3	3
Netherlands	12	13	13	14
Poland	0	0	0	0
Portugal	6	6	7	6
Romania	3	3	3	2
Russia	4	3	3	2
Slovakia	1	1	1	1
Slovenia	1	...	1	...
Spain	0
Sweden	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	...	1	2	2
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	3	3	3	2
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	3	2	3	2
<i>Mean</i>	3	3	3	3
<i>Median</i>	2	2	2	2
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	0	0
<i>Maximum</i>	12	13	13	14

Table 4.2.1.5 Prison population: % of aliens in the total STOCK

	2000	2001	2002	2003
	P41SA00	P41SA01	P41SA02	P41SA03
Albania
Armenia
Austria	30	32	32	38
Belgium	41	41	42	42
Bulgaria	1	2	2	2
Croatia	...	8	6	3
Cyprus	39	61	42	45
Czech Republic	12	11	10	10
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	6	8	8	8
France	22	21	22	22
Georgia	0	0	0	0
Germany	20	20	21	19
Greece	46	45	46	43
Hungary	5	5	5	4
Iceland	5	10	9	9
Ireland
Italy	27	29	30	30
Lithuania	1	1	1	2
Luxembourg	...	60
Malta
Moldova
Netherlands	56	56	58	56
Poland	2	2	2	2
Portugal	12	12	15	16
Romania	1	1	1	1
Russia
Slovakia	3	3	2	2
Slovenia	17	...	15	...
Spain	19	...	25	...
Sweden
Switzerland	71
Ukraine	2
UK: England & Wales	8	9	10	12
UK: Northern Ireland	1	1	1	1
UK: Scotland	2	2	1	1
<i>Mean</i>	16	18	16	18
<i>Median</i>	10	10	10	9
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	0	0
<i>Maximum</i>	56	61	58	71

Table 4.2.2.1 Prison population per 100 000 population: FLOW – Total

	2000	2001	2002	2003	% change
	R42FT00	R42FT01	R42FT02	R42FT03	2000-2003
Albania
Armenia
Austria	156	152	171	175	12
Belgium	143	140	154	154	8
Bulgaria	81	69	78	83	3
Croatia	395	383	394	279	-29
Cyprus	218	261	235	255	17
Czech Republic	256	232	174	192	-25
Denmark	312	302	276	293	-6
Estonia	602	680	532	721	20
Finland	127	132	143	147	16
France	109	106	125	129	18
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland	91	117	110	138	52
Ireland
Italy	144	139	143	144	0
Lithuania	352	425	403	342	-3
Luxembourg	384	306	226	252	-34
Malta	79	83	101	95	20
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland	232	248	239	234	1
Portugal	57	67	70	66	15
Romania	145	169	158	109	-23
Russia
Slovakia	140	85	86	98	-30
Slovenia	285	256	206	180	-37
Spain	104	103	104
Sweden	103	104	114	120	16
Switzerland	652	655	693	727	12
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	247	250	258	256	3
UK: Northern Ireland	308	261	287	312	1
UK: Scotland	649	684	757	742	14
<i>Mean</i>	245	247	240	250	
<i>Median</i>	187	201	173	180	
<i>Minimum</i>	57	67	70	66	
<i>Maximum</i>	652	684	757	742	

Table 4.2.2.2 Prison population: % of pre-trial detainees in the total FLOW

	2000	2001	2002	2003
	P42FP00	P42FP01	P42FP02	P42FP03
Albania
Armenia
Austria	65	68	69	73
Belgium	67	67	68	68
Bulgaria	35	51	54	47
Croatia	23
Cyprus	30	34	31	33
Czech Republic	48	47	44	42
Denmark	30	32	36	35
Estonia
Finland	25	28	25	25
France	78	75	76	...
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland	29	27	34	17
Ireland
Italy	90	86	88	...
Lithuania	59	56	55	56
Luxembourg
Malta	77	72	72	72
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland	54	54	51	50
Portugal	86	86	88	75
Romania
Russia
Slovakia	38	41	42	45
Slovenia	18	19	22	24
Spain	65	66	69	...
Sweden
Switzerland	38	37	38	39
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	59	59	63	62
UK: Northern Ireland	42	44	48	46
UK: Scotland	42	44	49	50
<i>Mean</i>	50	52	53	48
<i>Median</i>	45	51	51	46
<i>Minimum</i>	18	19	22	17
<i>Maximum</i>	90	86	88	75

Table 4.2.2.3 Prison population: % of females in the total FLOW

	2000	2001	2002	2003
	P42FW00	P42FW01	P42FW02	P42FW03
Albania
Armenia
Austria	8.1	8.3	8.4	8.5
Belgium	6.9	6.6	6.8	6.7
Bulgaria	2.8	3.7	3.4	3.2
Croatia	3.1
Cyprus	7.1	9.3	6.2	8.2
Czech Republic
Denmark	3.9	3.8	3.3	3.5
Estonia	...	5.1	4.7	8.1
Finland	5.6	6.4	7.4	6.7
France	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.5
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland	6.3	8.1	10.1	6.2
Ireland
Italy	8.3	7.9	8.0	8.9
Lithuania	2.1	2.3	2.6	1.7
Luxembourg	7.2	4.9	10.6	11.3
Malta	4.5	6.4	9.3	7.2
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal	10.1	7.4	8.7	7.6
Romania
Russia
Slovakia
Slovenia	4.7	4.3	4.4	3.7
Spain
Sweden	6.0	5.9	6.7	6.8
Switzerland
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	8.3	8.6	9.3	9.6
UK: Northern Ireland	4.9	4.4	4.6	5.1
UK: Scotland	6.7	7.1	7.5	8.2
<i>Mean</i>	5.9	6.1	6.6	6.6
<i>Median</i>	6.0	6.4	6.8	6.8
<i>Minimum</i>	2.1	2.3	2.6	1.7
<i>Maximum</i>	10.1	9.3	10.6	11.3

Table 4.2.2.4 Prison population: % of minors in the total FLOW

	2000	2001	2002	2003
	P42FM00	P42FM01	P42FM02	P42FM03
Albania
Armenia
Austria	6.4	8.8	9.7	8.8
Belgium	4.1	3.6	2.7	4.0
Bulgaria	1.8	2.5	2.5	2.4
Croatia	0.7
Cyprus	8.3	5.8	6.7	9.1
Czech Republic
Denmark	2.6	2.9	3.2	3.4
Estonia	...	6.1	6.6	2.8
Finland	5.2	6.8	4.4	4.4
France	6.0	5.1	5.0	4.2
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland	2.0	0.3	0.9	0.2
Ireland
Italy	2.3	2.0	1.8	1.9
Lithuania	1.4	1.4	1.7	1.3
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal	10.2	10.3	12.3	9.8
Romania
Russia
Slovakia
Slovenia	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5
Spain
Sweden	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Switzerland
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	4.2	3.7	3.9	3.7
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	5.4	5.0	5.2	5.0
<i>Mean</i>	3.8	4.0	4.2	3.8
<i>Median</i>	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.6
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	10.2	10.3	12.3	9.8

Table 4.2.2.5 Prison population: % of aliens in the total FLOW

	2000	2001	2002	2003
	P42FA00	P42FA01	P42FA02	P42FA03
Albania
Armenia
Austria	40.9	41.2	42.7	...
Belgium	44.1	43.5	42.0	41.7
Bulgaria	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.7
Croatia	14.8
Cyprus	40.6	40.7	39.9	54.8
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France	23.4	23.3	24.4	23.6
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland	5.5	11.7	12.3	11.7
Ireland
Italy	34.4	36.2	37.5	34.9
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta	34.1	35.8	36.8	29.3
Moldova
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Russia
Slovakia
Slovenia	2.8	3.2	3.4	2.3
Spain
Sweden	25.1	24.8	26.5	25.5
Switzerland
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	8.3	10.1	9.3	10.1
UK: Northern Ireland	1.1	1.3	1.2	2.2
UK: Scotland	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1
<i>Mean</i>	19.9	21.2	21.5	20.0
<i>Median</i>	19.1	23.3	24.4	17.6
<i>Minimum</i>	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1
<i>Maximum</i>	44.1	43.5	42.7	54.8

Comments on Tables 4.2.1.1 to 4.2.1.5 and 4.2.2.1 to 4.2.2.5

Albania: The data for 2002 refer to 1 October 2002.

Czech Republic:

Female – minors excluded; pre-trial detainees and convicted females included.

Aliens – includes pre-trial detainees and convicted persons, both male and female and minors.

Minors – both male and female (persons 15 - 18 years old).

Denmark: Pre-trial female detainees are excluded.

Estonia: Data refer to 1 January.

Regarding females and minor figures, only convicted females and minors are included (excluding pre-trial detainees).

France: Statistical domain: metropolitan France.

Refers to figures on 1 October.

Flow data include entries following an escape, after re-arrest.

Germany: Data refer to 31 March.

Figures on aliens refer to convicted prisoners and those on remand pending deportation only.

Regarding pre-trial detainees, a breakdown by nationality is not possible.

Italy: The data for adults refer to 1 July, the data for minors refer to 31 December.

Lithuania: Figures refer to 31 December.

Luxembourg: Figures refer to 31 December.

Moldova: Figures refer to 1 October.

The flow data also include transfers, entries following leave and entries following an escape, after re-arrest.

Netherlands: The stock data refer to 30 September.

The concept of alien is according to country of birth.

Poland: Data as of 31 August, except for minors where the data refer to 31 December. Number of total prison population consists of pre-trial detainees, sentenced persons and sentenced by misdemeanour board.

The flow data also include transfers.

Romania: Data referring to aliens are recorded on 31 December.

Russia: Data refer to 1 January.

Amnesty and stricter rules for arrest and pre-trial detention caused a decline in the prison population.

Slovakia: The flow data also include all transfers, appearances before a judicial authority, entries following leave and entries following an escape, after re-arrest.

Spain: A new legislation on juvenile offenders came into force in 2000. Since then, minors have not been included in correctional statistics.

Sweden: Data refer to 1 October. Data on minors refer only to pre-trial detainees.

Switzerland: The flow data include also transfers, appearances before a judicial authority and, under some conditions, entries following leave.

The percentage of aliens in the total prison population (stock) relates to the year 2004 instead of 2003.

Ukraine: Data refer to 1 January.

UK: England & Wales: Data at 30 June.

UK: Northern Ireland: Data is average prison population for the year.

UK: Scotland: Minors are defined as all those under 18. For the flow data, warrants and not receptions are counted.

	Criminal offences: Total	Traffic offences	Intentional homicide: Total	Intentional homicide: Completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery	Theft: Total	Theft: of a motor vehicle	Theft: Total	Theft: Burglary: Domestic	Theft: Burglary: Total	Drug offences: Total	Drug offences: Drug trafficking
		R43TTT03	R43HOT03	R43HCT03	R43AST03	R43RAT03	R43ROT03	R43THT03	R43TVT03	R43BUT03	R43BDT03	R43DRT03	R43DTT03	
Moldova	177	33.0	10.5	9.2	33	55	6	...
Netherlands
Poland	205	7	16	6.9	47	51	...	41.1
Portugal	97	10.6	2.1	3.0	16	19	34	30.5
Romania	165	2	31	...	2.1	9.8	28	70	2	...
Russia	607	...	70	...	53.2	17.6	59	183	47	...
Slovakia	110
Slovenia	36	...	5	...	1.8	4.2	5	6	3	...
Spain	137	...	5	...	3.1	5.2	31	...
Sweden	59	3	6	8	17	...
Switzerland	45	9	4	2.7	2.7	1.9	4	10	19	15.4
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	113	5	7	...	1.5	5.8	17	23	1.4	15.7	20	...
UK: Northern Ireland	42	2	6	...	0.8	2.5	6	4	0.6	0.0	3	...
UK: Scotland	107	...	15	12.9	18.5	2.7	11	15	1.0	6.3	17	16.4
Mean	130	4	15	10	8	5	18	35	1	11	0	13	10	10
Median	59	3	7	10	3	3	11	15	1	6	0	9	7	7
Minimum	36	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Maximum	726	14	70	33	53	18	59	183	1	41	1	47	31	31

Table 4.2.3.2 Convicted prison population percentage of females, by offence - 2003

	Criminal offences: Total	Traffic offences	Intentional homicide:		Assault	Rape	Robbery	Theft: Total		Theft: of a motor vehicle	Theft: Total		Theft: Burglary: Domestic		Drug offences: Total	
			Completed	Intentional homicide: Total				R43HCW03	R43RW03		R43THW03	R43BUIW03	R43BDW03	R43DRW03	R43DTW03	
Albania	2.5	...	3.8	...	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	...
Armenia
Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria	3.1	...	4.3	4.7	0.0	0.0	3.5
Croatia	3.3	0.0	4.2	3.2	6.7	0.0	6.3	3.1	2.7	...
Cyprus	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Czech Republic	2.5	...	5.8	...	1.2	0.1	2.3	3.4	6.2	3.8
Denmark	19.0	...
Estonia	4.1
Finland	4.9	...	7.2	...	3.3	1.7	5.0	4.4	6.7	...
France	3.0	...	6.8	...	2.5	0.1	...	2.0	3.8
Georgia	4.2	...	5.7	1.9	3.2	37.5
Germany	4.4	1.6	5.6	...	2.3	0.4	2.5	5.4	1.4	0.6	5.5	5.4
Greece
Hungary	10.2
Iceland	5.8	12.5	18.2	20.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	5.9	3.8	...
Ireland
Italy
Lithuania	2.9	...	4.5	...	2.9	0.0	1.5	2.0	12.8	...
Luxembourg	3.4	5.0	9.4	...
Malta	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	1.7	19.0	...

	Criminal offences: Total	Traffic offences	Intentional homicide: Total	Intentional homicide: Completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery	Theft: Total	Theft: of a motor vehicle	Theft: Burglary		Drug offences: Total	Drug trafficking
										R43TTW03	R43HOW03		
Moldova	3.2	4.4	2.6	0.0	2.0	3.6	9.8	...
Netherlands
Poland	2.7	0.5	7.9	0.7	2.0	1.4	...	0.7
Portugal	5.8	4.2	2.8	0.0	1.6	1.7	11.6	12.2
Romania	4.3
Russia	5.7
Slovakia	3.9
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	5.2
Switzerland	11.5	2.3	4.6	6.6	4.5	0.7	3.8	5.4	5.7	5.7
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	5.8	2.2	3.6	...	4.7	0.1	2.7	7.0	0.8	4.9	...	13.0	...
UK: Northern Ireland	1.2	0.0	3.1	...	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.5	0.0	0.0	...
UK: Scotland	4.5	...	4.0	3.8	3.5	0.0	3.3	6.7	0.0	0.6	...	7.2	6.7
Mean	4	2	6	7	3	0	3	4	0	2	1	8	11
Median	4	1	5	4	3	0	2	3	0	1	1	6	6
Minimum	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	4
Maximum	11	13	18	20	8	2	6	7	1	5	1	19	38

	Criminal offences: Total	Traffic offences	Intentional homicide: Total	Intentional homicide: Completed	Assault	Rape	Robbery	Theft: Total	Theft: of a motor vehicle	Theft: Burglary: Total	Theft: Burglary: Domestic	Drug offences: Total	Drug offences: Drug trafficking
Moldova	2.2	1.5	0.4	0.7	2.1	4.4	1.1	...
Netherlands
Poland	0.0
Portugal	4.7	1.4	0.0	3.8	11.5	7.4	2.4	1.5
Romania	1.8
Russia	2.2	...	1.2	...	2.3	3.2	2.8	0.9
Slovakia	1.1
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	3.0	4.6	0.2	...	5.6	0.8	3.3	5.9	20.9	5.5	...	0.5	...
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	1.9	...	0.5	0.6	3.8	1.5	2.1	3.0	8.0	2.8	...	0.0	0.0
Mean	2	2	1	1	3	2	4	4	10	4	4	1	0
Median	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	8	3	4	0	0
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	0
Maximum	7	6	5	2	10	12	11	18	21	6	4	2	1

	Criminal offences: Total		Traffic offences		Intentional homicide: Total		Intentional homicide: Completed		Assault		Rape		Robbery		Theft: Total		Theft: of a motor vehicle		Theft: Burglary: Total		Theft: Burglary: Domestic		Drug offences: Total		Drug offences: Drug trafficking				
	R43TCA03	R43TTA03	R43HCA03	R43HSA03	R43HCA03	R43HSA03	R43RAA03	R43ROA03	R43THA03	R43TVA03	R43BUA03	R43BDA03	R43DRA03	R43DTA03															
Moldova		
Netherlands		
Poland	1.5		
Portugal		
Romania	0.9		
Russia		
Slovakia	3.5		
Slovenia		
Spain		
Sweden		
Switzerland	73.3	46.8	51.2	49.2	59.2	46.8	55.6	52.4	67.6	73.0		
Ukraine		
UK: England & Wales	10.6	4.9	8.9	...	3.6	9.8	5.6	3.7	
UK: Northern Ireland	
UK: Scotland	1.2	...	0.7	0.5	0.7	1.5	1.2	0.4	
Mean	19	24	13	13	20	11	17	19	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	24	37	
Median	8	5	2	1	4	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	37	
Minimum	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	73	67	51	49	67	47	56	55	2	2	2	56	55	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	68	73	

Comments on Tables 4.2.3.1 to 4.2.3.4

Croatia: The data refer to 31 December 2003.

Czech Republic: The data are for 31 December 2000 and show the number of offences committed by convicted persons, i.e. the counting unit is not a person but an offence.

Denmark: Assaults also include assaults against public servants. Theft also includes theft of cars and vandalism.

Data refer to 2 December 2003.

Estonia: Data refer to 1 January 2004. The definitions for Assault, Robbery and Theft differ from those in the previous chapters.

Finland: The figure for 'rape' also comprises other sexual offences.

France: The nomenclature for the offences used in prison statistics is less detailed than that for convictions, e.g.:

Homicide = attempted and completed homicide, excluding assault leading to death

Assault = assault and bodily injury and assault against children

Rape = rape and sexual offences

Theft (total) = aggravated theft (including robbery) and simple theft

Germany: Convicted prison population by offence on 31 March 2003.

Rape: the figures given include sexual assault as well as some other sexual offences.

Drug trafficking: The definition of drug trafficking given in the definitions section cannot be applied exactly as far as correctional statistics are concerned. Therefore, figures reported here are slightly higher than they would have been if the definition could be met.

Lithuania: Numbers of prison population are at 31 December.

The figures of assault include only intentional grave body injury or infection.

Malta: Drug offences include all drug-related offences.

Poland: 'Intentional homicide' excludes infanticide, euthanasia and assault leading to death.

'Rape' excludes sexual intercourse with a minor without force and other forms of sexual assault.

'Robbery' excludes theft immediately followed by violence.

Russia: Data refer to 1 January.

Total number of drug offences excludes minors.

Number of minors excludes pre-trial detainees.

Sweden: Data refer to 1 October 2003.

The offence definitions deviate from the standard definitions used in the previous chapters.

UK: England & Wales: Data at 30 June 2003.

UK: Northern Ireland: Includes immediate custody prisoners, excludes fine defaulters.

UK: Scotland: Data are as at 1 September.

Minors are defined as all those under 18. Aliens are defined as all those who have specified a nationality other than 'British'.

4.3 Technical information

Pre-trial detainees are included in all countries except Hungary. But persons who were convicted but had not yet been sentenced were also excluded in Bulgaria and Malta. And sentenced detainees who have appealed or who are within the statutory limit for doing so are also excluded in England & Wales and Scotland.

Persons held in institutions for juvenile offenders are included in all countries except Hungary, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Northern Ireland.

Persons held in institutions for drug-addicts offenders are excluded in all countries except Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Moldova, the Netherlands, Russia and Slovakia.

Persons held in facilities under the responsibility of any Ministry other than the Ministry of Justice are excluded in all countries except Albania, Austria, Finland, Malta, the Netherlands and Switzerland.

Offenders serving their sentence under electronic surveillance are excluded in all countries except Belgium, France and the Netherlands.

Only for Portugal and Russia the maximum age for minors used in this chapter differs from that in Chapter 1 (Table 1.2.2.). For both countries the maximum age is 20.

4.4 Sources

Albania	General directory of the prisons system. Ministry of Justice
Armenia	...
Austria	Information given electronically by the Ministry of Justice
Belgium	Service Public Fédéral Justice – Direction générale de l'Exécution des Peines et Mesures
Bulgaria	The computing centre of the Punishment Enforcement General Direction
Croatia	Annual Prison's Reports, Ministry of Justice, Administration and Local Self-Governance, unpublished
Cyprus	Prisons Statistic Books
Czech Republic	The Yearbook, 2000 - 2003, Prison Service of the Czech Republic. Published
Denmark	Statistics Denmark and the Danish Department of Correction
Estonia	Ministry of Justice – statistics on prison population – not published

Finland	...
France	Ministère de la Justice, direction de l'Administration pénitentiaire, Annuaire statistique de la Justice
Georgia	...
Germany	Statistisches Bundesamt (Hrsg.) Internal statistics of the Federal Ministry of Justice, unpublished
Greece	National Statistical Service of Greece. Ministry of Justice (unpublished data)
Hungary	HQ of Correctional Institutions
Iceland	Prison and Probation Administration in Iceland
Ireland	...
Italy	National Institute of Statistics-Istat. Ministero della Giustizia
Lithuania	Ministry of Justice – Prison Department. Statistics Lithuania. Centre for Crime Prevention
Luxembourg	Ministry of Justice
Malta	Corradino Correctional Facilities
Moldova	Département des institutions pénitentiaires, Ministère de la Justice
Netherlands	Ministry of Justice (WODC) and Central Bureau of Statistics
Poland	Central Prison Authority, Department of Statistics
Portugal	Prison Services, Ministry of Justice
Romania	National Prisons Administration, Ministry of Justice
Russia	www.prison.org/penal/stat/ Site on Russian prison system www.mhg.ru/publications/1C2F913 Moscow Helsinki Group Report on Prisons
Slovakia	General Directorate of Prison and Justice Guard Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (SPACE). Surveys 2000 to 2003
Slovenia	Annual reports of the National Prison Administration 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003
Spain	Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (SPACE). Surveys 2000 to 2003
Sweden	Official statistics published by the National Prison Authority
Switzerland	l'enquête annuelle sur la privation de liberté
Ukraine	Department of Execution of Punishment of Ukraine. Unpublished Report
UK: England & Wales	Based on data taken from 'Offender Management Caseload Statistics 2003' See www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds
UK: Northern Ireland	Northern Ireland Office Research and Statistical Bulletin 2/2004: The Northern Ireland Prison Population in 2003
UK: Scotland	Scottish Prison Service

Appendix I

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 3.3).

Conviction statistics are indeed more bound to legal concepts than police statistics. This explains why variation in definitions is higher in Chapter 3 than in Chapter 1. For the offence definitions that follow, we shall first look at those used in Chapter 1 and specify, wherever appropriate, eventual deviations from the pragmatic standard definition in Chapter 3.

The table below shows which countries were able to meet the standard definitions in all respects.

More specifically:

Table 1 Standard definitions met by country and criminal offence

	Total criminal offences	Intentional homicide	Assault	Rape	Robbery	Theft	Theft of a motor vehicle	Burglary	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: Total	Drug offences: Drug trafficking
Albania											
Armenia	YES			YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
Austria	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES			YES	YES
Belgium				YES	YES	YES	YES			YES	YES
Bulgaria											YES
Croatia	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Cyprus			YES		YES			YES	YES	YES	YES
Czech Republic	YES										YES
Denmark							YES	YES		YES	YES
Estonia	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES			YES	YES
Finland	YES	YES			YES	YES	YES			YES	YES
France			YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES
Georgia	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES			YES	YES
Germany			YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Greece			YES							YES	YES
Hungary	YES						YES			YES	YES
Iceland		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Ireland	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Italy	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Lithuania	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Luxembourg						YES				YES	YES
Malta					YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

	Total criminal offences	Intentional homicide	Assault	Rape	Robbery	Theft	Theft of a motor vehicle	Burglary	Domestic burglary	Drug offences: Total	Drug offences: Drug trafficking
Moldova	YES										YES
Netherlands	YES					YES					YES
Poland	YES	YES	YES			YES				YES	YES
Portugal		YES			YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES
Romania	YES		YES		YES	YES	YES			YES	YES
Russia										YES	YES
Slovakia	YES	YES	YES				YES	YES		YES	YES
Slovenia		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES		YES		YES
Spain	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES				YES
Sweden		YES				YES					YES
Switzerland			YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
Ukraine									YES	YES	YES
UK: England & Wales	YES	YES			YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
UK: Northern Ireland	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
UK: Scotland	YES					YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

A. Total criminal offences

According to the standard definition, this category should include all offences defined as criminal by any law, including traffic offences (mostly dangerous and drunk driving). 'Criminal' offences in this pragmatic sense include acts normally processed by the public prosecutor or a judge, whereas offences processed directly by the police, such as minor traffic offences and certain breaches of public order, are not included.

The following countries did not include traffic offences at all:

- Albania
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Denmark
- France
- Germany
- Iceland
- Luxembourg
- Slovenia
- Switzerland

In the following countries, all (i.e. even minor) traffic offences were included:

- Cyprus
- Greece
- Malta
- Portugal

In the following countries, public order offences are included:

- Portugal
- Russia
- Sweden
- Ukraine

B. 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
- infanticide

but exclude assistance with suicide.

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', et cetera.

The following countries were not able to meet the standard definition and excluded assault leading to death:

- Albania
- Armenia
- Belgium
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Greece
- Hungary
- Moldova
- The Netherlands
- Russia
- Slovenia
- Ukraine

The following countries excluded cases of euthanasia:

- Belgium
- Estonia
- Greece
- Malta
- Slovenia
- Ukraine

Infanticide is included in homicide in all countries with the exception of

- Czech Republic
- Greece
- Romania

Assistance with suicide is included only in

- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Cyprus
- France
- Ireland
- Italy
- Malta
- Switzerland
- UK: Scotland

C. 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
- acts just causing pain
- slapping/punching
- sexual assault

The following countries were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects and include in their assault statistics:

a. assault leading to death

This list includes the same countries that exclude assault leading to death from their homicide statistics (see A). In addition, the following countries include this kind of situations in their statistics of assault:

- Bulgaria
- Georgia
- Malta

b. threats

are generally excluded, except in

- Bulgaria
- Georgia
- Ireland
- Malta
- UK: Northern Ireland

c. acts just causing pain or slapping or punching

are included in:

- Bulgaria
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Finland
- Ireland
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Portugal
- Sweden
- UK: England and Wales
- UK: Northern Ireland
- UK: Scotland

d. sexual assault

is included in the statistics only in

- Croatia

D. Rape

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:

- other than vaginal penetration (e.g. buggery)
- violent intra-marital intercourse
- sexual intercourse without force with a helpless person
- sexual intercourse with force with a minor
- incestual sexual intercourse with or without force with a minor

but exclude:

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

Countries that were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects are listed here:

a. acts other than vaginal penetration

is excluded in statistics on rape in

- Denmark
- Georgia
- Greece
- Russia
- Ukraine
- UK: England & Wales
- UK: Scotland

b. violent intra-marital intercourse

is excluded in the rape statistics only in

- Greece
- Moldova
- Russia

c. sexual intercourse without force with a helpless person

is included everywhere except in the following countries:

- Denmark
- Georgia
- Greece
- Netherlands
- Slovenia
- Sweden
- UK: Scotland

d. sexual intercourse with force with a minor

is excluded in

- Georgia
- Greece
- Slovenia

e. incestual sexual intercourse with or without force with a minor

is excluded in

- Austria
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Finland
- Georgia
- Greece
- Hungary
- Poland
- Russia
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- UK: England & Wales

f. sexual intercourse with a minor without force

is excluded everywhere, except in:

- Albania
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Malta
- Moldova
- Portugal

g. other forms of sexual assault

are excluded from rape statistics everywhere except in:

- Bulgaria
- Romania

E. Robbery

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 with violence

but exclude:

- pickpocketing
- extortion
- blackmail

It should be noted that legal definitions of robbery often exclude mugging (or bag-snatching) where the offender takes the object away without directly hurting or threatening the victim. However, police statistics do not differentiate to the same degree between the two situations for obvious practical reasons (the exact circumstances being often unknown at this stage). Therefore, the concept of robbery, as used in Chapter 1, is somewhat broader than in Chapter 3 (in connection with conviction statistics).

Countries that were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects in Chapter 1 are listed here:

- a. Countries excluding muggings
 - Czech Republic
 - Denmark
 - Greece
 - Poland
 - Slovakia
 - Sweden
 - Ukraine

- b. Countries excluding theft with violence
 - Denmark
 - Greece
 - Hungary
 - UK: Northern Ireland
 - UK: Scotland

Figures for all countries exclude extortion and blackmail, except in Bulgaria.

Figures exclude pick-pocketing everywhere except in Bulgaria, Moldova and the Netherlands.

F. Theft

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:

- burglary
- theft of motor vehicles
- theft of other items
- theft of small value

but exclude:

- embezzlement (including theft by employees)
- receiving/handling of stolen goods

Countries that were not able to meet the standard definition in all respects are listed here:

- a. Burglary is included in all countries.
- b. Theft of motor vehicles is included in theft statistics of all countries with the exception of Denmark, Moldova and Ukraine.
- c. Theft of other items is included in the counts of all countries.
- d. Theft of small values is usually not included in the statistics of
 - Czech Republic
 - Hungary
 - Lithuania
 - Poland
 - Russia
 - Slovakia
- e. Embezzlement is excluded in all countries with the exception of
 - Albania
 - Bulgaria
 - Cyprus
 - Greece
 - Moldova
- f. Receiving/handling stolen property is included in theft counts only in Bulgaria.

G. Theft of a motor vehicle

According to the standard definition, figures on theft of a motor vehicle should, where possible, include joyriding, but exclude theft of motorboats and handling/receiving stolen vehicles.

- a. The following countries excluded joyriding:
 - Czech Republic
 - Georgia
 - Greece
 - Moldova
 - Netherlands
 - Poland
 - Russia
 - Slovenia

Users of the Sourcebook should be aware that figures on convictions (in Chapter 3) for ‘motor vehicle theft’ often include joyriding only. The reason is that the traditional concept of theft (as it had shaped continental as well as Anglo-Saxon legislations) implied that the object was taken away by the thief with the intent to keep it. Wherever that intent is not present, as typically in the case of joyriding, the act is not punishable, at least not as theft. Therefore, most legislators have made it a special offence to steal a motor vehicle for temporary use only. Convictions for this kind of temporary use are recorded in conviction statistics by most countries, whereas ‘real’ theft of a car (where the intent was to keep it permanently) are included in counts of convictions for (common) theft. In police statistics (Chapter 1), this differentiation may not apply, because police officers usually do not know the ‘thief’s intent when they discover that a motor vehicle has been taken away.

- b. Theft of motorboats is included in:
 - Bulgaria
 - Cyprus
 - Finland
 - Lithuania
 - Sweden
- c. Receiving / handling stolen property is included in motor vehicle theft counts in Bulgaria and Lithuania.

H. Burglary

According to the standard definition, burglary is gaining access to a closed part of a building or other premises by use of force with the intent to steal goods. Figures on burglary should, where possible, include theft from a factory, shop or office, from a military establishment, or by using false keys; they should exclude, however, theft from a car, from a container, from a vending machine, from a parking meter and from a fenced meadow/compound.

a. Theft (burglary) from a factory, shop, or office

All countries include such incidences in burglary counts, except Italy.

b. Theft (burglary) from a military establishment

Such incidences are excluded from burglary statistics in:

- Albania
- Bulgaria
- Georgia
- Greece
- Italy
- Slovenia

c. Theft (burglary) by gaining entrance with false keys

Only Greece, Switzerland and Scotland exclude such incidences from burglary counts.

d. Theft from a car

is excluded, in line with the standard definition, from burglary counts in a majority of countries. Only the following countries include such incidences in burglary counts:

- Austria
- Bulgaria
- Czech Republic
- Estonia
- Iceland
- Malta
- Moldova
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Romania
- Russia
- Slovenia
- Spain

e. Theft from a container, a vending machine, a parking meter or a fenced meadow / compound

are excluded from burglary counts, except in the following countries where they are included:

- Austria
- Bulgaria
- Czech Republic
- Estonia
- Finland
- Iceland (but theft from a parking meter is excluded in Iceland)
- Malta (but theft from a parking meter and from a fenced meadow / compound are excluded in Malta)
- Moldova (but theft from a parking meter is excluded in Moldova)
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Romania
- Russia
- Slovenia (but theft from a fenced meadow / compound is excluded in Slovenia)
- Spain
- Sweden (but theft from a fenced meadow / compound is excluded in Sweden)

- Switzerland (but theft from a fenced meadow / compound is excluded in Switzerland)
- UK: Northern Ireland

Readers should be aware that, throughout the continent, burglary does not usually constitute a special offence. In line with traditional concepts of theft in European law, burglary usually constitutes an aggravated form of theft. Therefore, many countries have provided data on aggravated theft in Chapter 3, categories in conviction statistics closely following legal definitions. However, conviction statistics in the category of 'aggravated theft', often include other forms of more serious theft along with burglary. 'Burglary' counts given in Chapter 3 should therefore be regarded with some caution.

I. Domestic Burglary

According to the standard definition, domestic burglary is gaining access to private premises by use of force with the intent to steal goods. Figures on domestic burglary should, where possible, include theft from an attic or from a basement (in multiple dwellings) as well as theft from a secondary residence (even if unoccupied). They should exclude, however, theft from a factory, shop or an office, as well as theft from a detached garage, barn or stable, or from a fenced meadow/compound. In Chapter 3 only a few countries were able to provide data on convictions for domestic burglary.

a. Contrary to the standard definition, incidences of theft from an attic or a basement were excluded from counts of domestic burglary in the following countries:

- Austria
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Georgia
- Russia
- Sweden

b. Contrary to the standard definition, incidences of theft from a secondary residence were excluded from counts of domestic burglary in the following countries:

- Denmark
- Georgia
- Poland
- Slovakia
- Sweden

c. Contrary to the standard definition, incidences of theft from a factory, shop or an office, from a detached garage, shed, barn or stable and from a fenced meadow or compound were included in counts of domestic burglary in the following countries:

- Belgium (but theft from a factory, shop or an office were excluded in Belgium)
- Bulgaria
- Czech Republic
- Moldova
- Netherlands
- Romania

J. Drug Offences (Total)

Drug offences are largely uniform through international conventions. According to the standard definition used here, the category of drug offences should, where possible, include possession, cultivation, production, sale, supplying, transportation, importation, exportation and financing of drug operations; drug trafficking should include, where possible, such acts as far as they are not in connection with personal use.

a. Possession of illicit drugs is included in counts of total drug offences in all countries. However, possession of small quantities (in connection with personal use) is not an offence or (as in the Netherlands) is systematically not prosecuted and, thus, not included in the counts of

- Czech Republic
- Estonia (since September 2002)
- Italy
- Netherlands
- Portugal
- Slovenia
- Spain

In these countries, the figures given in Table 1.2.1.14 will include proportionately more offences of trafficking compared to countries where drug users are often subject to arrest or prosecution.

b. Cultivation, production, sale, and supplying of drugs is covered in drug offences counts in all countries without exception.

c. Transportation of drugs is included in counts of total drug offences in all countries with the exception of Bulgaria.

d. Importation of drugs is included in counts of total drug offences in all countries except in Bulgaria and Sweden.

e. Exportation of drugs is included in counts of total drug offences in all countries except in Bulgaria.

f. Financing of drug operations is included in the counts of total drug offences of all countries with the exception of

- Bulgaria
- Czech Republic
- Ireland
- Moldova
- Portugal
- Slovenia

K. Drug trafficking

Drug trafficking should include, where possible, drug offences (as defined under J) which are not in connection with personal use. All countries included here have laws that make it an offence to commit any such acts (as defined under J). The only relevant differentiation is that some countries do not make it an offence, or reserve milder sanctions, for acts (especially possession) committed by drug users. Some other countries make 'serious trafficking' (involving usually large quantities, or large profits) an aggravated offence. With these reservations, the legislation is rather uniform throughout Europe, given the central role of international conventions in this domain. Given the difficulty of distinguishing aggravated and other forms of trafficking, this differentiation (made in the first edition) has been omitted in the second and third editions.

Appendix II

Population figures (in millions)

Country	2000	2001	2002	2003
Albania	3.47	3.49	3.51	3.53
Armenia	3.04	3.03	3.01	3.00
Austria	8.11	8.13	8.15	8.16
Belgium	10.26	10.29	10.31	10.33
Bulgaria	7.82	7.74	7.66	7.59
Croatia	4.41	4.44	4.48	4.50
Cyprus	0.76	0.76	0.77	0.77
Czech Republic	10.27	10.26	10.26	10.25
Denmark	5.34	5.36	5.37	5.39
Estonia	1.38	1.37	1.36	1.35
Finland	5.17	5.18	5.19	5.20
France	59.38	59.66	59.93	60.18
Georgia	4.78	4.75	4.73	4.71
Germany*	82.19	82.28	82.35	82.40
Greece	10.56	10.58	10.60	10.63
Hungary	10.14	10.11	10.08	10.06
Iceland	0.28	0.28	0.29	0.29
Ireland	3.79	3.84	3.88	3.92
Italy	57.72	57.84	57.93	58.00
Lithuania	3.65	3.65	3.63	3.62
Luxembourg	0.44	0.44	0.45	0.46
Malta	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.40
Moldova	4.43	4.43	4.43	4.44
Netherlands	15.91	16.02	16.12	16.22
Poland	38.65	38.64	38.63	38.60
Portugal	10.34	10.39	10.43	10.48
Romania	22.45	22.43	22.40	22.38
Russia	146.73	146.02	145.27	144.59
Slovakia	5.40	5.40	5.41	5.42
Slovenia	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
Spain	40.02	40.09	40.15	40.22
Sweden	8.92	8.94	8.95	8.97
Switzerland	7.27	7.31	7.36	7.41
Ukraine	49.01	48.51	48.06	47.67
UK: England & Wales	52.14	52.36	52.57	52.79
UK: Northern Ireland	1.68	1.69	1.70	1.70
UK: Scotland	5.06	5.06	5.05	5.06

Notes on Appendix II:

Total mid-year population.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, International Data Base (available online: consulted on February 22, 2006).

Germany: Data for Chapter 3 refer to former West Germany (including Berlin) only: in the year 2000 the population figure was 68.40, in 2001 68.71, in 2002 68.91 and in 2003 69.00.

United Kingdom: Demographic data for England and Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland are estimates calculated by National Statistics Online (www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=6).

WODC-rapporten

Om zo veel mogelijk belanghebbenden te informeren over de onderzoeksresultaten van het WODC wordt een beperkte oplage van de rapporten kosteloos verspreid onder functionarissen, werkgroepen en instellingen binnen en buiten het ministerie van Justitie. Dit gebeurt aan de hand van een verzendlijst die afhankelijk van het onderwerp van het rapport opgesteld wordt. De rapporten in de reeks Onderzoek en beleid (O&B) worden uitgegeven door Boom Juridische uitgevers en zijn voor belangstellenden die niet voor een kosteloos rapport in aanmerking komen, te bestellen bij Boom distributiecentrum, postbus 400, 7940 AK Meppel, tel.: 0522-23 75 55, via e-mail: bdc@bdc.boom.nl.

Een complete lijst van de WODC-rapporten is te vinden op de WODC-site (www.wodc.nl). Daar zijn ook de uitgebreide samenvattingen te vinden van alle vanaf 1997 verschenen WODC-rapporten. Volledige teksten van de rapporten (vanaf 1999) zullen met terugwerkende kracht op de WODC-site beschikbaar komen. Hieronder volgen de titelbeschrijvingen van de in 2002, 2003, 2004 en 2005 verschenen rapporten.

Kamphorst, P.A., G.J. Terlouw

Van vast naar mobiel; een evaluatie van het experiment met elektronisch huisarrest voor minderjarigen als modaliteit voor de voorlopige hechtenis
2002, O&B 195

Moolenaar, D.E.G., F.P. van Tulder, G.L.A.M. Huijbregts, W. van der Heide

Prognose van de sanctiecapaciteit tot en met 2006
2002, O&B 196

Bokhorst, R.J., C.H. de Kogel, C.F.M. van der Meij

Evaluatie van de Wet BOB; fase 1: de eerste praktijkervaringen met de Wet bijzondere opsporingsbevoegdheden
2002, O&B 197

Kleemans, E.R., M.E.I. Brienens, H.G. van de Bunt m.m.v.

R.F. Kouwenberg, G. Paulides, J. Barendsen

Georganiseerde criminaliteit in Nederland; tweede rapportage op basis van de WODC-monitor
2002, O&B 198

Voert, M. ter, J. Kuppens

Schijn van partijdigheid rechters
2002, O&B 199

Daalder, A.L.

Het bordeelverbod opgeheven; prostitutie in 2000-2001
2002, O&B 200

Klijn, A.

Naamrecht
2002, O&B 201

Kruissink, M., C. Verwers

Jeugdreclassering in de praktijk
2002, O&B 202

Eshuis, R.J.J.

Van rechtbank naar kanton; evaluatie van de competentiegrensverhoging voor civiele handelszaken in 1999

2002, O&B 203

Meijer, R.F., M. Grapendaal, M.M.J. van Ooyen, B.S.J. Wartna, M. Brouwers, A.A.M. Essers

Geregistreerde drugcriminaliteit in cijfers; achtergrondstudie bij het Justitieonderdeel van de Nationale Drugmonitor: Jaarbericht 2002

2003, O&B 204

Tak, P.J.J.

The Dutch criminal justice system; organization and operation – second revised edition

2003, O&B 205

Kromhout, M., M. van San

Schimmige werelden; nieuwe etnische groepen en jeugdcriminaliteit

2003, O&B 206

Kogel, C.H. de, C. Verwers

De longstay afdeling van Veldzicht; een evaluatie

2003, O&B 207

Moolenaar, D.E.G., G.L.A.M. Huijbregts

Sanctiecapaciteit 2007; een beleidsneutrale prognose

2003, O&B 208

Eshuis, R.J.J.

Claims bij de rechtbank

2003, O&B 209

Combrink-Kuiters, L., E. Niemeyer, M. ter Voert m.m.v. N. Dijkhoff, M. van Gammeren-Zoetewij, J. Kuppens

Ruimte voor Mediation

2003, O&B 210

Heide, W. van der, A.Th.J. Eggen (red.)

Criminaliteit en rechtshandhaving 2001; Ontwikkelingen en samenhangen

2003, O&B 211

European Sourcebook

European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2003

2003, O&B 212

Smit, P.R., F.P. van Tulder, R.F. Meijer, P.P.J. Groen

Het ophelderingspercentage nader beschouwd

2003, O&B 213

Dijksterhuis, B.M., M.J.G. Jacobs, W.M. de Jongste

De competentiegrens van enkelvoudige kamers in strafzaken

2003, O&B 214

Bunt, H.G. van de, C.R.A. van der Schroot

Prevention of Organised Crime

2003, O&B 215

- Wartna, B.S.J., N. Tollenaar**
Bekenden van Justitie
2004, O&B 216
- Moolenaar, D.E.G., P.P.J. Groen, A.G. Mein, B.S.J. Wartna, M. Blom**
Wegenverkeerswet 1994
2004, O&B 217
- Faber, W., A.A.A. van Nunen**
Uit onverdachte bron
2004, O&B 218
- Velthoven, B.C.J. van, M.J. ter Voert m.m.v. M. van Gammeren-Zoetewij**
Geschilbeslechtingdelta 2003; Over verloop en afloop van (potentieel) juridische problemen van burgers
2004, O&B 219
- Leuw E., R.V. Bijl, A. Daalder**
Pedoseksuele delinquentie; Een onderzoek naar prevalentie, toedracht en strafrechtelijke interventies
2004, O&B 220
- Leertouwer, E.C., G.L.A.M. Huijbregts**
Sanctiecapaciteit 2008
2004, O&B 221
- Beijer, A., R.J. Bokhorst, M. Boone, C.H. Brants, J.M.W. Lindeman**
De wet bijzondere opsporingsbevoegdheden – eindevaluatie
2004, O&B 222
- Moors, J.A., M.Y.W. Von Bergh, S. Bogaerts, J.W.M.W. van Poppel, A.M. van Kalmthout**
Kiezen voor delen?
2004, O&B 223
- Adriaanse, J.A.A., N.J.H. Huls, J.G. Kuijl, P. Vos**
Informeel reorganisatie in het perspectief van surseance van betaling, WSNP en faillissement
2004, O&B 224
- Jong, P.O. de, M. Herweijer**
Alle regels tellen
2004, O&B 225
- Kogel, C.H. de, C. Verwers, V.E. den Hartogh**
'Blijvend delictgevaarlijk' – empirische schattingen en conceptuele verheldering
2004, O&B 226
- Wartna, B.S.J., N. Tollenaar, M. Blom**
Recidive 1997; Een cijfermatig overzicht van de strafrechtelijke recidive van volwassen en jeugdige daders
2005, O&B 227
- Wartna, B.S.J., N. Tollenaar, A.A.M. Essers**
Door na de gevangenis; Een cijfermatig overzicht van de strafrechtelijke recidive onder ex-gedetineerden
2005, O&B 228

Wartna, B.S.J., S. el Harbachi, A.M. van der Laan

Jong vast; Een cijfermatig overzicht van de strafrechtelijke recidive van ex-pupillen van justitiële jeugdinstellingen
2005, O&B 229

Wartna, B.S.J., S. el Harbachi, L.M. van der Knaap

Buiten behandeling; Een cijfermatig overzicht van de strafrechtelijke recidive van ex-terbeschikkinggestelden
2005, O&B 230

Lünnemann, K.D., M.Y. Bruinsma

Geweld binnen en buiten; Aard, omvang en daders van huiselijk en publiek geweld in Nederland
2005, O&B 231

Erp, J.G. van, M.D. van Ewijk

Werklast bestuurlijke boete; Determinanten van de werkbelasting in de bestuursrechtspleging
2005, O&B 232

Broeksteeg, J.L.W., E.M.J. Hardy, S. Klosse, M.G.W.M. Peeters, L.F.M. Verhey

Zicht op wetgevingskwaliteit; Onderzoek naar de wetgevingsadvisering van de Raad van State
2005, O&B 233

Gritter, E., G. Knigge, N.J.M. Kwakman

De WED op de helling; Een onderzoek naar de wenselijkheid de Wet op de economische delicten te herzien
2005, O&B 234

Rovers, G.B., E. de Vries Robbé

Interne criminaliteit in de logistieke sector
2005, O&B 235

Kogel, G.H. de, V.E. den Hartogh

Contraire beëindiging van de TBS-maatregel; Aantal, aard en verband met recidive
2005, O&B 236

Eggen, A.Th.J., W. van der Heide

Criminaliteit en rechtshandhaving 2004; Ontwikkelingen en samenhangen
2006, O&B 237

Bruin, D.E. de, C.J.M. Meijerman, F.R.J. Leenders, R.V. Braam

Verslingerd aan meer dan een spel; Een onderzoek naar de aard en omvang van kansspelproblematiek in Nederland
2006, O&B 238

Knaap, L.M. van der, L.T.J. Nijssen, S. Bogaerts

Geweld verslagen? Een studie naar de preventie van geweld in het publieke en semi-publieke domein
2006, O&B 239

Kogel, C.H. de, M.H. Nagtegaal, E. Neven, G. Vervaeke

Gewelddadige delinquenten met een psychische stoornis

2006, O&B 240

**Martin Killias, Marcelo Fernando Aebi, Kauko Aromaa, Bruno Aubusson
de Cavarlay, Gordon Barclay, Beata Gruszczyńska, Hanns von Hofer,**

Vasilika Hysi, Jörg - Martin Jehle, Paul Smit, Cynthia Tavares

European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics

2006, O&B 241

